Independent and combined effects of nutrition and sanitation interventions on child growth and enteric pathogen carriage in rural Cambodia: a factorial cluster-randomised controlled trial

Amanda Lai[1,2], Irene Velez[3], Ramya Ambikapathi[4], Krisna Seng[3], Karen Levy[5], Erin Kowalsky[1,2], David Holcomb[1], Konstantinos T. Konstantinidis[2], Oliver Cumming[6], Joe Brown[1*]

[1] Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA
[2] School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA
[3] MSI, A Tetra Tech Company, Arlington, Virginia, USA
[4] Department of Public Health, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA
[5] Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA
[6] Department of Disease Control, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

* Corresponding author: Joe Brown, joebrown@unc.edu

Abstract

Background

Childhood exposure to enteric pathogens associated with poor sanitation contributes to undernutrition, which is linked with adverse effects later in life. This trial assessed the independent and combined effects of nutrition and sanitation interventions on child growth outcomes and enteric pathogen infection in rural Cambodia, where the prevalence of childhood stunting remains high.

Methods

We conducted a factorial cluster-randomised controlled trial of 4,015 households with 4,124 children (1-28 months of age at endline) across three rural provinces in Cambodia. Fifty-five communes (clusters) were randomly assigned to a control arm or one of three treatments: a nutrition-only arm, a sanitation-only arm, and a combined nutrition and sanitation arm receiving both treatments. The primary outcome was length-for-age Z-score (LAZ); other outcomes included weight-for-age Z-score (WAZ), weight-for-length Z-score (WLZ), stunting, wasting, underweight, and caregiver-reported diarrhoea. We assayed stool specimens from a subset of all children (n = 1,620) for 27 enteric pathogens (14 bacteria, 6 viruses, 3 protozoa, and 4 soil-transmitted helminths) and estimated effects of interventions on enteric pathogen detection and density. Analysis was by intention-to-treat. The trial was pre-registered with ISRCTN Registry (ISRCTN77820875).

Findings

Self-reported adherence was high for the nutrition intervention but uptake was low for sanitation. Compared with a mean LAZ of -1.04 (SD 1.2) in the control arm, children in the nutrition-only arm (LAZ +0.08, 95% CI -0.01-0.18) and combined nutrition and sanitation arm (LAZ +0.10, 95% CI 0.01-0.20) experienced greater linear growth; there were no measurable differences in LAZ in the sanitation-only arm (LAZ -0.05, 95% CI -0.16-0.05). We found no effect of any intervention (delivered independently or combined) on either enteric pathogen frequency or pathogen load in stool. Compared with a mean WAZ of -1.05 (SD 1.1) in the control arm, children in the nutrition-only arm (WAZ +0.10, 95% CI 0.00-0.19) and combined intervention arm (WAZ +0.11, 95% CI 0.03-0.20) were heavier for their age; there was no difference in WAZ in the sanitation-only arm. There were no differences between arms in prevalence of stunting, wasting, underweight status, one-week period prevalence of diarrhoea, pathogen prevalence, or pathogen density in stool.

Interpretation

Improvements in child growth in nutrition and combined nutrition and sanitation arms are consistent with previous efficacy trials of combined nutrition and sanitation interventions. We found no evidence that the sanitation intervention alone improved child growth or reduced enteric pathogen detection, having achieved only modest changes in access and use.

Funding

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), contracts AID-OAA-M-13-00017 and AID-OAA-TO-16-00016. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility

of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

Introduction

Childhood undernutrition is associated with higher susceptibility to infectious disease, reduced cognitive function, and various adverse outcomes later in life[1]. Growth faltering is an effect of chronic undernutrition and tends to manifest in a child's first two years[2]. The relationship between breastfeeding and overall good nutrition and growth faltering is well understood[3,4], so many studies have focused on improving infant and child nutrition to achieve better growth outcomes[5–7]. However, nutrition interventions alone have not been successful in eliminating stunting[5], suggesting that broader interventions addressing other important factors are needed alongside exclusive breastfeeding and improved nutritional intake[8].

Reducing early childhood exposure to enteric pathogens through safe water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) may complement other interventions by reducing diarrhoeal diseases and environmental enteric dysfunction[9,10] – both of which can impact early childhood growth and development[11]. While diarrhoea has been widely used as a primary outcome measure in WASH studies[6,7,12–18], recent studies have used direct detection of enteric pathogens (as a proxy for enteric infection)[16,19,20] and anthropometry measurements[6,7,21–23] as primary outcomes as these measures are more objectively measurable and may also broadly indicate health status in capturing cumulative effects of exposures via environmental enteric dysfunction[24]. There has therefore been significant interest in recent years in the specific contribution of poor sanitation to persistent stunting in high-burden settings. Observational studies have found strong associations between child growth faltering and poor access to sanitation in Cambodia[25], Indonesia[21], and India[26]. However, recent randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in Zimbabwe[22], Bangladesh[6], and Kenya[7] that delivered standalone household-level sanitation interventions (not coupled with other nutrition or hygiene interventions) were not found to improve child growth in efficacy trials.

The community-led total sanitation (CLTS) framework is an approach to ending open defecation (OD) through behavioural change and collective action rather than through the provision of hardware and materials[27]. CLTS and other rural promotion-based interventions shift the focus from individual and household sanitation practices to a community-level concern over OD by triggering collective behaviour change through powerful emotional drivers such as shame and disgust, as well as positive motivators such as improved health, dignity, and pride[28,29]. Observational studies in Cambodia[30], India[31], Ecuador[32] and elsewhere[33,34] found higher community-level sanitation coverage to be associated with reduced prevalence of stunting. Despite this, recent RCTs employing promotion-based interventions have found mixed effects on child growth. One trial was found to be successful in improving child growth in Mali[18], but this effect was not observed in other trials in Tanzania[35], Indonesia[36], nor India[12,37].

This study contributes to a growing literature on the impact of combined nutrition and sanitation interventions on early child growth, caregiver-reported diarrhoea, and detection and quantification of enteric pathogens in stool as a proxy for enteric infection. We used a factorial cluster-randomised controlled trial (cRCT) to assess the independent and combined effects of nutrition and sanitation interventions delivered in the context of a large-scale, USAID-funded rural nutrition and sanitation/hygiene program in Cambodia. We hypothesised that children receiving both sanitation and nutrition interventions would have increased linear growth

compared with children from control areas lacking these interventions. We further hypothesised that combined nutrition and sanitation interventions would lead to synergistic improvements in linear growth beyond what was realised in either standalone intervention arm. The hypothesised pathway for these effects, consistent with secondary outcome measures, was reduced enteric pathogen frequency and enteric pathogen load in stools.

Methods

Study design and participants

We implemented a two-by-two factorial cRCT in rural communes in three provinces in Cambodia: Battambang, Pursat, and Siem Reap[38]. The communes targeted by the program were selected based on two criteria: communes where at least 30% of the population was living below the poverty line according to the 2011 Cambodia Ministry of Planning's Commune Database; and communes where latrine subsidies were not then in place. This study is reported per the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) guideline[39] (see Supporting Information for CONSORT checklist).

Randomisation and masking

In 2015, prior to the start of project activities, we randomly assigned communes to one of three treatment arms (nutrition only, sanitation/hygiene only, combined nutrition and sanitation/hygiene) or control arm using a random number generator with reproducible seed in Stata 13 (Stata, College Station, TX). Randomisation was conducted at a cluster level to limit the risk of contamination between study arms. All villages within each treatment commune received the assigned interventions for their respective commune. Following randomisation, three communes were dropped from the trial due to objections from the local governments of overlap with other current programming. This resulted in 55 communes with treatment arms of different sizes: 11 communes in nutrition-only arm; 13 in sanitation-only arm; 12 in combined-intervention arm; and 19 in control arm (Figure 2). The trial enrolled primary caregivers with a child that was born during or after the time of exposure to the interventions (1 - 28 months at time of our study) and who had lived in the commune during the child's entire life, resulting in a participant population of children 1-28 months old. Neither participants nor field staff were masked to treatment status due to the nature of the interventions. Participants were not told about other communes receiving interventions, and field staff did not discuss the trial with participants. The data collection team was blinded to the arm assignment and number of treatment arms.

Procedures

The interventions were delivered in the 36 intervention communes over the course of two years, between 2015-2017, while the remaining 19 control communes were unexposed to the programmes. Two international non-governmental organizations – Save the Children and SNV – provided programmatic implementation and coordinated activities with local governments. The nutrition interventions included complementary feeding activities and education through community-based growth promotion sessions; caregiver groups; home visits; and conditional cash transfers (CCTs) linked to the utilization of key health and nutrition services focusing on first 1,000 days of life. The sanitation interventions consisted primarily of CLTS as it was delivered here, latrine vouchers coupled with supply-side support for sanitation and hygiene products, and social behaviours change communications (SBCC)[40]. Intervention activities and

frequency are summarized in Table 1, and additional details about the interventions are described in the Supporting Information.

The survey was communicated in the Khmer language to assess household and child-level risk factors of children under 28 months of age. Enumerators completed in-home interviews with the primary caregiver of children in the household about basic household member information; breastfeeding and nutrition of children up to age 28 months; number of pregnancies and child births of the caregiver; intervention exposure and participation; household WASH conditions and practices; and household assets/characteristics to construct wealth scores (excluding WASH variables).

