

1 **Do the Health Benefits of Boiling Drinking Water Outweigh the Negative Impacts of**
2 **Increased Indoor Air Pollution Exposure?**

3 **Authors:** Emily Floess¹, Ayse Ercumen², Angela Harris¹, Andrew P. Grieshop¹

4 ¹Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering, North Carolina State
5 University, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA

6 ²Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, North Carolina State University,
7 Raleigh, North Carolina, USA

8 Corresponding Authors: Angela Harris and Andrew Grieshop

9 Angela Harris:
10 Aharris5@ncsu.edu
11 3213 Fitts-Woolard Hall
12 915 Partners Way
13 Raleigh, NC 27607

14
15 Andrew Grieshop:
16 apgriesh@ncsu.edu
17 3165 Fitts-Woolard Hall
18 915 Partners Way
19 Raleigh, NC 27607

20

21 Conflict of Interest: The authors declare they have nothing to disclose.

22 **Abstract**

23 **Background** Billions of the world's poorest households are faced with the lack of access to both
24 safe drinking water and clean cooking. One solution to microbiologically contaminated water is
25 boiling, often promoted without acknowledging the additional risks incurred from indoor air
26 degradation from using solid fuels.

27 **Objectives** This modeling study explores the tradeoff of increased air pollution from boiling
28 drinking water under multiple contamination and fuel use scenarios typical of low-income
29 settings.

30 **Methods** We calculated the total change in disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) from indoor
31 air pollution (IAP) and diarrhea from fecal contamination of drinking water for scenarios of
32 different source water quality, boiling effectiveness, and stove type. We used Uganda and
33 Vietnam, two countries with a high prevalence of water boiling and solid fuel use, as case
34 studies.

35 **Results** Boiling drinking water reduced the diarrhea disease burden by a mean of 1110 DALYs
36 and 368 DALYs per 10,000 people for those under and over <5 years of age in Uganda,
37 respectively, for high-risk water quality and the most efficient (lab-level) boiling scenario, with
38 smaller reductions for less contaminated water and ineffective boiling. Similar results were
39 found in Vietnam, though with fewer avoided DALYs in children under 5 due to different
40 demographics. In both countries, for households with high baseline IAP from existing solid fuel
41 use, adding water boiling to cooking on a given stove was associated with a limited increase in
42 IAP DALYs due to the log-linear dose-response curves. Boiling, even at low effectiveness, was
43 associated with *net* DALY reductions for medium- and high-risk water, even with unclean
44 stoves/fuels. Use of clean stoves coupled with effective boiling significantly reduced total
45 DALYs.

46 **Discussion** Boiling water generally resulted in net decreases in DALYs. Future efforts should
47 empirically measure health outcomes from IAP vs. diarrhea associated with boiling drinking
48 water using field studies with different boiling methods and stove types.

49

50 Introduction

51 Globally, many households face the challenges of both poor drinking water quality and the lack
52 of access to clean cooking fuels. Two billion people lack safely managed drinking water.¹ In
53 2019, 1.53 million deaths were attributed to diarrheal diseases,² and 60% of all diarrheal deaths
54 are due to improper water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH).³ Diarrhea is the leading cause of
55 death and illness globally among children under 5 years.⁴ Meanwhile, 2.6 billion people cook
56 using solid fuels⁵ resulting in high exposures to fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}).⁶ Indoor air
57 pollution (IAP) causes stroke, ischemic heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease,
58 lung cancer,⁷ and acute lower respiratory infections.⁸ IAP was associated with 6.7 million
59 premature deaths annually in 2019.⁹

60 A third of households in 67 countries report treating their drinking water at home.¹⁰ Boiling
61 water is the most common household water treatment,¹¹ with an estimated 1.2 billion users (70%
62 of all household water treatment users).¹² Boiling for water treatment is most common in the
63 Western Pacific region and least common in the Eastern Mediterranean and African regions. It is
64 widespread in many Asian nations including Indonesia (90.6% of households practicing water
65 treatment methods reporting boiling), Mongolia (95.2%), Uzbekistan (98.5%) and Vietnam
66 (91.0%).¹¹ Though boiling on the African continent is comparatively less common, many
67 countries in Africa have high rates of boiling,^{11,13} including Lesotho, Rwanda, Uganda (more
68 than 80% of households reported boiling), and Burundi and Namibia (over 60% reported
69 boiling).¹³ Boiling for water treatment has been widely promoted for decades for low-income
70 countries and emergency situations.¹⁴ Limitations of boiling include potential recontamination
71 of stored boiled water by contact with hands and utensils because boiling does not provide
72 residual protection. Improper boiling methods can also result in poor water quality¹⁵⁻¹⁷ and
73 families often mix boiled and non-boiled water.¹⁸

