Influence of climate and environment on the efficacy of water, sanitation, and handwashing interventions on diarrheal disease in rural Bangladesh: a re-analysis of a randomized control trial

Anna T. Nguyen[1], Jessica A. Grembi[2], Marie Riviere[1], Gabriella Barratt Heitmann[1], William D. Hutson[3], Tejas S. Athni[1], Arusha Patil[1], Ayse Ercumen[4], Audrie Lin[5], Yoshika Crider[6], Andrew Mertens[5], Leanne Unicomb[7], Mahbubur Rahman[7], John M. Colford Jr.[5], Stephen P. Luby[2], Benjamin F. Arnold[8], Jade Benjamin-Chung[1,9]

[1] Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, United States
[2] Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, United States
[3] Brown School, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA.
[4] Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, United States
[5] Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, United States
[6] King Center on Global Development, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, United States
[7] International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Dhaka, Bangladesh
[8] Francis I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, United States
[9] Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, CA 94158

Abstract

Background: Climate change may influence the effectiveness of environmental interventions. We investigated if climate and environment modified the effect of low-cost, point-of-use water, sanitation, and handwashing (WASH) interventions on diarrhea and predicted intervention effectiveness under climate change scenarios.

Methods: We analyzed data from a cluster-randomized trial in rural Bangladesh that measured diarrhea prevalence in children 0-2 years from 2012-2016. We matched remote sensing data on temperature, precipitation, humidity, and surface water to households by location and measurement date. We estimated prevalence ratios (PR) for WASH interventions vs. control stratified by environmental factors using generative additive models and targeted maximum likelihood estimation. We estimated intervention effects under predicted precipitation in the study region in 2050 for climate change scenarios from different Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs).

Findings: WASH interventions more effectively prevented diarrhea under higher levels of total precipitation in the previous week and when there was heavy rain in the previous week (heavy rainfall PR = 0.38, 95% CI 0.23-0.62 vs. no heavy rainfall PR = 0.77, 0.60-0.98). We did not detect substantial effect modification by other environmental variables. WASH intervention effectiveness increased under most climate change scenarios; in a fossil-fueled development scenario (SSP5), the PR was 0.46 (0.44-0.48) compared to 0.67 (0.65-0.68) in the study.

Interpretation: WASH interventions had the strongest effect on diarrhea under higher precipitation, and effectiveness may increase under climate change without sustainable development. WASH interventions may improve population resilience to climate-related health risks.

Funding: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Heart, Lung, And Blood Institute

Research in Context Panel

Evidence before this study

We searched Google Scholar using the search terms “sanitation” OR “hygiene” OR “WASH” OR “water quality”; and “heterogen*” or “effect modif*”; and “climate” OR “environmental”; and “diarrhea” OR “enteric infection”; and “risk” AND/OR “factors”. In general, the effect modification of sanitation and hygiene on diarrhea or enteropathogen infection by climate and environment is not well studied. One study in Ecuador investigated different relationships between rainfall, diarrhea, and unimproved sanitation and water sources. They found that poor sanitation was most strongly associated with elevated diarrhea after precipitation minimums, whereas poor water sources were most strongly associated with elevated diarrhea after precipitation maximums. One study in Rwanda also found that high levels of runoff were protective against diarrhea only in households with unimproved toilets. In Bangladesh, one study found that access to tubewells was most effective at reducing childhood diarrhea in non-flood controlled areas. No prior studies have projected changes in WASH effectiveness under different climate change scenarios.

Added value of this study

To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess differences in WASH intervention effectiveness for multiple environmental variables and the first to predict future intervention effectiveness under different climate change scenarios. We spatiotemporally matched individual-level data from a trial in rural Bangladesh to remote sensing data on temperature, precipitation, humidity, and surface water presence. We compared the effectiveness of WASH interventions to prevent diarrhea under different levels of potential environmental effect modifiers. We then used

23 climate models with high spatiotemporal resolution to predict changes in intervention
24 effectiveness under different climate change scenarios.

25 *Implications of all the available evidence*

26 We found that WASH interventions were more effective under increasing precipitation
27 and following heavy rain (over 80th percentile) events. Prior studies have found that diarrhea
28 tends to increase with rainfall. Several studies have documented that precipitation-associated
29 increases in diarrhea occurred primarily after heavy rain that followed dry periods, but we found
30 that WASH intervention effectiveness in preventing diarrhea was higher even at moderate
31 precipitation levels that were not necessarily preceded by a dry period. Under climate change
32 scenarios with higher precipitation, we projected that WASH interventions may become more
33 effective. In settings similar to rural Bangladesh, our findings suggest that regions that are
34 expected to experience greater rainfall should be prioritized for intervention installation,
35 promotion, and maintenance and that these activities might be most impactful during the rainy
36 season.