Stool samples were collected and preserved in duplicate using Zymo DNA/RNA Shield buffer (Zymo Research, Irvine, CA) at 1:1 by volume and stored in -20°C until extraction. A subset of stool samples were randomly selected for extraction and molecular analysis. Our extraction protocol was adapted from the xTAG Gastrointestinal Pathogen Panel (GPP; Luminex Molecular Diagnostics, Toronto, ON, Canada) protocol for pre-treatment and the QIAamp 96 Virus QIAcube HT (Qiagen, Germany) protocol for remaining extraction procedures[16]. Briefly, 200 mg solid (or 200 uL if liquid) preserved stool was combined with 1000 uL of Buffer ASL (Qiagen, Germany) in an SK38 soil grinding tube (Bertin, Rockville, MD), vortexed for 5 minutes (Vortex Genie 2, Scientific Industries, Bohemia, NY), incubated at room temperature for 10 minutes, and centrifuged at 12,000g for 2 minutes (Eppendorf, Enfield, CT). 200 uL of supernatant was used for total nucleic acid extraction following the QIAamp 96 Virus QIAcube HT protocol. We assayed total nucleic acids using a custom-developed TaqMan Array Card (TAC; ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, VA) – a compartmentalised probe-based quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assay for 30 enteric pathogen genes using individual assays validated in previously published literature in TAC format[41,42]. PCR cycling conditions were also adapted from previous work[41,42]. Details on specific targets, assays, assay validation, and other analytical metadata are included in Supporting Information.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was length-for-age Z-score (LAZ). For children 1-24 months in age, we measured recumbent length; for children 24-28 months in age, we measured standing height. Herein, “length” will be inclusive of both recumbent length and standing height. Secondary outcomes included weight-for-age Z-score (WAZ); weight-for-length Z-score (WLZ); proportion of children stunted (LAZ<-2), underweight (WAZ<-2), and wasted (WLZ<-2); caregiver reported diarrhoea; all-cause mortality; and enteric pathogen detection and quantification in stool. Child length and weight were measured by trained paired enumerators following guidelines from the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance project (FANTA)[43]. Final measurements took place in August 2019, 28 months after the end of the roll-out period. Data collection was completed by KHANA Centre for Population Health Research, with oversight and support from Management Systems International (MSI). Data collection details and measurement protocols are further described in Supporting Information.

We assessed enteric pathogens as the prevalence of individual gene targets, the number of co-detected pathogens, and enteric pathogen-associated gene copies per gram of stool based on PCR quantification cycle (Cq) and standard curves. *E.coli* pathotypes were defined as: EAEC (*aaiC*,

or *aatA*, or both), atypical EPEC (*eae* without *bfpA*, *stx1*, and *stx2*), typical EPEC (*bfpA*), ETEC (*STh*, *STp*, or *LT*), and STEC (*eae* without *bfpA* and with *stx1*, *stx2*, or both).

We documented process evaluation (PE) indicators to assess fidelty and adherence of intervention activities 28 months after the end of intervention roll-out. Fidelity was measured based on self-reported receipt of intervention activity, which included eight key nutrition activities: community dialogues (quarterly); caregiver group education course (monthly); village fairs (bi-annually); growth monitoring program (monthly); home health visits from VHSG (monthly); CCT with rolling enrolment (disbursed payments as participants met the various conditions); food vouchers (delivered once to CCT participants); and water filter vouchers (delivered once to CCT participants). Adherence was measured based on self-reported participation of intervention activities, which included household WASH practices and child nutrition behaviours. A theory of change diagram is included (Figure 1).

Statistical analysis

We performed an intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis for all outcomes using generalised estimating equations (GEE) with an exchangeable correlation structure and robust standard errors to account for clustering at the village level. We did not consider pre-intervention covariate balance[44,45] but present secondary analyses adjusted for pre-specified pre-intervention covariates in the Supporting Information[6]. Outcomes in each treatment arm were compared to the control arm and between standalone treatment arms and the combined treatment arm. We used linear regression to estimate mean differences in LAZ, WAZ, WLZ, and $\log_{10}$-transformed pathogen gene target densities and used log-linear Poisson regression to estimate the prevalence ratio (PR) between arms for nutritional status (stunting, wasting, and underweight), diarrhoea, and overall mortality. Enteric pathogen gene outcomes were dichotomised, with positive detections defined by a Cq <35[41], and Poisson regression was used to estimate PRs for individual pathogens detected in stool[58]. We further estimated the incidence rate ratio (IRR) of co-detected pathogens (total and in subgroups by bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and STHs) using negative binomial regression. We did not adjust for multiple comparisons for growth, diarrhoea, or mortality outcomes[6,46], but we did apply the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to control the false discovery rate within analyses of multiple enteric pathogen outcomes[47,48].

Sample size was chosen to obtain a clinically meaningful minimum detectable difference[49] in LAZ between arms while minimizing the burden to study communities, with increased allocation of eligible communes to the control arm to enhance statistical efficiency of multiple hypothesis testing [50]. This study had a minimum detectable effect size (MDES) of 0.19 in LAZ between treatment arms and 0.18 in LAZ between each treatment arm and control with α=0.05 and power=0.8 [51]. Details on power calculations are included in Supporting Information.

Role of the funding source

This study was funded by USAID. The funder had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the manuscript. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

Ethics

The study received approval from the National Ethics Committee for Health Research in the Cambodian Ministry of Health, Georgia Institute of Technology, and New England Institutional Review Board. Prior to any data collection, the trial was explained to participants in the Khmer language. Written and verbal consent were obtained prior to administering the surveys and anthropometry measurements. The trial was pre-registered with ISRCTN Registry (ISRCTN77820875).

Results

Among an initial of 82 eligible communes, 27 were excluded from the study due to requests from the provincial governments and potential overlap with other development programming. Ultimately, the evaluation included 55 communes randomly assigned to one of three treatment arms (n=36 communes) or control arm (n=19 communes). The number of communes assigned to the control arm relative to each treatment arm was greater to enhance statistical efficiency of multiple hypothesis testing[38]. Figure 2 shows the trial profile by intervention subgroups. 4,015 households participated in endline surveys; 4,005 households were included in these analyses (10 were excluded due to incomplete surveys), and 4,124 children had anthropometry measures taken.

Table 2 shows household and caregiver characteristics across treatment and control groups. Most variables were similar across groups. Primary caregivers in the control group reported lower levels of primary school attendance compared to the treatment groups, but paternal primary school attendance was similar. Households in the nutrition-only and sanitation-only groups had higher wealth index scores compared to households in the combined intervention and control groups. The survey was conducted during the rainy season, which generally corresponds to increased access to collected rainwater as an improved source of drinking water. The control group had a higher prevalence of improved water source as their main source of drinking water compared to the treatment groups.

Intervention fidelity was assessed 28 months after the intervention (Table 3). Nutrition intervention fidelity was high, with households in the nutrition-only and combined-intervention arms reporting significantly higher participation in these activities compared to the sanitation-only and control groups (Table 3). Approximately 60% of households in the nutrition-only and combined-intervention arms reported participating in at least four of the eight nutrition intervention activities, compared to 4% in the sanitation-only and control arms. Conversely, sanitation intervention fidelity was very low (Table 3), which was measured by self-reported CLTS participation. Only 6% of households in the sanitation-only and control arms reported participating in any CLTS activity, compared to 14% of households in the nutrition-only arm and 25% in the combined-intervention arm. Additional fidelity indicators are reported in Table 3.

Intervention adherence was assessed 28 months after the intervention (Table 4Table 3). More households in the control arm (70%) had an improved water source as their main source of drinking water, compared to other arms (approximately 60% in other arms). The combined intervention arm had greater access to improved sanitation facilities (61%) compared to the nutrition-only (55%), sanitation-only (51%), and control (52%) arms. OD (self-reported) was practiced less in the combined intervention arm (7%) compared to the nutrition-only (14%),

sanitation-only (16%), and control (16%) arms. Notably, the sanitation-only arm experienced a significantly higher increase in sanitation coverage (+25pp) compared to all other arms (+14pp in nutrition-only arm, +19pp in combined and control arms), though sanitation gains across all arms were evident in the intervention period, reflecting a strong secular trend of sanitation expansion that has been widely documented in rural Cambodia[25,30,52–56].

We assessed four key caregiver behaviours related to environmental hygiene: drinking and use of clean water, handwashing with soap and water at critical times, proper disposal of children's stools, and provision of safe play environments for children. Implementation programming encouraged safe handwashing behaviours as part of the "First 1,000 Days" activities and the nutrition CCT. Those in the nutrition-only arm (7%) and combined-intervention arm (9%) had greater awareness of critical handwashing times compared to those in the sanitation-only arm (4%) and control arm (4%), though levels were still low. There was a slightly higher prevalence of soap and water observed at handwashing stations in the combined-intervention (72%) and control (76%) arms than the nutrition-only (69%) and sanitation-only (70%) arms. We defined proper disposal of children's stools as discarding into a toilet/latrine or burying and considered discarding faeces into a drain, garbage or other solid waste, or leaving in the open to be improper disposal practices. Nutrition-only and combined intervention arms reported higher levels of proper disposal (71% and 74%, respectively) compared to the sanitation-only and control arms (65% and 68%, respectively). Few households were found to have safe play environments, defined as being free of observed human faeces, animal faeces, garbage/household waste, and sharp objects/other harms. 25% of households in the combined intervention arm had child play environments free of faeces observed by enumerators at the time of the household visit, compared to 21% in the nutrition-only, sanitation-only, and control arms. More households in the nutrition-only (78%) and combined-intervention (89%) arms brought children to health centres for monthly GMP visits than sanitation-only (23%) and control (33%) arms. There were no differences in breastfeeding behaviours between intervention and control arms, with 60-70% of each arm reporting continuous breastfeeding for children for the first two years. There were no statistically meaningful differences in dietary diversity score, minimum dietary diversity, and minimum meal frequency across the four arms.

Primary and secondary outcomes

Mean LAZ in the control arm was -1.04 (SD 1.20). Compared with control, children in the nutrition-only arm were longer by a mean of 0.08 LAZ (95% CI -0.01, 0.18), and children in the combined-intervention arm were longer by 0.10 LAZ (95% CI 0.01, 0.20), although these differences were not observed in the adjusted analyses (

Table 5, Figure 3, Supporting Information). Children in the nutrition-only arm and combined-intervention arm were heavier than children in the control arm by a mean of 0.10 WAZ (95% CI 0.00, 0.19) and 0.11 (95% CI 0.03, 0.20), respectively. These differences were slightly attenuated in the adjusted analyses (

Table 5, Supporting Information). No differences were observed between the control arm and intervention arm in terms of WLZ.