Background

In 2019, the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation estimated that over 500,000 deaths in children under the age of five were caused by diarrheal disease.[1] Children that suffer from repeated diarrheal episodes are at high risk of malnutrition, stunted growth, and impaired cognitive development.[2] The World Health Organization estimates that over half of diarrhea deaths are directly attributable to inadequate water safety, sanitation, and/or handwashing (WASH).[3]

However, randomized controlled trials of WASH interventions in rural Kenya and Bangladesh found varying effects in these quite different contexts; the trial in Bangladesh found a 1.7 percentage point reduction in diarrhea prevalence among children who received a combined water, sanitation, and hygiene intervention but the trial in Kenya found no significant reduction.[4,5] The unique physical, cultural, and environmental conditions of each study site may explain differences in treatment effects between these two trials.

Diarrheal disease is associated with meteorological variables such as temperature[6–9], precipitation[8–11], and humidity[7]. Other environmental factors, including proximity to surface water[12], have also been shown to affect enteric pathogen transmission. There are multiple plausible pathways through which climate and environmental conditions could impact the relationship between WASH interventions and diarrhea. Extreme precipitation and flooding can damage WASH infrastructure, leading to increased drinking water contamination.[13] Severe drought conditions might reduce the availability of well water for drinking and handwashing.[14]

Few studies have examined how climate and environmental factors modify the effect of WASH interventions on diarrhea. There is some evidence that the relationships between diarrhea prevalence and unimproved water sources and sanitation systems changed under different levels

60 of precipitation and runoff.[10,11] In Bangladesh, one study found that tubewells were most
61 effective in non-flood controlled areas.[15] Another study found that reductions in diarrhea from
62 sanitation interventions occurred exclusively during the rainy season in Bangladesh.[16] However,
63 no prior work has investigated whether the effectiveness of improved WASH varies under
64 multiple climatic and environmental conditions in a scenario where interventions were
65 randomized.

66 Our objective was to assess whether climatic and environmental factors modify the effect
67 of water, sanitation, and hygiene interventions on diarrhea prevalence. We analyzed individual-
68 level data from a randomized trial in rural Bangladesh that measured childhood diarrhea and
69 spatiotemporal environmental data from remote sensors.[5] We predicted potential changes in the
70 effectiveness of WASH interventions under different climate change scenarios.

71 **Methods**

72 Study Data

73 The WASH Benefits Bangladesh trial delivered low-cost, point-of-use household WASH
74 interventions and estimated their effects on diarrheal disease.[5,17] The trial enrolled pregnant
75 women in their second or third trimester between 2012-2013 in the Gazipur, Kishoreganj,
76 Mymensingh, and Tangail districts of rural Bangladesh. Village clusters were block-randomized
77 to one of the following arms: chlorinated drinking water (W); upgraded sanitation (S); promotion
78 of handwashing with soap (H); nutrition education with lipid-based supplement (Nutrition);
79 combined water, sanitation, and handwashing (WSH); combined water, sanitation, handwashing,
80 and nutrition (WSH + Nutrition); or control. We excluded the Nutrition arm from this analysis
81 since the effectiveness of nutrition alone is unlikely to depend on environmental factors.
82 Additional details on enrollment criteria and intervention details have been reported elsewhere.[5]

83 We restricted our analysis to children in the diarrhea cohort, which included children
84 born to pregnant women who enrolled in the trial and children living in the same compound that
85 were under the age of three at the time of enrollment. Diarrhea was measured at approximately 1
86 and 2 years after intervention delivery through caregiver report of at least three loose stools in
87 24-hours or a bloody stool within the past 7 days.

88 Environmental Data

89 We assessed pre-specified climatic and environmental variables as possible effect
90 modifiers (see details on data sources and variable definitions in Appendix 1). We matched
91 values of environmental factors to each child in the trial by finding the closest measurement to
92 their household coordinates at the date that outcomes were assessed. We calculated distances
93 between sensor measurements and study coordinates using the haversine formula.

94 *Temperature* We pulled temperature data from the MODIS/Terra Land Surface Temperature
95 (MOD11A1 v006) dataset from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).
96 We assessed temperature using the minimum, maximum, and average temperature in the 7-day
97 and 30-day period preceding each outcome measurement. Additionally, we computed antecedent
98 7-day averages under a 1-, 2-, and 3-week lag from outcome measurements and calculated binary
99 variables of whether these averages were above or below the median weekly average
100 temperatures across the study period.

101 *Surface Water* We obtained surface water data from the Global Surface Water Explorer dataset
102 from the European Commission's Joint Research Centre. We quantified the amount of adjacent
103 surface water by calculating the proportion of area (measured by 30x30 meter pixels) covered by
104 seasonal surface water (consistently present during a specific time of the year), ephemeral
105 surface water (not consistently present), and any surface water (seasonal, ephemeral, and

106 permanent surface water) within a 250-, 500-, and 750-meter radius of households. We
107 constructed categorical variables to indicate if the proportion of area covered by each type of
108 surface water was greater or less than the median proportion in the study area. Additionally, we
109 calculated the distance (in meters) from each household to the closest detected surface water,
110 seasonal surface water, and ephemeral surface water. We constructed a categorical variable
111 indicating the tertile of distance from each type of surface water to address data sparsity in the
112 continuous measures of distance.

113 *Vapor Pressure Deficit* We obtained vapor pressure deficit (VPD) data from the TerraClimate
114 dataset and matched outcome measurements to the closest measurement taken in the same month
115 and year, as the data was only available at a monthly resolution. Higher values of VPD indicate
116 lower humidity.

117 *Precipitation* We obtained precipitation data from the Global Unified Gauge-Based Analysis of
118 Daily Precipitation dataset from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. We
119 assessed precipitation through antecedent 7-day sums under 1-, 2-, and 3-week lags of outcome
120 measurements. We created binary variables indicating if these weekly sums exceeded the median
121 weekly total precipitation over the study period. We also calculated binary variables of heavy
122 rain under 1-, 2-, and 3-week lags, indicating if there was at least one day in the prior week
123 where total precipitation was above the 80th percentile of all daily totals.

124 Statistical Analysis

125 We assessed the effect of WASH interventions on caregiver-reported diarrhea prevalence
126 in the past 7 days for children in an intention-to-treat-analysis. To maximize precision, we
127 created an indicator for any "WASH interventions" (1 = water, sanitation, hygiene, combined
128 WSH, or combined WSH + Nutrition arms; 0 = control arms).

129 To allow for potentially non-linear relationships between continuous environmental
130 factors and diarrhea, we fit generalized additive models (GAM) between treatment and diarrhea,
131 including one environmental factor modeled using a spline in each model.[18] We specified a
132 binomial family with logit link functions and used restricted maximum likelihood estimation to
133 select smoothing parameters. We estimated simultaneous confidence intervals using a parametric
134 bootstrap of the variance-covariance matrix under a multivariate normal distribution.[19] We also
135 estimated prevalence ratios at the 10th and 90th percentile of each observed distribution and
136 estimated 95% confidence intervals using a non-parametric bootstrap with resampling at the
137 cluster level.

138 For categorical environmental factors, we estimated intervention effects using targeted
139 maximum likelihood estimation (TMLE). We included the simple mean, generalized linear
140 model (GLM), Bayesian GLM, GAM, and lasso net GLM as learners for both our treatment and
141 outcome ensemble models. We estimated the prevalence ratios and corresponding confidence
142 intervals for WASH interventions vs. control for each risk factor stratum.

143 To assess differences in WASH effectiveness under various climate change scenarios, we
144 estimated the prevalence ratio under projected distributions of precipitation in the study region in
145 2050. We used the UK Earth System model (UKESM1-0-LL), which best matched observed
146 values from the trial, to project the spatiotemporal distribution of rainfall in the study region
147 under different climate change scenarios.[20] We include additional details on our climate model
148 selection process in Appendix 2.

149 We examined three Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs): SSP1 represents a future
150 under sustainable development where CO_2 emissions are reduced to net zero by 2075. SSP2
151 represents a "middle of the road" approach where CO_2 emissions stay constant at current levels

152 until 2050 before gradually falling to net zero by 2100. SSP5 represents continued fossil-fueled
153 development, where CO_2 emissions triple by 2075.[21]

154 We extracted precipitation projections for study households by geographical coordinates
155 under each of these scenarios for every day in 2050. From the matched, daily data, we calculated
156 the weekly total precipitation for each household under lag periods for which we detected
157 significant effect modification in our primary analysis. We estimated diarrhea prevalence for the
158 WASH interventions and control groups under the projected precipitation distributions using
159 GAMs fitted with weekly total precipitation under the relevant lags as the independent variable.
160 We calculated the prevalence ratio using the parametric g-formula and constructed 95%
161 confidence intervals using 1,000 bootstrapped resamples taken at the cluster level.

162 To check for possible misclassification of the diarrhea outcome, we conducted a negative
163 control analysis using an outcome of caregiver-reported bruising in the past 7 days.[22]

164 Analyses were conducted in R (version 4.1.3). The pre-analysis plan and replication
165 scripts are available through the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/yt67k/).

166 Role of the funding source

167 The funders of the study had no role in study design, data analysis, interpretation, writing
168 of the manuscript, or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

169 **Results**

170 Our analysis included 12,440 total diarrhea measurements for 6,921 children between 0.5
171 and 5.5 years of age (mean 2.0, SD 1.2). We report additional participant demographics and the
172 distribution of environmental factors by group in Table 1. The unadjusted diarrhea prevalence
173 ratio associated with the pooled WASH interventions averaging across climatic conditions in the
174 trial was 0.66 (95% CI 0.54 - 0.80).