Compared to children in the standalone intervention arms, children in the combined intervention arm were longer and heavier than children in the sanitation-only arm, with children in the sanitation-only arm averaging -0.16 LAZ (95% CI -0.27, -0.04) and -0.10 WAZ (-0.20, -0.01) compared to children in the combined intervention arm (Table 5); these differences were attenuated in the adjusted analysis (Supporting Information).

Compared with the control arm, none of the intervention arms differed in the prevalence of children who experienced stunting, wasting, diarrhoea (7-day recall), or mortality. Fewer children in the combined-intervention arm were found to be underweight compared to the control arm (PR 0.82, 95% CI 0.68, 0.99), although these differences were attenuated in the adjusted analysis (Table 6; Supporting Information). Comparing the combined intervention arm to the standalone intervention arms, the combined-intervention appeared to be protective of stunting (PR 1.2 comparing sanitation-only arm to combined, 95% CI 1.0, 1.5) and underweight status (PR 1.2 comparing sanitation-only arm to combined, 95% CI 1.0, 1.5); however, these differences were also attenuated in the adjusted analyses (Supporting Information).

Enteric pathogen results

We collected 4,114 stool samples and randomly selected 1,745 for molecular analysis using multiple-target PCR for presence of gene targets associated with key enteric pathogens (bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and STH). We omitted 125 samples due to lack of amplification of one or more of three controls (phHPV as DNA control; MS2 as RNA control; manufacturer internal positive control) or due to unstable noise in amplification curves. 1,620 samples were included in the final dataset: 305 from the nutrition arm, 333 from the sanitation arm, 438 from the combined-intervention arm, and 544 from the control arm. We detected at least one bacterial gene in 87% of all samples, at least one viral gene in 49% of all samples, at least one protozoan gene in 20% of all samples, and at least one STH gene in 2% of all samples. Enteroaggregative *E.coli* (EAEC), enteric pathogenic *E.coli* (EPEC), enterovirus, *Campylobacter* spp., and enterotoxigenic *E.coli* (ETEC) were the most prevalent pathogens (Table 7). We detected a mean 2.2 bacterial genes (out of 9), 0.59 viral genes (out of 6), 0.21 protozoan genes (out of 4), and 0.03 STH genes (out of 4) in each sample. We found no differences in rate of bacterial, viral, protozoan, or STH gene co-detection between the control arm and any treatment arm or between the combined arm and the standalone intervention arms (Table 8). Prevalence increased with age for many pathogens (aEPEC, ETEC, *Shigella*/EIEC (*ipah*), STEC, adenovirus, *Giardia*), while prevalence peaked for children 9-17 months for other pathogens (*Campylobacter* spp., *C.diff*, EAEC, *Salmonella* spp.). Details on pathogen prevalence stratified by age are include in Supporting Information.

Examining prevalence of specific targets compared to the control arm, we found higher overall prevalence of any bacterial gene (PR 1.06, 95% CI 1.01, 1.11), adenovirus (PR 1.88, 95% CI 1.41, 2.51) and heat-labile/heat-stable ETEC (PR 2.00, 95% CI 1.19, 3.36) and lower prevalence of EIEC/*Shigella* spp. (PR 0.60, 95% CI 0.39, 0.94) in the nutrition-only arm. Children in the sanitation-only arm had less EPEC (PR 0.88, 95% CI 0.78, 1.00) compared to control. In the combined-intervention arm, we found less atypical-EPEC (PR 0.85, 95% CI 0.73, 0.98); more

heat-stable ETEC (PR 1.42, 95% CI 1.01, 2.00) and heat-labile/heat-stable ETEC (PR 1.74, 95% CI 1.06, 2.86); and a higher overall prevalence of any viral gene (PR 1.16, 95% CI 1.02, 1.31). We found similar mixed effects when comparing pathogen gene prevalence in individual treatment arms compared to the combined arm; there was lower overall presence of any bacterial target (PR 0.96, 95% CI 0.91, 1.02) and enterovirus (PR 0.82, 95% CI 0.67, 1.00) in the sanitation-only arm, and we found higher prevalence of adenovirus (PR 1.42, 95% CI 1.07, 1.87) in the nutrition-only arm (Table 9).

Generally, differences in mean gene quantities were consistent with prevalence differences (Table 9;

Table 10). We detected lower concentration of pathogen-associated genes in the nutrition-only and sanitation-only arms; children in the nutrition-only arm carried lower quantities of *STEC* (-1.46 $\log_{10}$-copies compared to control, 95% CI -2.97, 0.06) and *Giardia* (-1.73 $\log_{10}$-copies, 95% CI -3.02, -0.44), and children in the sanitation-only arm carried lower quantities of EPEC (-0.54 $\log_{10}$-copies, 95% CI -1.17, 0.09) and STEC (-1.71 $\log_{10}$-copies, 95% CI -3.07, -0.34). There was no measurable difference in mean gene quantities between the combined and control arm. Overall, with adjustment for multiple comparisons[47], there was no significant difference in quantity of pathogen genes between treatment arms.

Discussion

We assessed differences between arms receiving the nutrition intervention and sanitation intervention, both delivered independently and in combination. We found a modest effect on growth from the nutrition-only intervention and a greater effect in the combined intervention arm that was likely attributable to the nutrition intervention alone. Gains in sanitation coverage – self-reported access to any sanitation facility – were modest in sanitation arms (+25pp) over similar gains in the control (+19pp) and nutrition arms (+14pp); there were no other measurable differences between sanitation arms and non-sanitation arms, suggesting low overall uptake of the sanitation intervention and modest increases in sanitation coverage attributable to the intervention. There was no evidence of an effect of the sanitation intervention on linear growth in young children born since delivery of the intervention program (<28 months). The lack of a clear difference in linear growth between the nutrition-only arm and the combined intervention arm is also consistent with a conclusion that observed linear growth gains were largely attributable to the nutrition intervention alone, further suggesting that the addition of this sanitation intervention to nutrition intervention did not produce synergistic effects. Intermediate outcomes of meal frequency and dietary diversity did not appear to differ between arms, so effects may be attributable to other elements of the nutrition or combined intervention not captured by these measures. We observed no meaningful differences between arms with respect to secondary outcome measures of WAZ, WLZ, stunting, wasting, underweight status, diarrhoea, mortality, pathogen prevalence, pathogen quantity (number of pathogens detected), or pathogen concentration.

Diarrhoeal disease is a leading cause of child mortality globally, attributable in part to inadequate sanitation and subsequent exposure to enteric pathogens[57]. Among enteric pathogens, a number of bacteria, viruses, and protozoa have been implicated as globally important aetiologies of disease[58,59]; asymptomatic infections are also prevalent and may result in adverse longer-term effects on growth and development[24]. Enteric pathogens are transmitted by ingestion of contaminated food or water or contact with contaminated hands[60], mediated through numerous environmental pathways of transmission including via flies, animals, or soil[61–64]. It is plausible that safe and effective WASH measures can substantially limit exposures to enteric pathogens, effectively reducing diarrhoeal disease[13] and improving child growth outcomes[18,65]. The evidence base for rural sanitation improvements alone to improve child health is mixed, however[6,7,18,22,37,66]; community-level sanitation coverage – rather than access to a household latrine alone – may drive improved outcomes by lowering overall exposures[32,67,68].

Our findings are consistent with results from several recent randomised factorial WASH and nutrition efficacy trials reporting protective effects of combined/integrated interventions and null

effects of WASH alone on child growth outcomes[6,7,22]. A small number of experimental trials[65,69] and a larger number of observational studies[21,25,26,30,33,34,70,71] have reported increases in child growth and reductions in stunting prevalence with improvements in sanitation coverage and commensurate reductions in OD; among the latter, unmeasured confounding is a likely explanation for observed effects[69,17].

One- to two-week recall of diarrhoeal disease has historically been used as an outcome measure for sanitation trials, but there are concerns[72] about how diarrhoea is defined and how it is measured[73]: it is subject to a range of reporting biases, which make it potentially unsuitable as a reliable outcome measure for the assessment of unblinded interventions when measured via caregiver self-report[72]. More recently, growth measures such as age-adjusted linear growth or stunting have become common WASH trial outcomes. While imperfect[74], anthropometry is a more objective measure and also broadly indicates health status in capturing the cumulative effects of exposures, via environmental enteric dysfunction[24]. Stool-based detection of enteric pathogens, as a proxy for enteric infection (which is hypothesised to be on the causal pathway between WASH, environmental enteric dysfunction, and distal growth outcomes), has been proposed as enteric infection may plausibly be affected within the time-scales of short trials[75]. Recent studies in Mozambique, Bangladesh, and Zimbabwe have employed PCR methods for simultaneous detection of a broad range of enteric pathogen-associated genes, demonstrating the contribution of molecular detection of enteric pathogens as an outcome measure in large-scale sanitation trials as an objective proximal outcome measure[16,19,48,75–77].

There were differences in frequency and intensity of contact from program promoters across intervention arms, possibly resulting in reduced impact of the relatively light-touch sanitation intervention. Arms receiving nutrition intervention participated in monthly activities, whereas arms receiving sanitation intervention participated in one triggering session with few and infrequent follow-up visits. Thirteen core health/nutrition and sanitation/hygiene behaviours were promoted as part as the “Growth Together” SBCC campaign. The campaign was broadcasted on television indiscriminately across the country – and subsequently across treatment and control arms. The core behaviours were also promoted during all intervention activities, resulting in higher intensity of programming (including promotion of sanitation and hygiene practices) in the nutrition arms. The lower frequency in contact may explain the discrepancy in intervention adherence. The nutrition arms reported higher levels of participation in the key intervention activities, suggesting higher adherence of the nutrition intervention compared to the sanitation intervention. Similarly, those in the sanitation-only arm reported CLTS participation rates no different from the control arm (6% and 6%), compared with self-reported CLTS participation in the nutrition and combined arms (14% and 25%; **Error! Reference source not found.**; Table 4). The high self-reported CLTS participation in the nutrition-only arm compared to the control arm may reflect biases embedded in the self-reporting process, especially when considering the time elapsed since the initial CLTS interventions took place (28+ months prior) and how infrequently CLTS contact occurred relative to nutrition intervention. Households that already had access to sanitation may not have engaged with the CLTS programming, the survey respondent may not have been aware of or may not recall specific activities, or other reporting biases could have played a role. The greater frequency and intensity of contact between the interventions and the respondents in the nutrition arms may have resulted in greater apparent recall of programming of any kind in this arm, possibly increasing

reporting and observer biases; participants were not masked to intervention status due to the nature of the interventions. It is also possible that there were other nutrition- and/or WASH-related outreach efforts from actors external to the intervention program. We included observable indicators in addition to self-reported measures as indicators of intervention adherence, which included direct observations of sanitation facilities and domestic hygiene status (e.g., faeces in the play environment of children).

It is highly plausible that this sanitation intervention simply failed to sufficiently reduce environmental exposure to enteric pathogens. For example, only 22% of households in our survey were observed to have a child play environment free of animals, with little difference between treatment and control arms; this is a transmission pathway that our trial and many other WASH trials have not addressed[61]. The trial design is predicated on the theory that gains in sanitation coverage may lead to improved growth outcomes in children via reductions in the transmission of enteric infection and disease, though links between sanitation coverage and specific outcomes are poorly understood in high-burden settings. The change in community coverage in this trial was limited and likely insufficient to reduce community exposure and transmission.

Gains in sanitation coverage attributable to the sanitation intervention were statistically significant but modest when comparing sanitation coverage at the time of our study with pre-intervention estimates in the same communes from 2016[78] (Supporting Information). Community-level OD estimates in the sanitation-only arm decreased by 25 percentage points (pp; 95% CI 23 pp, 27 pp) while OD in the control arm decreased by 19 percentage points (95% CI 17 pp, 20 pp), highlighting the measurable gains attributable to the intervention despite the strong secular trend of sanitation coverage. This trend in Cambodia has been documented in other studies: the percentage of all children younger than five years of age with access to an improved sanitation facility, from nationally representative DHS survey data, was 5% in 2000, 17% in 2005, 29% in 2010, and 54% in the most recent DHS survey from 2014[25,54]. Corresponding increases in rural areas specifically have also been rapid. From 2010 to 2014, access to any sanitation facility increased from 30% to 44% and improved sanitation coverage increased from 27% to 43%[25,54]. The rapid pace of WASH development in rural Cambodia makes it challenging to measure the impact of specific programs.

This trial was limited in its capacity to measure intervention impacts due to our use of a single cross-sectional survey to retrospectively assess interventions delivered over the previous 28 months. This study included children born from 28 months before up to one month before the final measurement, with the primary outcome variable of age-adjusted linear growth on a continuous scale. As a result, children were exposed to varying levels of “maturity” of the interventions to which they are exposed. Extending the study timeline was not feasible, though subsequent follow-up to assess longer-term impacts would be valuable. Additionally, this trial was not designed to detect effects that may not be realised later on in a child’s life, so we are unable to capture possible catch-up growth, the potential reversal of child growth faltering by rapid linear growth[79] over 24 months of age. While a focus on the first 1,000 days is justified[2], investigation of growth and growth-promoting factors after this window may provide additional insight on improved WASH practices and their role in supporting long-term development and health.

While molecular detection of a specific pathogen in stool unambiguously indicates prior exposure to that pathogen, our data do not necessarily indicate active enteric infection, potential for disease, or direct effects on the individual. We were also limited by the suite of pathogen targets selected on our custom TAC assay; we selected these targets *a priori* based on a range of globally observed enteric pathogens, but we cannot know whether these were the most important enteric pathogens in rural Cambodia. There is also evidence that the *invA* gene, which was selected for *Salmonella* spp. detection, is not specific to *Salmonella enterica* and suggest the consideration of other genes, such as *ttrA/C*, for reliable detection of *S. enterica*[80].

There are a few key observations from this study that should be considered in future interventions and effectiveness trials of comparable interventions. Increased frequency, duration, and intensity of CLTS programming could have resulted in greater uptake of sanitation in target communes. Despite the sanitation coverage gains observed in the sanitation-only arm, much of which may have been as a result of the sanitation intervention, we are unable to attribute beneficial effects – i.e., measurable differences in prespecified outcomes – to the sanitation intervention due to the high sanitation gains also observed in the control arm. There may have been other benefits of sanitation gains that were not measured, including in safety and broader measures of well-being[81]. To reduce enteric pathogen exposure in high-burden settings, the WASH community should pursue interventions that have the potential to dramatically reduce contact with all faeces, including animal faeces, and may require more holistic strategies[17,69]. Future trials may also include additional objective outcome measures, including intermediate measures of environmental contamination that are on the causal pathway between interventions and exposures. Finally, we need transformative approaches on reducing exposures in early childhood to address the trend of high pathogen prevalence in this critical period of development, when adverse effects of exposure can persist throughout the life course[16,19,41,48,76,82].

Other Information

Trial Registry

The trial is registered with ISRCTN Registry (ISRCTN77820875).

Protocol

The National Ethics Committee for Health Research in the Cambodian Ministry of Health reviewed and approved the protocols (NECHR #110) prior to the start of data collection. The study also received approvals from the Institutional Review Board at Georgia Institute of Technology (Ref: H19286) and from New England IRB (IRB#: 120190186).

Funding

This study was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under contract number OAA-M-13-00017. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

Acknowledgements

We thank the staff and participants of the study for their important contributions. We also acknowledge contributions by Caroline Akerley, Farran Bush, Isabelle du Plessis, and Juliann Pham.

Author contributions

Conceptualisation	IV, OC, JB
Data Curation	IV, KS, AL
Formal Analysis	AL, RA, IV
Funding Acquisition	IV, JB
Investigation	AL, KS, IV, JB
Methodology	AL, IV, OC, JB
Project Administration	IV, KS, JB
Resources	IV, JB
Software	N/A
Supervision	IV, KS, OC, JB
Validation	N/A
Visualisation	N/A
Writing – Original Draft Preparation	AL
Writing – Review & Editing	AL, IV, RA, EK, DH, KS, OC, JB, KL



Figure 1: Theory of change diagram



Figure 2: Trial profile



Figure 3: Unadjusted intervention effects on LAZ. Data are mean differences (point) with 95% CIs (line)

Figure 4: Impact of interventions on unadjusted prevalence ratio of individual pathogens. Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals were determined using log-linear Poisson models with generalized estimating equations.



Table 1: Summary of intervention activities

	Intervention activity	Frequency
Nutrition-only		
	Community dialogues led by village chief and VHSG to support children's growth	Quarterly
	Caregiver group sessions led by local women trained by staff to promote 13 key stunting prevention behaviours	Monthly
	GMP sessions led by VHSGs to monitor growth and refer children who were sick or not growing well to health centers	Monthly
	Home visits to pregnant women, caregivers of children 9-11 months old, and caregivers of children not growing well to promote childcare and feeding, home hygiene, and handwashing	Monthly
	Village fair help twice per year to offer hands-on learning experiences (health/nutrition, WASH and agricultural using games, latrine marketing and sales	Twice per year
	CCT (cash for antenatal and postnatal care visits and adherence to handwashing stations), vouchers for water filters and food baskets	Up to six payments over first 1,000 days of child life
Sanitation-only		
	CLTS triggering session	Once
	Door-to-door visits to provide information about sanitation/latrines	At least five times per village
	Latrine vouchers to subsidise poor households in villages that reached 75% sanitation coverage to achieve sufficient open defecation free (ODF) coverage	Once, as needed
	Promoted supply-side support by connecting small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) with communes after triggering event	Continuously
Combined		
	All activities described in NUTR and SAN groups above	See above
Control		
	None	N/A

Table 2: Household and caregiver characteristics

	Nutrition-only		Sanitation-only		Combined		Control	
	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI
Buddhist	0.98	(0.97, 0.99)	0.97	(0.96, 0.98)	0.96	(0.95, 0.97)	0.99	(0.98, 0.99)
Married or living together	0.95	(0.93, 0.96)	0.94	(0.92, 0.95)	0.94	(0.92, 0.95)	0.95	(0.94, 0.96)
Maternal age (years)	32.0	(31.2, 32.7)	31.1	(30.4, 31.9)	31.9	(31.2, 32.5)	31.0	(30.5, 31.5)
Primary caregiver has attended primary school	0.87	(0.85, 0.89)	0.87	(0.84, 0.89)	0.88	(0.85, 0.89)	0.81	(0.79, 0.83)
Spouse has attended primary school	0.90	(0.88, 0.92)	0.86	(0.83, 0.88)	0.87	(0.85, 0.89)	0.87	(0.85, 0.89)
Household size	5.63	(5.48, 5.78)	5.54	(5.40, 5.69)	5.36	(5.24, 5.47)	5.52	(5.42, 5.62)
Number of children in HH	2.61	(2.52, 2.70)	2.61	(2.51, 2.70)	2.43	(2.36, 2.50)	2.43	(2.37, 2.49)
Has electricity	0.73	(0.70, 0.76)	0.74	(0.71, 0.77)	0.76	(0.73, 0.78)	0.75	(0.72, 0.77)
Owns a mobile phone	0.93	(0.92, 0.95)	0.90	(0.88, 0.92)	0.87	(0.85, 0.89)	0.90	(0.89, 0.92)
Has a finished floor [1]	0.92	(0.90, 0.94)	0.93	(0.91, 0.95)	0.96	(0.94, 0.97)	0.96	(0.95, 0.97)
Wealth index score, excluding WASH variables	0.06	(-0.06, 0.19)	0.19	(0.05, 0.33)	-0.02	(-0.14, 0.09)	-0.12	(-0.21, -0.03)
Improved drinking water source [2]	0.59	(0.56, 0.62)	0.56	(0.52, 0.59)	0.61	(0.58, 0.64)	0.70	(0.68, 0.72)
Has water source on site	0.68	(0.64, 0.71)	0.58	(0.55, 0.61)	0.60	(0.57, 0.63)	0.65	(0.62, 0.67)
Water source is <5 min, roundtrip	0.20	(0.16, 0.25)	0.23	(0.19, 0.28)	0.24	(0.19, 0.29)	0.34	(0.29, 0.39)
Reported minutes to fetch water, roundtrip	12.42	(10.6, 14.2)	14.14	(12.5, 15.8)	14.50	(13.1, 15.9)	13.56	(12.3, 14.8)

[1] Finished floor defined as floor made of wood plans, palm/bamboo, parquet or polished wood, vinyl or asphalt strips, ceramic tiles, cement tiles, or cement. Floor materials were classified by enumerator observation. [2] Improved sources of drinking water include: piped water into dwelling/yard/plot, public tap or standpipe, tube well or borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, bottled water, and rainwater.