175 Temperature

176 We found no evidence of effect modification of WASH interventions by minimum or
177 maximum temperatures within the prior 7- or 30- day period. Diarrhea prevalence tended to
178 increase with average temperature in the previous 7- and 30-days in both arms, but the increase
179 in prevalence per degree was lower in the WASH interventions group (Figure 1A). For weekly
180 average temperature under 2-3-week lags, prevalence increased with temperature in the control
181 group but remained similar across temperature levels in the intervention group. For a change of
182 average weekly temperature with a 3-week lag from 19.2°C (10th percentile) to 26.6 °C (90th
183 percentile), the prevalence of diarrhea changed from 3.6% (95% CI 3.0-4.6) to 3.8% (95% CI
184 3.4-4.7) in the WASH interventions arms and 2.4% (95% CI 1.8-3.4) to 5.1% (95% CI 4.3-6.8)
185 in the control arm. This corresponded to a prevalence ratio of 2.03 (95% CI 1.05, 3.81) at 19.2°C
186 and 0.74 (95% CI 0.56, 0.98) at 26.6°C. We found no significant differences in diarrhea
187 prevalence between the interventions vs. control arms for weekly average temperature under a 1-
188 week lag. (Figure 1B). There were no differences in prevalence ratios for weekly average
189 temperatures above vs. below-median under any lag period. (Figure 1C, Table A1)

190 Surface Water

191 The effect of WASH interventions was larger among children with below-median vs.
192 above-median seasonal surface water within 250 meters (0.58, 95% CI 0.45-0.74 vs. 0.92, 95%
193 CI 0.61-1.39). We found no effect modification by the proportion of land covered by any other
194 type of surface water or within any other distance. (Figure 2, Table A2)

195 The prevalence ratio of WASH interventions was lowest in households that were in the
196 33rd-66th percentile in distance to seasonal surface water (0.53, 95% CI 0.36-0.76) compared to
197 households in the 0th-33rd percentile (0.99, 95% CI 0.55-1.78) or in the 66th-100th percentile

198 (0.60, 95% CI 0.38-0.94). We found no effect modification by distance to any surface water or
199 ephemeral surface water. (Figure 2, Table A2)

200 Vapor Pressure Deficit (VPD)

201 WASH interventions were less effective at higher values of VPD. The prevalence of
202 diarrhea was 5.0% (95% CI 4.3-6.5) in the control arm and 3.4% (95% CI 3.1-4.1) in the WASH
203 interventions arm at a VPD of 0.65 kPa (10th percentile), compared to 3.0% (95% CI 2.0-4.7) in
204 the control and 4.5% (95% CI 3.7-6) in the intervention at 1.37 kPa (90th percentile) (Figure A1).
205 At 0.65 kPa, we estimated a prevalence ratio of 0.70 (95% CI 0.42, 0.95). At 1.37 kPa, we
206 estimated a prevalence ratio of 1.93 (95% CI 1.02, 4.08).

207 Precipitation

208 The effectiveness of WASH interventions increased with weekly total precipitation under
209 1-2-week lags. (Figure 3A). For a change of weekly total precipitation under a 1-week lag from 0
210 mm (10th percentile) to 125 mm (90th percentile), we estimated that diarrhea prevalence changed
211 from 4.0% (95% CI 3.6-4.8) to 3.2% (95% CI 2.7-4.1) in the WASH interventions arms
212 compared to 3.0% (95% CI 2.7-3.7) to 5.3% (95% CI 4.5-7) in the control arm. The prevalence
213 ratio was 1.38 (95% CI 1.08, 1.8) at 0 mm and 0.72 (95% CI 0.4, 1.43) at 125 mm. We observed
214 similar results under 2-3-week lags, but with smaller differences in prevalence between the
215 WASH interventions arms and control arms at higher values of weekly total precipitation.

216 The prevalence ratio associated with WASH interventions was lower when there was at
217 least one day of heavy rain (0.38, 95% CI 0.23-0.62) in the 8- to 14-day period before outcome
218 measurement (1-week lag) compared to when there were no days with heavy rain (0.77, 95% CI
219 0.60-0.98) (Figure 3B, Table A3). We did not observe effect modification by heavy rain in other
220 7-day periods under 2-3-week lags. WASH interventions were more effective when total weekly

221 precipitation under a 3-week lag was above-median (0.57, 95% CI 0.46-0.71) compared to
222 below-median (1.00, 95% CI 0.67-1.49) (Figure 3C, Table A3). We found similar trends under
223 the 1-2-week lag periods.

224 Peak precipitation was higher under climate change scenarios compared to during the
225 trial (Figure 4A). We projected an increase in intervention effectiveness in climate scenarios in
226 which the study area was predicted to have heavier, more frequent rainfall. During the study
227 period, the prevalence ratio for total weekly precipitation under a 1-week lag was 0.67 (95% CI
228 0.65-0.68) (Figure 4B, Table A4). Under SSP1, where there is a predicted decrease in the
229 frequency and volume of rainfall, the prevalence ratio was similar (0.66; 95% CI 0.64-0.68).
230 Under SSP2 and SSP5, where there is a predicted increase in rainfall, we estimated lower
231 prevalence ratios of 0.59 (95% CI 0.57-0.60) for SSP2 and 0.46 (95% CI 0.44-0.48) for SSP5.
232 (Figure 4B)

233 Other analyses

234 We did not observe any significant differences in intervention effect estimates by climate
235 or environment on reported bruising, a negative-control outcome. (Appendix 3)

236 In accordance with our pre-analysis plan, we ran analyses for water flow accumulation,
237 enhanced vegetative index, land use, and population density but generally did not find that these
238 variables modified the effect of WASH interventions on diarrhea prevalence. Results for these
239 analyses are available at https://osf.io/yt67k/.

240 **Discussion**

241 WASH interventions in rural Bangladesh were more effective under conditions with
242 higher total precipitation and heavy rainfall. We found that WASH interventions reduced
243 diarrhea prevalence by 62% (95% CI 38%-77%) following heavy rainfall and up to 43% (95%

244 CI 28%-56%) after above-median rainfall compared to the overall 34% (95% CI 19%-45%)
245 reduction observed in the original trial. We observed some heterogeneity in treatment
246 effectiveness under varying levels of temperature, vapor pressure deficit and surface water, but
247 precision of these estimates was low. Under highly unregulated fossil-fueled development that
248 will lead to heavier, more frequent rainfall (SSP5), we predicted that WASH interventions will
249 reduce diarrhea prevalence by up to 54% (95% CI 52%-56%) in a climate change scenario.
250 WASH interventions were more effective under higher weekly average precipitation with
251 a 1- and 2-week lag, in weeks with a heavy rain event with a 1-week lag, and in weeks with
252 above-median precipitation with all lag periods. While no prior studies have rigorously assessed
253 whether WASH intervention effectiveness varies with precipitation, prior studies have found
254 both positive and negative associations between diarrhea and precipitation; heavy rain was
255 associated with higher diarrhea prevalence following dry periods but not following wet periods.[23]
256 These differences are usually attributed to the concentration-dilution hypothesis, which posits
257 that diarrhea risk is highest from heavy rainfall following dry periods because pathogens that
258 become concentrated during dry periods are flushed into the environment.[23] We were unable to
259 investigate this hypothesis since most heavy rain preceded by wet periods during the study.
260 However, we observed higher intervention effectiveness following heavy rain regardless of
261 whether it was preceded by a dry period. This is consistent with past studies in Bangladesh that
262 found that heavy rainfall was associated with higher concentrations of diarrhea-causing *E. coli* in
263 wells regardless of antecedental rainfall.[9] The rainy season in Bangladesh brings continuous
264 heavy rainfall which may flush contaminants from unimproved latrines directly into well water
265 or into pond water that eventually drains to tube wells through the aquifer.[9] Improved WASH

266 may reduce the prevalence of diarrhea under these conditions by moderating increases in fecal
267 contamination that are associated with heavy rain.

268 Diarrhea prevalence stayed relatively constant across temperature levels among WASH
269 intervention recipients but increased with average temperature in the control group; however,
270 there was no effect modification by minimum or maximum temperature. To our knowledge, no
271 prior studies assessed differences in WASH effectiveness by temperature, but some have
272 evaluated differences in diarrhea prevalence. One study found a positive association with
273 temperature and bacterial diarrhea, but no relationship between temperature and viral diarrhea,
274 suggesting that differences in environmental survival by pathogen taxa could impact the
275 influence of temperature on the effect of WASH interventions.[6] Our findings suggest that WASH
276 interventions may mitigate increases in diarrhea prevalence associated with average
277 temperatures, even at less than extreme temperature levels.

278 We found weak evidence that WASH interventions were more effective in areas with less
279 seasonal surface water within 250 meters. Standing surface water is highly susceptible to
280 contamination by enteric pathogens, and previous qualitative studies have shown that vulnerable
281 communities may use surface water as drinking water for convenience or during times of water
282 scarcity, which could lead to increased diarrhea.[24,25]

283 WASH interventions were slightly more effective at lower values of VPD that correspond
284 to high humidity. No prior studies have evaluated the impact of humidity on WASH
285 effectiveness, but prior studies have found very weak associations between humidity and most
286 enteric bacteria and viruses.[26]

287 Compared to during the study period, WASH effectiveness is predicted to be similar
288 under a sustainable development scenario (SSP1), where average rainfall was predicted to be

289 lower than current levels in our climate models, and to be higher under "middle-of-the-road"
290 (SSP2) and fossil-fueled development scenarios (SSP5), where rainy seasons are predicted to last
291 longer and have higher total precipitation. No studies have assessed the future effectiveness of
292 WASH under climate change, but there is growing evidence that increased rainfall will lead to
293 higher diarrhea incidence and potential degradation of water and sanitation infrastructure. [25,27–29]
294 Our results suggest that during future periods of extreme rainfall, WASH interventions may be
295 especially impactful and increase resilience of vulnerable populations. Low cost, point-of-use
296 WASH interventions require prolonged uptake and maintenance, which can be difficult to
297 sustain; efforts to promote uptake may be most fruitful prior to or during the rainy season, when
298 interventions are likely to have the greatest impact. Further, our findings suggest that in areas
299 with limited resources, WASH interventions should be targeted to populations where rainfall is
300 projected to be the highest.