Table 3: Intervention fidelity indicators

	Nutrition-only			Sanitation-only			Combined			Control		
Nutrition	N	n	%	N	n	%	N	n	%	N	n	%
Participated in any "First 1,000 Days" type activity [1]	817	615	75%	792	145	18%	1,055	813	77%	1,460	383	26%
Participated in any GMP	817	641	78%	792	181	23%	1,055	935	89%	1,460	482	33%
Received home visit VHSG	817	518	63%	792	227	29%	1,055	661	63%	1,460	490	34%
Enrolled in any CCT program for health and nutrition [2]	817	224	27%	792	19	2%	1,055	228	22%	1,460	31	2%
Received any voucher for food basket [3]	817	440	54%	792	1	0%	1,055	554	53%	1,460	6	0%
Received any voucher for water filter [3]	817	41	5%	792	40	5%	1,055	149	14%	1,460	100	7%
Aware of *Grow Together* campaign [4]	817	353	43%	792	93	12%	1,055	471	45%	1,460	149	10%
Participation in nutrition intervention activities: none (0 of 8)	817	65	8%	792	404	51%	1,055	44	4%	1,460	585	40%
Participation in nutrition intervention activities: low (1-3 of 8)	817	262	32%	792	359	45%	1,055	367	35%	1,460	809	55%
Participation in nutrition intervention activities: med (4-6 of 8)	817	387	47%	792	29	4%	1,055	501	47%	1,460	65	4%
Participation in nutrition intervention activities: high (7-8 of 8)	817	103	13%	792	0	0%	1,055	143	14%	1,460	1	0%
Sanitation												
Any CLTS participation [5]	817	115	14%	792	46	6%	1,055	261	25%	1,460	81	6%
Received any voucher to build latrine [6]	817	66	8%	792	51	6%	1,055	123	12%	1,460	84	6%

[1] "First 1,000 Days" activities were administered in nutrition-only and combined arms and include: community dialogues, caregiver group education sessions, and village fairs. [2] CCT program ended in Jan 2019 and the Government of Cambodia started a new CCT program in July 2019 across study area. CCT program administered in nutrition-only and combined arms only. [3] Vouchers for water filter and food baskets were targeted subsidies distributed to CCT participants in nutrition-only and combined arms. [4] *Grow Together* campaign was part of the nutrition programming (nutrition-only and combined arms). However, three TV spots were seen across all four arms. [5] In sanitation-only and combined arms, the Ministry of Rural Development confirmed that the project was the only CLTS campaign active in those areas. [6] Latrine vouchers were targeted subsidies given to households in villages that reached 75% sanitation coverage in sanitation-only and combined arms.

Table 4: Intervention adherence indicators (28-months after intervention)

	Nutrition-only			Sanitation-only			Combined			Control		
Nutrition	N	n or mean	% or SD	N	n or mean	% or SD	N	n or mean	% or SD	N	n or mean	% or SD
Visited health facility for at least four antenatal care check-ups	697	632	91%	712	646	91%	910	819	90%	1,257	1116	89%
Brought child for monthly GMP at community or health center	817	641	78%	792	181	23%	1,055	935	89%	1,460	482	33%
Breastfeeding exclusively for children <6 months	171	109	64%	161	110	68%	205	140	68%	272	182	67%
Ever breastfed (all children)	817	797	98%	792	765	97%	1,048	1021	97%	1,457	1420	97%
Solid and semi-solid foods eaten for children >6 months	646	609	94%	631	611	97%	843	792	94%	1,185	1134	96%
Dietary diversity score (0-7)	817	2.24	1.61	792	2.19	1.58	1,048	2.20	1.62	1,457	2.33	1.59
Achieved minimum dietary diversity	817	202	25%	792	177	22%	1,048	247	24%	1,457	350	24%
Achieved minimum meal frequency	817	537	66%	792	518	65%	1,048	680	65%	1,457	977	67%
Achieved minimum acceptable diet	817	170	21%	792	159	20%	1,048	205	20%	1,457	310	21%
Treated drinking water	817	548	67%	792	471	59%	1,055	765	73%	1,460	1,037	71%
Treated drinking water with filter	817	151	18%	792	160	20%	1,055	302	29%	1,460	548	40%
Sanitation												
Had improved sanitation facility [1]	816	452	55%	791	400	51%	1,054	638	61%	1,459	759	52%
Open defecation (OD)	817	112	14%	792	126	16%	1,055	73	7%	1,460	231	16%
Used shared toilet	817	252	31%	791	264	33%	1,054	343	33%	1,459	468	32%
Caregiver reported adults in HH openly defecating	697	92	13%	658	116	18%	973	118	12%	1,208	213	18%
Time to get to toilet, one way (minutes)	171	4.22	4.11	166	3.92	3.83	219	4.74	8.17	291	5.05	8.27
Reported latrine built as a result of CLTS activity	115	51	44%	46	15	33%	261	91	35%	81	28	35%
Reported latrine built using latrine voucher	50	10	20%	15	4	27%	91	37	41%	28	12	43%
Main reason for not constructing latrine: lack of funds	20	17	85%	18	14	78%	60	55	92%	14	14	100%
Main reason for construction latrine: privacy	51	7	14%	15	6	40%	91	6	7%	28	7	25%
Main reason for construction latrine: security	51	10	20%	15	2	13%	91	20	22%	28	4	14%
Main reason for construction latrine: hygiene	51	17	33%	15	5	33%	91	43	47%	28	10	36%
Main reason for construction latrine: OD is harmful	51	5	10%	15	1	7%	91	9	10%	28	5	18%

Child stools properly disposed of [2]	817	581	71%	792	515	65%	1,055	781	74%	1,460	993	68%
Community-level open defecation before intervention	817	28%	27%	792	41%	33%	1,055	28%	28%	1,460	32%	31%
Community-level open defecation after intervention	817	14%	21%	792	16%	21%	1,055	9%	17%	1,460	13%	20%
Environmental hygiene												
Child stools left in the open	817	147	18%	792	170	21%	1,055	160	15%	1,460	315	22%
Child play environment observed to be free of animals	817	182	22%	792	187	24%	1,055	261	25%	1,460	294	20%
Child play environment observed to be free of garbage/HH waste	817	298	36%	792	290	37%	1,055	419	40%	1,460	567	39%
Child play environment observed to be free of sharp objects	817	449	55%	792	427	54%	1,055	639	61%	1,460	818	56%
Child play environment observed to be free of faeces	817	313	38%	792	304	38%	1,055	448	42%	1,460	555	38%

[1] Improved sanitation facilities include: flush/pour flush toilet to a piped sewer system, septic tank or pit latrine, a ventilated improved pit latrine, a pit latrine with slab, and a composting toilet. [2] Proper disposal of children faeces consist of putting or rinsing stool into a sanitation facility or burying it; improper disposal of children faeces includes putting or rinsing stool into a drain or ditch, throwing it into garbage or leaving it in the open.

Table 5: Effects of interventions on length and weight (Primary outcome (LAZ) and secondary outcomes (WAZ, WLZ)), comparing intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined intervention

				Unadjusted mean difference (95% CI)	
	N	Mean	SD	Compared to control arm	Compared to combined intervention arm
LAZ					
Nutrition-only	798	-0.95	1.16	0.08 (-0.01, 0.18)	-0.02 (-0.12, 0.09)
Sanitation-only	777	-1.09	1.23	-0.05 (-0.16, 0.05)	-0.16 (-0.27, -0.04)
Combined	1037	-0.94	1.16	0.10 (0.01, 0.20)	--
Control	1443	-1.04	1.20	--	--
WAZ					
Nutrition-only	815	-0.95	1.29	0.10 (0.00, 0.19)	-0.02 (-0.12, 0.08)
Sanitation-only	792	-1.04	1.13	0.01 (-0.07, 0.09)	-0.10 (-0.20, -0.01)
Combined	1044	-0.94	1.11	0.11 (0.03, 0.20)	--
Control	1452	-1.05	1.10	--	--
WLZ					
Nutrition-only	814	-0.60	1.04	0.06 (-0.03, 0.15)	-0.02 (-0.12, 0.08)
Sanitation-only	790	-0.59	0.98	0.06 (-0.02, 0.14)	-0.02 (-0.11, 0.07)
Combined	1043	-0.58	1.03	0.08 (0.00, 0.16)	--
Control	1452	-0.65	0.98	--	--

Table 6: Effects of intervention on child health outcomes, comparing intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined intervention.