301 Limitations

302 Our study is subject to several limitations. We measured caregiver-reported diarrhea,
303 which is susceptible to courtesy bias. However, our negative control analysis using an alternative
304 caregiver-reported outcome suggested that there was no evidence of misclassification.

305 We were unable to investigate effect modification of specific intervention arms due to
306 data sparsity; pooling across intervention arms was necessary to ensure sufficient statistical
307 power.

308 The generalizability and accuracy of our predicted changes in WASH effectiveness may
309 be limited. Because we used precipitation projections specific to our study site, our predictions
310 for WASH intervention effectiveness under climate change scenarios cannot necessarily be
311 generalized to other sites. However, our findings may still be relevant for regions with similar

climates, environmentally-mediated transmission patterns, and WASH infrastructures. Additionally, these climate models considered how environmental variables are expected to change under different global scenarios but do not account for improvements to WASH technologies or local economic development. These factors will likely impact future WASH intervention effectiveness in ways that our study could not capture.

Conclusion

In rural Bangladesh, low-cost, household level WASH interventions more effectively reduced diarrhea prevalence at higher average temperature levels and following periods of higher precipitation and heavy rain. We observed up to a 62% reduction in diarrhea prevalence following extreme rainfall compared to the overall average 34% reduction found over the entire study period. Under likely climate change scenarios, our study suggests that WASH interventions will be more effective due to higher levels of rainfall. In settings similar to rural Bangladesh, WASH interventions should be prioritized in areas that are prone to extreme precipitation and during the rainy season. In addition, WASH interventions may increase communities' resilience against extreme weather under climate change by preventing environmentally-mediated enteric infections.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Gates Foundation (grant number OPPGD759 to the University of California, Berkeley) and the Task Force for Global Health (grant number NTDSC088G to Innovations for Poverty Action, and grant number NTDSC089G to the University of California, Berkeley). Research reported in this publication was supported in part by the National Institute of Allergy And Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health under Award Numbers K01AI141616 (PI: Benjamin-Chung) and R01AI166671 (PI: Arnold), the National Heart, Lung, And Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health under award number T32HL151323 (Nguyen), and a Stanford University School of Medicine Dean's Postdoctoral Fellowship (Grembi). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. Jade Benjamin-Chung is a Chan Zuckerberg Biohub Investigator. We also acknowledge the Stanford Research Computing Center for computational resources at the Sherlock high-performance cluster.

Role of the Funding Source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data analysis, interpretation, writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Authors' Contributions

Anna T. Nguyen: data curation, formal analysis, methodology, project administration, software, visualization, writing - original draft

Jessica A. Grembi: data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing – review & editing.

Marie Riviere: data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing – review & editing.

Gabby Barratt Heitmann, William D. Hutson: visualization, formal analysis, investigation, writing – review & editing.

Tejas S. Athni: formal analysis, investigation, writing – review & editing.

Arusha Patil: visualization, writing – review & editing.

Ayse Ercumen, Audrie Lin, Leanne Unicomb, Mahbubur Rahman, John M. Colford, Jr., Stephen P. Luby: project administration, supervision, resources, writing - review & editing

Yoshika Crider, Andrew Mertens: resources, methodology, writing - review & editing

Benjamin F. Arnold: methodology, software, project administration, writing - review & editing

Jade Benjamin-Chung: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, methodology, project administration, resources, supervision, visualization, writing - original draft

Ethics Committee Approval

The original trial protocol was approved by the Ethical Review Committee at The International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh (PR-11063), the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of California, Berkeley (2011-09-3652), and the institutional review board at Stanford University (25863).

References

1 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). GBD Results. Seattle WA IHME Univ. Wash. 2020. https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-results (accessed Sept 20, 2022).

2 Global Diarrhea Burden | Global Water, Sanitation and Hygiene | Healthy Water | CDC. 2018; published online Nov 9. https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/global/diarrhea-burden.html (accessed Dec 18, 2021).

3 Diarrhoeal disease. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/diarrhoeal-disease (accessed Dec 18, 2021).

4 Null C, Stewart CP, Pickering AJ, *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Kenya: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018; **6**: e316–29.

5 Luby SP, Rahman M, Arnold BF, *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018; **6**: e302–15.

6 Carlton EJ, Woster AP, DeWitt P, Goldstein RS, Levy K. A systematic review and meta-analysis of ambient temperature and diarrhoeal diseases. *Int J Epidemiol* 2016; **45**: 117–30.