				Compared to control arm	Compared to combined-intervention arm
	N	Mean	SD	PR (95% CI)	PR (95% CI)
Stunted					
Nutrition-only	801	0.15	0.36	0.84 (0.69, 1.03)	0.93 (0.74, 1.15)
Sanitation-only	782	0.21	0.40	1.12 (0.94, 1.33)	1.23 (1.02, 1.49)
Combined	1046	0.17	0.37	0.91 (0.76, 1.09)	--
Control	1449	0.18	0.39	--	--
Wasted					
Nutrition-only	815	0.07	0.26	0.87 (0.65, 1.17)	1.12 (0.80, 1.57)
Sanitation-only	790	0.07	0.26	0.84 (0.62, 1.14)	1.08 (0.76, 1.53)
Combined	1052	0.07	0.25	0.78 (0.58, 1.04)	--
Control	1457	0.08	0.28	--	--
Underweight					
Nutrition-only	816	0.15	0.35	0.85 (0.71, 1.03)	1.04 (0.84, 1.29)
Sanitation-only	792	0.17	0.38	1.00 (0.85, 1.19)	1.22 (1.00, 1.49)
Combined	1053	0.14	0.35	0.82 (0.68, 0.99)	--
Control	1457	0.17	0.38	--	--
Diarrhoea (7-day recall)					
Nutrition-only	788	0.19	0.39	0.89 (0.74, 1.06)	0.95 (0.78, 1.14)
Sanitation-only	752	0.21	0.41	0.99 (0.84, 1.17)	1.05 (0.88, 1.25)
Combined	1018	0.20	0.40	0.94 (0.80, 1.11)	--
Control	1411	0.21	0.41	--	--
All-cause mortality					
Nutrition-only	1574	0.03	0.16	1.55 (0.71, 3.39)	1.61 (0.68, 3.82)
Sanitation-only	1636	0.03	0.16	1.09 (0.50, 2.40)	1.13 (0.48, 2.68)
Combined	1932	0.03	0.16	0.96 (0.44, 2.10)	--
Control	2688	0.03	0.16	--	--

Table 7: Enteric pathogen gene prevalence among treatment arms

	All samples (N=1620)	Nutrition-only (N=305)	Sanitation-only (N=333)	Combined (N=438)	Control (N=544)
Bacteria					
Campylobacter spp.	551 (34%)	104 (34%)	114 (34%)	162 (37%)	171 (31%)
Clostridium difficile	139 (9%)	33 (11%)	25 (8%)	41 (9%)	40 (7%)
EAEC	1029 (64%)	204 (67%)	207 (62%)	281 (64%)	337 (62%)
EPEC	899 (55%)	172 (56%)	173 (52%)	234 (53%)	320 (59%)
aEPEC	703 (43%)	139 (46%)	137 (41%)	173 (39%)	254 (47%)
tEPEC	109 (7%)	15 (5%)	17 (5%)	32 (7%)	45 (8%)
ETEC	422 (26%)	86 (28%)	79 (24%)	114 (26%)	143 (26%)
ETEC-LT	342 (21%)	75 (25%)	68 (20%)	86 (20%)	113 (21%)
ETEC-ST	194 (12%)	39 (13%)	37 (11%)	63 (14%)	55 (10%)
ETEC-LT/ST	114 (7%)	28 (9%)	26 (8%)	35 (8%)	25 (5%)
Salmonella spp.	134 (8%)	28 (9%)	19 (6%)	39 (9%)	48 (9%)
Shigella spp.	186 (11%)	24 (8%)	39 (12%)	52 (12%)	71 (13%)
STEC	132 (8%)	27 (9%)	22 (7%)	45 (10%)	38 (7%)
Vibrio cholerae	10 (1%)	1 (0%)	6 (2%)	1 (0%)	2 (0%)
At least 1 bacterium detected	1410 (87%)	276 (90%)	282 (85%)	386 (88%)	466 (86%)
Mean number of bacteria detected	2.48 (2.42, 2.55)	2.46 (2.32, 2.60)	2.43 (2.28, 2.57)	2.51 (2.39, 2.63)	2.51 (2.40, 2.62)
Viruses					
Adenovirus	287 (18%)	77 (25%)	59 (18%)	78 (18%)	73 (13%)
Astrovirus	7 (0%)	2 (1%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)	1 (0%)
Enterovirus	558 (34%)	97 (32%)	105 (32%)	169 (39%)	187 (34%)
Norovirus	54 (3%)	8 (3%)	9 (3%)	20 (5%)	17 (3%)
Rotavirus	17 (1%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	6 (1%)	7 (1%)
Sapovirus	24 (1%)	4 (1%)	5 (2%)	9 (2%)	6 (1%)
At least 1 virus detected	788 (49%)	152 (50%)	157 (47%)	231 (53%)	248 (46%)
Mean number of viruses detected	1.20 (1.17, 1.23)	1.25 (1.17, 1.33)	1.15 (1.09, 1.21)	1.23 (1.17, 1.30)	1.17 (1.12, 1.23)
Protozoa					
Cryptosporidium	17 (1%)	4 (1%)	1 (0%)	6 (1%)	6 (1%)
Entamoeba	13 (1%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	8 (2%)	3 (1%)
Giardia	306 (19%)	52 (17%)	68 (20%)	84 (19%)	102 (19%)
At least 1 protozoan detected	328 (20%)	56 (18%)	69 (21%)	93 (21%)	110 (20%)
Mean number of protozoa detected	1.02 (1.01, 1.04)	1.02 (0.98, 1.05)	1.01 (0.99, 1.04)	1.05 (1.01, 1.10)	1.01 (0.99, 1.03)
STH					
Ascaris lumbricoides	3 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	0 (0%)
Trichuris trichiura	3 (0%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)
Ancylostoma duodenale	17 (1%)	0 (0%)	4 (1%)	4 (1%)	9 (2%)
Necator americanus	20 (1%)	3 (1%)	6 (2%)	5 (1%)	6 (1%)
At least 1	37 (2%)	4 (1%)	10 (3%)	9 (2%)	14 (3%)
Mean number of STH detected	1.16 (1.04, 1.29)	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	1.10 (0.90, 1.30)	1.33 (1.00, 1.67)	1.14 (0.95, 1.34)

Table 8: Unadjusted incidence rate ratios of co-detected bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and STHs, comparing intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined intervention.

		Compared to control arm			Compared to combined arm	
	N	Nutrition-only	Sanitation-only	Combined	Nutrition-only	Sanitation-only
Bacteria	1620	1.04 (0.95, 1.13)	0.96 (0.87, 1.05)	1.03 (0.95, 1.12)	0.01 (-0.08, 0.10)	-0.07 (-0.17, 0.02)
Viruses	1620	1.16 (0.99, 1.37)	1.02 (0.86, 1.19)	1.22 (1.05, 1.41)	-0.04 (-0.21, 0.12)	-0.18 (-0.34, -0.02)
Protozoa	1620	0.92 (0.68, 1.23)	1.03 (0.79, 1.35)	1.10 (0.85, 1.41)	-0.18 (-0.48, 0.12)	-0.06 (0.66, -0.34)
STHs were omitted because <5% of samples had detectable STH genes.						

Table 9: Unadjusted prevalence ratios (PR) of detected bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and STHs, comparing intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined intervention.

	Compared to control arm			Compared to combined arm	
	Nutrition-only	Sanitation-only	Combined	Nutrition-only	Sanitation-only
Any bacterium	1.06 (1.00, 1.11)	0.99 (0.93, 1.05)	1.03 (0.98, 1.08)	1.03 (0.98, 1.08)	0.96 (0.91, 1.02)
Camploybacter spp.	1.08 (0.89, 1.32)	1.09 (0.90, 1.32)	1.18 (0.99, 1.40)	0.92 (0.76, 1.12)	0.93 (0.76, 1.12)
C.diff	1.47 (0.95, 2.28)	1.02 (0.63, 1.65)	1.27 (0.84, 1.93)	1.16 (0.75, 1.78)	0.80 (0.50, 1.29)
EAEC	1.08 (0.97, 1.20)	1.00 (0.90, 1.12)	1.04 (0.94, 1.14)	1.04 (0.94, 1.16)	0.97 (0.87, 1.08)
EPEC	0.96 (0.85, 1.08)	0.88 (0.78, 1.00)	0.91 (0.81, 1.02)	1.06 (0.93, 1.20)	0.97 (0.85, 1.11)
aEPEC	0.98 (0.84, 1.14)	0.88 (0.75, 1.03)	0.85 (0.73, 0.98)	1.15 (0.97, 1.37)	1.04 (0.88, 1.24)
tEPEC	0.59 (0.34, 1.05)	0.62 (0.36, 1.06)	0.88 (0.57, 1.37)	0.67 (0.37, 1.22)	0.70 (0.39, 1.24)
ETEC	1.07 (0.85, 1.35)	0.90 (0.71, 1.15)	0.99 (0.80, 1.22)	1.08 (0.85, 1.38)	0.91 (0.71, 1.17)
ETEC-LT	1.18 (0.92, 1.53)	0.98 (0.75, 1.29)	0.95 (0.74, 1.21)	1.25 (0.95, 1.65)	1.04 (0.78, 1.38)
ETEC-ST	1.26 (0.86, 1.86)	1.10 (0.74, 1.63)	1.42 (1.01, 2.00)	0.89 (0.61, 1.29)	0.77 (0.53, 1.13)
ETEC-LT/ST	2.00 (1.19, 3.36)	1.70 (1.00, 2.89)	1.74 (1.06, 2.86)	1.15 (0.71, 1.85)	0.98 (0.60, 1.59)
Salmonella spp.	1.04 (0.67, 1.62)	0.65 (0.39, 1.08)	1.01 (0.67, 1.51)	1.03 (0.65, 1.64)	0.64 (0.38, 1.09)
EIEC/*Shigella* spp.	0.60 (0.39, 0.94)	0.90 (0.62, 1.29)	0.91 (0.65, 1.27)	0.66 (0.42, 1.05)	0.99 (0.67, 1.46)
STEC	1.27 (0.79, 2.03)	0.95 (0.57, 1.57)	1.47 (0.97, 2.22)	0.86 (0.55, 1.36)	0.64 (0.39, 1.05)
Any virus	1.09 (0.95, 1.26)	1.03 (0.89, 1.20)	1.16 (1.02, 1.31)	0.94 (0.82, 1.09)	0.89 (0.77, 1.03)
Adenovirus	1.88 (1.41, 2.51)	1.32 (0.96, 1.81)	1.33 (0.99, 1.78)	1.42 (1.07, 1.87)	0.99 (0.73, 1.35)
Enterovirus	0.93 (0.76, 1.13)	0.92 (0.75, 1.12)	1.12 (0.95, 1.32)	0.82 (0.67, 1.01)	0.82 (0.67, 1.00)
Any protozoa	0.91 (0.68, 1.21)	1.02 (0.78, 1.34)	1.05 (0.82, 1.34)	0.86 (0.64, 1.16)	0.98 (0.74, 1.29)
Giardia	0.91 (0.67, 1.23)	1.09 (0.83, 1.43)	1.02 (0.79, 1.33)	0.89 (0.65, 1.22)	1.06 (0.80, 1.42)
Gene targets with <5% prevalence were omitted from PR analyses: *V.cholera*, astrovirus, norovirus, rotavirus, sapovirus, *Cryptosporidium*, *Entamoeba*, and all STHs (*Ascaris*, *Trichuris*, *Ancylostoma*, and *Necator*).					