7 Liu Z, Liu Y, Zhang Y, *et al.* Effect of ambient temperature and its effect modifiers on bacillary dysentery in Jinan, China. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **650**: 2980–6.

8 Levy K, Woster AP, Goldstein RS, Carlton EJ. Untangling the Impacts of Climate Change on Waterborne Diseases: a Systematic Review of Relationships between Diarrheal Diseases and Temperature, Rainfall, Flooding, and Drought. *Environ Sci Technol* 2016; **50**: 4905–22.

9 Nijhawan A, Howard G. Associations between climate variables and water quality in low- and middle-income countries: A scoping review. *Water Res* 2022; **210**: 117996.

10 Bhavnani D, Goldstick JE, Cevallos W, Trueba G, Eisenberg JNS. Impact of Rainfall on Diarrheal Disease Risk Associated with Unimproved Water and Sanitation. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2014; **90**: 705–11.

11 Mukabutera A, Thomson D, Murray M, *et al.* Rainfall variation and child health: effect of rainfall on diarrhea among under 5 children in Rwanda, 2010. *BMC Public Health* 2016; **16**: 731.

12 Hashizume M, Wagatsuma Y, Faruque ASG, *et al.* Factors determining vulnerability to diarrhoea during and after severe floods in Bangladesh. *J Water Health* 2008; **6**: 323–32.

13 Kohlitz J, Willetts J, Gero A, Lyons S, Boisson S, Medlicott K. Climate, Sanitation and Health. https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/climate-sanitation-and-health (accessed Dec 19, 2021).

14 Wang P, Asare E, Pitzer VE, Dubrow R, Chen K. Associations between long-term drought and diarrhea among children under five in low- and middle-income countries. *Nat Commun* 2022; **13**: 3661.

15 Wu J, Yunus M, Streatfield PK, *et al.* Impact of tubewell access and tubewell depth on childhood diarrhea in Matlab, Bangladesh. *Environ Health* 2011; **10**: 109.

16 Contreras JD, Islam M, Mertens A, *et al.* Evaluation of an on-site sanitation intervention against childhood diarrhea and acute respiratory infection 1 to 3.5 years after implementation: Extended follow-up of a cluster-randomized controlled trial in rural Bangladesh. *PLOS Med* 2022; **19**: e1004041.

17 Arnold BF, Null C, Luby SP, *et al.* Cluster-randomised controlled trials of individual and combined water, sanitation, hygiene and nutritional interventions in rural Bangladesh and Kenya: the WASH Benefits study design and rationale. *BMJ Open* 2013; **3**: e003476.

18 Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Generalized Additive Models. *Stat Sci* 1986; **1**: 297–310.

19 Marra G, Wood SN. Coverage Properties of Confidence Intervals for Generalized Additive Model Components. *Scand J Stat* 2012; **39**: 53–74.

20 Sellar AA, Jones CG, Mulcahy JP, *et al.* UKESM1: Description and Evaluation of the U.K. Earth System Model. *J Adv Model Earth Syst* 2019; **11**: 4513–58.

21 IPCC. Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021 https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGI_Full_Report.pdf (accessed March 28, 2022).

22 Arnold BF, Ercumen A, Benjamin-Chung J, Colford JM. Brief Report: Negative Controls to Detect Selection Bias and Measurement Bias in Epidemiologic Studies. *Epidemiol Camb Mass* 2016; **27**: 637–41.

23 Kraay ANM, Man O, Levy MC, Levy K, Ionides E, Eisenberg JNS. Understanding the Impact of Rainfall on Diarrhea: Testing the Concentration-Dilution Hypothesis Using a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Environ Health Perspect* 2020; **128**: 126001.

24 Boithias L, Choisy M, Souliyaseng N, *et al.* Hydrological Regime and Water Shortage as Drivers of the Seasonal Incidence of Diarrheal Diseases in a Tropical Montane Environment. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2016; **10**: e0005195.

25 Delpla I, Jung A-V, Baures E, Clement M, Thomas O. Impacts of climate change on surface water quality in relation to drinking water production. *Environ Int* 2009; **35**: 1225–33.

26 Colston JM, Zaitchik BF, Badr HS, *et al.* Associations Between Eight Earth Observation-Derived Climate Variables and Enteropathogen Infection: An Independent Participant Data

438 Meta-Analysis of Surveillance Studies With Broad Spectrum Nucleic Acid Diagnostics.
439 *GeoHealth* 2022; **6**: e2021GH000452.

440 27 Levy K, Smith SM, Carlton EJ. Climate Change Impacts on Waterborne Diseases: Moving
441 Toward Designing Interventions. *Curr Environ Health Rep* 2018; **5**: 272–82.

442 28 Patz JA, Frumkin H, Holloway T, Vimont DJ, Haines A. Climate Change: Challenges and
443 Opportunities for Global Health. *JAMA* 2014; **312**: 1565–80.

444 29 Sherpa AM, Koottatep T, Zurbrügg C, Cissé G. Vulnerability and adaptability of sanitation
445 systems to climate change. *J Water Clim Change* 2014; **5**: 487–95.

446

Table 1: Study population characteristics, by intervention group

	Control	**Improved WASH***
Children	1956	4965
Observations	3466	8974
Households	1203	3051
Children per household	1.6 (1.6 - 1.7)	1.6 (1.6 - 1.7)
Diarrhea during study period	186 (9.5%)	339 (6.8%)
Age at first measurement (years)	1.6 (1.6 - 1.7)	1.6 (1.6 - 1.6)
Age at any measurement (years)	2.0 (2.0 - 2.1)	2.0 (2.0 – 2.0)
Average weekly temperature, 0 week lag (C)	23.7 (23.3 - 24.2)	23.7 (23.4 - 24)
Weekly total precipitation, 1 week lag (mm)	48.3 (37.8 - 58.7)	48 (41.4 - 54.7)
Heavy rain, 0 week lag	667 (19.24%)	1584 (17.65%)
Vapor pressure deficit (kPa)	0.8 (0.8 - 0.9)	0.8 (0.8 - 0.8)
Enhanced vegetation index	0.3 (0.3 - 0.4)	0.3 (0.3 - 0.3)
Distance from any surface water (m)	266 (225.3 - 306.6)	283.4 (258.4 - 308.5)
Area covered by any surface within 500 meters (%)	8.5% (6.2% - 10.9%)	9.1% (7.6% - 10.6%)
Population density (persons per 100 m^2)	13.0 (11.7 - 14.4)	13.0 (12.1 - 13.9)
Land Use Category		
Croplands	1032 (29.77%)	2425 (27.02%)
Natural Vegetation	2065 (59.58%)	5408 (60.26%)
Savannas	367 (10.59%)	1135 (12.65%)

Sample sizes, child demographics, diarrhea prevalence, and environmental risk factor distributions in the control group vs improved WASH group (water, sanitation, hygiene, combined WSH, or combined WSH + Nutrition arms). For categorical variables, the number of occurrences and percentages are reported. For continuous variables, the mean and 95% confidence interval are reported.

Figure 1: Differences in diarrhea prevalence by temperature, stratified by treatment group



A) Predicted diarrhea prevalence by average, minimum, and maximum temperature in the past 7 and 30 days, stratified by treatment arm. Distribution of observed temperature values are displayed below plots showing model fits, with the median value marked by a red vertical line. Prevalence ratios for diarrhea in the pooled WASH treatment vs control group are displayed for the 10th and 90th percentiles of each distribution, with 95% CIs estimated by taking 1,000 bootstrapped resamples by cluster.

B) Predicted diarrhea prevalence by average weekly temperature under a 1-, 2-, and 3-week lag, stratified by treatment arm

C) Prevalence ratios for diarrhea in the pooled treatment vs control arms by different levels of average weekly temperature under a 1-, 2-, and 3-week lag. Confidence intervals calculated to adjust for clustering of treatment assignment.

Figure 2: Differences in WASH intervention effect by surface water presence



Prevalence ratios for diarrhea in the pooled treatment vs control arms by different levels of any, ephemeral, and season surface water presence. Confidence intervals calculated to adjust for clustering of treatment assignment. Amount of nearby surface water describes the proportion of land within a given distance from a child's household that was covered by surface water. Tertile bounds for distance from any surface water were 0-33rd: 0-164 m, 33-66th: 164-316 m, 66-100th: 316-1818 m; from ephemeral surface water were 0-33rd: 0-261 m, 33-66th: 261-508 m, 66-100th: 508-2083 m; from seasonal surface water were 0-33rd: 0-230 m, 33-66th: 230-453 m, 66-100th: 453-1902 m.

Figure 3: Differences in diarrhea prevalence and WASH intervention effect by precipitation and treatment



A) Predicted diarrhea prevalence by total weekly precipitation, stratified by treatment group. The upper bounds of confidence intervals are truncated at a prevalence of 20% on the plot, but values reach as high as 22% under the 1-week lag and 60% under the 2-week lag. Distribution of observed precipitation values are displayed below plots showing model fits, with the median value marked by a blue vertical line. Prevalence ratios for diarrhea in the pooled WASH treatment vs control group are displayed for the 10th and 90th percentiles of each distribution, with 95% CIs calculated by taking 1,000 bootstrapped resamples by cluster.

B) Prevalence ratios for diarrhea in the pooled WASH treatment vs control group by different levels of heavy rain (1+ days in the week with precipitation above the 80th percentile of daily total rainfall in the study)

C) *Prevalence ratios for diarrhea in the pooled WASH treatment vs control group by different levels of total weekly precipitation (above/below median weekly total rainfall in the study)*

Figure 4: Predicted changes in rainfall and WASH intervention effect under different climate change scenarios



A) Predicted trends in total weekly precipitation, by climate change scenario
B) Prevalence ratios for diarrhea in the pooled treatment vs control arms, by climate change scenario