Table 10: Mean difference in log_{10}-transformed gene copy estimates, comparing intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined intervention.

	Compared to control arm			Compared to combined arm	
	Nutrition-only	Sanitation-only	Combined	Nutrition-only	Sanitation-only
Bacteria					
CAMP	0.22 (-0.60 - 1.03)	-0.40 (-1.27 - 0.48)	-0.24 (-1.00 - 0.53)	0.45 (-0.37 - 1.28)	-0.16 (-1.05 - 0.73)
CDIF	0.31 (-1.14 - 1.75)	-0.37 (-1.92 - 1.19)	0.19 (-1.16 - 1.54)	0.11 (-1.29 - 1.52)	-0.56 (-2.08 - 0.96)
EAEC_aaic	-0.38 (-1.35 - 0.60)	0.35 (-0.52 - 1.22)	-0.28 (-1.08 - 0.52)	-0.10 (-1.11 - 0.92)	0.63 (-0.28 - 1.54)
EAEC_aata	-0.36 (-1.26 - 0.53)	-0.24 (-1.05 - 0.56)	0.12 (-0.69 - 0.93)	-0.48 (-1.43 - 0.47)	-0.36 (-1.24 - 0.51)
EPEC_bfpa	-1.08 (-3.47 - 1.31)	-1.13 (-3.16 - 0.89)	1.15 (-0.38 - 2.67)	-2.23 (-4.57 - 0.11)	-2.28 (-4.24 - -0.32)
EPEC_eae	-0.12 (-0.80 - 0.56)	-0.54 (-1.17 - 0.09)	0.24 (-0.33 - 0.82)	-0.37 (-1.05 - 0.32)	-0.78 (-1.41 - -0.15)
ETEC_LT	-0.62 (-1.64 - 0.40)	-0.47 (-1.56 - 0.61)	-0.03 (-1.06 - 1.00)	-0.59 (-1.65 - 0.47)	-0.44 (-1.57 - 0.68)
ETEC_stp	0.13 (-1.73 - 1.98)	1.29 (-0.61 - 3.20)	0.87 (-0.97 - 2.71)	-0.75 (-2.61 - 1.11)	0.42 (-1.49 - 2.33)
SALM	1.42 (-0.04 - 2.87)	0.27 (-0.97 - 1.52)	0.80 (-0.33 - 1.93)	0.62 (-0.93 - 2.17)	-0.53 (-1.89 - 0.83)
IPAH	0.22 (-1.33 - 1.77)	-0.28 (-1.68 - 1.13)	1.17 (0.07 - 2.26)	-0.95 (-2.43 - 0.53)	-1.44 (-2.77 - -0.11)
STEC1	-1.46 (-2.97 - 0.06)	-1.71 (-3.07 - -0.34)	-0.00 (-1.49 - 1.49)	-1.46 (-2.84 - -0.07)	-1.70 (-2.92 - -0.49)
STEC2	-0.20 (-1.45 - 1.04)	0.09 (-1.20 - 1.37)	0.72 (-0.47 - 1.91)	-0.92 (-2.06 - 0.22)	-0.63 (-1.82 - 0.56)
Viruses					
ADEV	0.50 (-0.48 - 1.49)	0.67 (-0.32 - 1.67)	0.48 (-0.42 - 1.38)	0.03 (-0.96 - 1.02)	0.20 (-0.80 - 1.20)
ENTV	-0.40 (-1.09 - 0.28)	-0.35 (-0.97 - 0.26)	-0.26 (-0.77 - 0.24)	-0.14 (-0.84 - 0.56)	-0.09 (-0.72 - 0.54)
Protozoa					
GIAR	-1.73 (-3.02 - -0.44)	0.23 (-1.16 - 1.62)	-0.14 (-1.47 - 1.18)	-1.58 (-3.06 - -0.11)	0.37 (-1.19 - 1.93)

Gene targets with <5% prevalence were omitted from PR analyses: *V.cholera*, astrovirus, norovirus, rotavirus, sapovirus, *Cryptosporidium*, *Entamoeba*, and all STHs (*Ascaris*, *Trichuris*, *Ancylostoma*, and *Necator*).

References

1. Prendergast, A. J. & Humphrey, J. H. The stunting syndrome in developing countries. *Paediatr Int Child Health* **34**, 250–265 (2014).
2. Victora, C. G. *et al.* Maternal and child undernutrition: consequences for adult health and human capital. *The Lancet* **371**, 340–357 (2008).
3. de Onis, M. & Blössner, M. The World Health Organization Global Database on Child Growth and Malnutrition: methodology and applications. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **32**, 518–526 (2003).
4. Black, R. E. *et al.* Maternal and child undernutrition: global and regional exposures and health consequences. *The Lancet* **371**, 243–260 (2008).
5. Dewey, K. G. & Adu-Afarwuah, S. Systematic review of the efficacy and effectiveness of complementary feeding interventions in developing countries. *Matern Child Nutr* **4 Suppl 1**, 24–85 (2008).
6. Luby, S. P. *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Global Health* **6**, e302–e315 (2018).
7. Null, C. *et al.* 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**, e316–e329 (2018).
8. Ruel, M. T. & Alderman, H. Nutrition-sensitive interventions and programmes: how can they help to accelerate progress in improving maternal and child nutrition? *Lancet* **382**, 536–551 (2013).
9. Prendergast, A. J. *et al.* Assessment of Environmental Enteric Dysfunction in the SHINE Trial: Methods and Challenges. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **61**, S726–S732 (2015).
10. Mbuya, M. N. N. & Humphrey, J. H. Preventing environmental enteric dysfunction through improved water, sanitation and hygiene: an opportunity for stunting reduction in developing countries. *Maternal & Child Nutrition* **12**, 106–120 (2016).
11. Guerrant, R. L., Schorling, J. B., McAuliffe, J. F. & de Souza, M. A. Diarrhea as a cause and an effect of malnutrition: diarrhea prevents catch-up growth and malnutrition increases diarrhea frequency and duration. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **47**, 28–35 (1992).
12. Clasen, T. *et al.* Effectiveness of a rural sanitation programme on diarrhoea, soil-transmitted helminth infection, and child malnutrition in Odisha, India: a cluster-randomised trial. *The Lancet Global Health* **2**, e645–e653 (2014).
13. Wolf, J. *et al.* Impact of drinking water, sanitation and handwashing with soap on childhood diarrhoeal disease: updated meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Trop Med Int Health* **23**, 508–525 (2018).
14. Chard, A. N., Garn, J. v, Chang, H. H., Clasen, T. & Freeman, M. C. Impact of a school-based water, sanitation, and hygiene intervention on school absence, diarrhea, respiratory infection, and soil-transmitted helminths: results from the WASH HELPS cluster-randomized trial. *J Glob Health* **9**, 20402 (2019).
15. Reese, H. *et al.* Assessing longer-term effectiveness of a combined household-level piped water and sanitation intervention on child diarrhoea, acute respiratory infection, soil-transmitted helminth infection and nutritional status: a matched cohort study in rural Odisha, . *International Journal of Epidemiology* **48**, 1757–1767 (2019).

16. Knee, J. *et al.* Effects of an urban sanitation intervention on childhood enteric infection and diarrhea in Maputo, Mozambique: A controlled before-and-after trial. *Elife* **10**, 2020.08.20.20178608 (2021).
17. Cumming, O. *et al.* The implications of three major new trials for the effect of water, sanitation and hygiene on childhood diarrhea and stunting: a consensus statement. *BMC Medicine* **17**, 173 (2019).
18. Pickering, A. J., Djebbari, H., Lopez, C., Coulibaly, M. & Alzua, M. L. Effect of a community-led sanitation intervention on child diarrhoea and child growth in rural Mali: A cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Global Health* **3**, e701–e711 (2015).
19. Rogawski McQuade, E. T. *et al.* Impact of Water Quality, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutritional Interventions on Enteric Infections in Rural Zimbabwe: The Sanitation Hygiene Infant Nutrition Efficacy (SHINE) Trial. *J Infect Dis* **221**, 1379–1386 (2020).
20. Hill, C. L. *et al.* Impact of Low-Cost Point-of-Use Water Treatment Technologies on Enteric Infections and Growth among Children in Limpopo, South Africa. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **103**, 1405–1415 (2020).
21. Rah, J. H., Sukotjo, S., Badgaiyan, N., Cronin, A. A. & Torlesse, H. Improved sanitation is associated with reduced child stunting amongst Indonesian children under 3 years of age. *Maternal & Child Nutrition* **16**, e12741 (2020).
22. Humphrey, J. H. *et al.* 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**, e132–e147 (2019).
23. Prendergast, A. J. *et al.* Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on stunting and anaemia among HIV-exposed children in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health* **3**, 77–90 (2019).
24. Humphrey, J. H. Child undernutrition, tropical enteropathy, toilets, and handwashing. *Lancet* **374**, 1032–1035 (2009).
25. Ikeda, N., Irie, Y. & Shibuya, K. Determinants of reduced child stunting in Cambodia: analysis of pooled data from three demographic and health surveys. *Bull World Health Organ* **91**, 341–349 (2013).
26. Spears, D. How Much International Variation in Child Height Can Sanitation Explain? *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 6351* (2013).
27. Kar, K. Practical guide to triggering community-led total sanitation (CLTS). (2005).
28. Venkataramanan, V., Crocker, J., Karon, A. & Bartram, J. Community-Led Total Sanitation: A Mixed-Methods Systematic Review of Evidence and Its Quality. *Environmental Health Perspectives* **126**, 026001 (2018).
29. Kar, K. & Chambers, R. Handbook on community-led total sanitation. (2008).
30. Vyas, S., Kov, P., Smets, S. & Spears, D. Disease externalities and net nutrition: Evidence from changes in sanitation and child height in Cambodia, 2005–2010. *Economics & Human Biology* **23**, 235–245 (2016).
31. Spears, D. Exposure to open defecation can account for the Indian enigma of child height. *Journal of Development Economics* **146**, 102277 (2020).
32. Harris, M., Alzua, M. L., Osbert, N. & Pickering, A. Community-Level Sanitation Coverage More Strongly Associated with Child Growth and Household Drinking Water Quality than Access to a Private Toilet in Rural Mali. *Environ Sci Technol* **51**, 7219–7227 (2017).

33. Larsen, D. A., Grisham, T., Slawsky, E. & Narine, L. An individual-level meta-analysis assessing the impact of community-level sanitation access on child stunting, anemia, and diarrhea: Evidence from DHS and MICS surveys. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* **11**, e0005591 (2017).
34. Fink, G., Günther, I. & Hill, K. The effect of water and sanitation on child health: evidence from the demographic and health surveys 1986–2007. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **40**, 1196–1204 (2011).
35. Briceño, B., Coville, A., Gertler, P. & Martinez, S. Are there synergies from combining hygiene and sanitation promotion campaigns: Evidence from a large-scale cluster-randomized trial in rural Tanzania. *PLoS One* **12**, e0186228–e0186228 (2017).
36. Cameron, L., Olivia, S. & Shah, M. Scaling up sanitation: Evidence from an RCT in Indonesia. *Journal of Development Economics* **138**, 1–16 (2019).
37. Patil, S. R. *et al.* The Effect of India's Total Sanitation Campaign on Defecation Behaviors and Child Health in Rural Madhya Pradesh: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. *PLOS Medicine* **11**, e1001709 (2014).
38. Marschner, I. C. Optimal design of clinical trials comparing several treatments with a control. *Pharmaceutical Statistics* **6**, 23–33 (2007).
39. Schulz, K. F., Altman, D. G., Moher, D. & Group, for the C. CONSORT 2010 Statement: Updated Guidelines for Reporting Parallel Group Randomised Trials. *PLOS Medicine* **7**, e1000251 (2010).
40. McKee, N., Becker-Benton, A. & Bockh, E. Social and Behavior Change Communication. in *The Handbook of Development Communication and Social Change* 278–297 (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2014). doi:10.1002/9781118505328.ch17.
41. Liu, J. *et al.* Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to identify causes of diarrhoea in children: a reanalysis of the GEMS case-control study. *The Lancet* **388**, 1291–1301 (2016).
42. Pholwat, S. *et al.* Genotypic antimicrobial resistance assays for use on E. coli isolates and stool specimens. *PLoS One* **14**, e0216747–e0216747 (2019).
43. Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES): Anthropometry Procedures Manual*. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/2017-2018/manuals/2017_Anthropometry_Procedures_Manual.pdf (2017).
44. Mutz, D. C., Pemantle, R. & Pham, P. The Perils of Balance Testing in Experimental Design: Messy Analyses of Clean Data. *The American Statistician* **73**, 32–42 (2019).
45. Senn, S. Testing for baseline balance in clinical trials. *Stat Med* **13**, 1715–1726 (1994).
46. Rothman, K. J. No Adjustments Are Needed for Multiple Comparisons. *Epidemiology* **1**, (1990).
47. Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)* **57**, 289–300 (1995).
48. Grembi, J. A. *et al.* Effect of Water, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutrition Interventions on Enteropathogens in Children 14 Months Old: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural Bangladesh. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* (2020) doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa549.

49. Peacock, J. L., Lo, J., Rees, J. R. & Sauzet, O. Minimal clinically important difference in means in vulnerable populations: challenges and solutions. *BMJ Open* **11**, e052338 (2021).
50. Hayes, R. J. & Bennett, S. Simple sample size calculation for cluster-randomized trials. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **28**, 319–326 (1999).
51. Bloom, H. S. Minimum Detectable Effects: A Simple Way to Report the Statistical Power of Experimental Designs. *Evaluation Review* **19**, 547–556 (1995).
52. Zanello, G., Srinivasan, C. S. & Shankar, B. What Explains Cambodia's Success in Reducing Child Stunting-2000-2014? *PLOS ONE* **11**, e0162668 (2016).
53. Kov, P., Smets, S., Spears, D. & Vyas, S. *Growing taller among toilets: Evidence from changes in sanitation and child height in Cambodia, 2005-2010*. https://riceinstitute.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2013/08/Cambodia-paper.pdf (2013).
54. National Institute of Statistics, Directorate General for Health, and I. I. *Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey 2014*.
55. Harper, J. *et al.* Household Preferences for Rural Fecal Sludge Management Services in Cambodia: A Discrete Choice Experiment. *Environmental Science & Technology* **55**, 1832–1841 (2021).
56. Salter, D. Identifying constraints to increasing sanitation coverage: sanitation demand and supply in Cambodia. *Phnom Penh: Water and Sanitation Program* **24**, (2008).
57. Troeger, C. *et al.* Estimates of the global, regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and aetiologies of diarrhoea in 195 countries: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **18**, 1211–1228 (2018).
58. Platts-Mills, J. a *et al.* Pathogen-specific burdens of community diarrhoea in developing countries: a multisite birth cohort study (MAL-ED). *The Lancet Global Health* **3**, e564–e575 (2015).
59. Kotloff, K. L. *et al.* Burden and aetiology of diarrhoeal disease in infants and young children in developing countries (the Global Enteric Multicenter Study, GEMS): a prospective, case-control study. *The Lancet* **382**, 209–222 (2013).
60. Wagner, E. G. & Lanoix, J. N. *Excreta Disposal for Rural Areas and Small Communities*. (WHO, 1958).
61. Prendergast, A. J. *et al.* Putting the “A” into WaSH: a call for integrated management of water, animals, sanitation, and hygiene. *The Lancet Planetary Health* **3**, e336–e337 (2019).
62. Wagner, E. G. & Lanoix, J. N. *Excreta Disposal for Rural Areas and Small Communities*. (WHO, 1958).
63. Berendes, D. M., Yang, P. J., Lai, A., Hu, D. & Brown, J. Estimation of global recoverable human and animal faecal biomass. *Nature Sustainability* **1**, 679–685 (2018).
64. Penakalapati, G. *et al.* Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A Systematic Review and Proposed Research Priorities. *Environmental Science & Technology* **51**, 11537–11552 (2017).
65. Hammer, J. & Spears, D. Village sanitation and child health: Effects and external validity in a randomized field experiment in rural India. *Journal of Health Economics* **48**, 135–148 (2016).
66. Contreras, J. D. & Eisenberg, J. N. S. Does Basic Sanitation Prevent Diarrhea? Contextualizing Recent Intervention Trials through a Historical Lens. *International*

Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health vol. 17 Preprint at https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17010230 (2020).
67. Fuller, J. A., Villamor, E., Cevallos, W., Trostle, J. & Eisenberg, J. N. I get height with a little help from my friends: herd protection from sanitation on child growth in rural Ecuador. *Int J Epidemiol* **45**, 460–469 (2016).
68. Fuller, J. A. & Eisenberg, J. N. S. Herd Protection from Drinking Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Interventions. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **95**, 1201–1210 (2016).
69. Pickering, A. J. *et al.* The WASH Benefits and SHINE trials: interpretation of WASH intervention effects on linear growth and diarrhoea. *The Lancet Global Health* **7**, e1139–e1146 (2019).
70. Checkley, W. *et al.* Effect of water and sanitation on childhood health in a poor Peruvian peri-urban community. *The Lancet* **363**, 112–118 (2004).
71. Barnard, S. *et al.* Impact of Indian Total Sanitation Campaign on Latrine Coverage and Use: A Cross-Sectional Study in Orissa Three Years following Programme Implementation. *PLOS ONE* **8**, e71438 (2013).
72. Watson, S. I., Rego, R. T. T., Hofer, T. & Lilford, R. J. Evaluations of water, sanitation and hygiene interventions should not use diarrhoea as (primary) outcome. *BMJ Global Health* **7**, e008521 (2022).
73. Schmidt, W.-P. *et al.* Epidemiological methods in diarrhoea studies—an update. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **40**, 1678–1692 (2011).
74. Kerac, M. *et al.* 'Severe malnutrition': thinking deeply, communicating simply. *BMJ Global Health* **5**, e003023 (2020).
75. Brown, J. & Cumming, O. Stool-Based Pathogen Detection Offers Advantages as an Outcome Measure for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Trials. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **102**, 260–261 (2020).
76. Rogawski, E. T. *et al.* Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to investigate the effect of enteropathogen infections on linear growth in children in low-resource settings: longitudinal analysis of results from the MAL-ED cohort study. *The Lancet Global Health* **6**, e1319–e1328 (2018).
77. Brown, J. *et al.* A controlled, before-and-after trial of an urban sanitation intervention to reduce enteric infections in children: research protocol for the Maputo Sanitation (MapSan) study, Mozambique. *BMJ Open* **5**, e008215 (2015).
78. Lai, A. *et al.* Risk factors for early childhood growth faltering in rural Cambodia: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* **12**, e058092 (2022).
79. Leroy, J. L., Ruel, M., Habicht, J.-P. & Frongillo, E. A. Using height-for-age differences (HAD) instead of height-for-age z-scores (HAZ) for the meaningful measurement of population-level catch-up in linear growth in children less than 5 years of age. *BMC Pediatrics* **15**, 145 (2015).
80. Resendiz-Nava, C., Esquivel-Hernandez, Y., Alcaraz-Gonzalez, A., Castaneda-Serrano, P. & Nava, G. M. PCR Assays Based on invA Gene Amplification are not Reliable for Salmonella Detection. *Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology* **In Press**, (2019).
81. Shiras, T. *et al.* Shared latrines in Maputo, Mozambique: exploring emotional well-being and psychosocial stress. *BMC International Health and Human Rights* **18**, 30 (2018).
82. Platts-Mills, J. A. *et al.* Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to assess the aetiology, burden, and clinical characteristics of diarrhoea in children in low-resource

settings: a reanalysis of the MAL-ED cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health* **6**, e1309–e1318 (2018).