74 Other concerns raised by boiling water are the potential for increased air pollution exposures
75 from fuel combustion¹⁹ and high fuel costs.²⁰ Solid fuel use is prevalent in low-income settings
76 for both cooking and boiling water. Reducing the use of solid fuels reduces indoor fine
77 particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) concentrations,²¹ yet transitions to clean fuels (e.g., liquified petroleum
78 gas; LPG) have proven challenging.²² Despite the perception that clean fuels are better and more
79 convenient,²³ the associated financial burden (e.g., the cost relative to wood, which is often
80 cheap or free) and other barriers often prevent their widespread adoption.²⁴ One proposed
81 solution is “improved cooking solutions” (ICS), or “*Cooking solutions that improve, however*
82 *minimally, the adverse health, environmental, or economic outcomes from traditional solid fuel*
83 *technologies*”.²⁵ ICS includes natural- or forced-draft biomass cookstoves with improved
84 combustion efficiency. For example, pellet-fed gasifier stoves emit >90% less (PM_{2.5}) than
85 conventional stoves.²⁶⁻²⁸ However, despite their potential to provide health and other benefits
86 relative to traditional stoves, behavioral, technical, and economic challenges have limited their
87 adoption.^{29,30} Electric stoves are an additional clean option but are not common in low-income
88 countries due to their cost and the poor availability and reliability of electrical grid connections.
89 In Uganda, for example, less than 1% of the population cooks with electricity³¹ due to the
90 expense of electricity and lack of subsidies.³²

91 Those working to mitigate risks from indoor air pollution (IAP) and unsafe drinking water face
92 similar challenges in designing, implementing, and securing the sustained use of interventions
93 such as clean fuel and household water treatment.³⁰ However, few studies have examined these
94 linked risks together. A randomized controlled trial in Rwanda combining a cookstove and water
95 filter intervention found the intervention reduced the prevalence of reported child diarrhea by
96 29% and that the benefits of the program outweighed the financial costs.^{33,34} In a related cost-
97 benefit analysis, the averted DALYs from using a water filter and improved cookstove were
98 found to be 239 and 556 per 10,000 people per year, respectively.³³ However, the study observed
99 no significant reduction in 48-hour personal exposure to PM_{2.5},³⁴ consistent with challenges
100 faced by stove replacement programs observed elsewhere.³⁵ A study in China measured the
101 reduction in thermotolerant coliforms in water from boiling using different methods and modeled
102 air pollution from boiling water. The modeled mean 24-hour PM_{2.5} kitchen concentration from
103 boiling water with biomass combustion was 79 µg/m³¹⁹, substantially above the WHO interm-1
104 target of 35 µg/m³.³⁶ Boiling with electric kettles was associated with the largest reduction in
105 thermotolerant coliforms. However, the study did not measure health outcomes. To date, no
106 study has specifically investigated the tradeoffs associated with drinking water treatment by
107 boiling using solid fuels and compared the health risks. The overarching goal of this study is to
108 develop a modeling framework to quantify the net health impacts from boiling drinking water
109 with solid fuels, accounting for a range of IAP-associated health outcomes and for diarrhea
110 associated with water contaminated with fecal matter. This framework is then applied using
111 available literature value for inputs for two countries, Uganda and Vietnam, selected as case
112 studies.

113 **Methods**

114 ***Framework Definition and Test Population***

115 DALYs are commonly used to quantify health burdens because they account for morbidity with
116 differential disease severity³⁷ and mortality. In our study, we used DALYs as the primary metric
117 to compare multiple risks.³⁸ Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment (QMRA) models are
118 commonly used to determine the diarrhea risk associated with consuming water from a particular
119 water source.³⁹ For IAP, the population attributable fractions based on dose-response curves for
120 individual diseases are used to calculate the burden of disease.^{40,41}

121 We adopted these two methods (Figure 1), creating two modules, and used literature-derived
122 distributions of the relevant IAP, QMRA, and demographic parameters as inputs (See
123 Supplemental Material, Parameters Needed for Model). The *water risk module* uses a QMRA
124 model to calculate the DALYs from drinking water contaminated by fecal matter before and after
125 treatment by boiling. The *air risk module* uses an indoor box model to quantify the PM_{2.5}
126 concentrations for different stoves and the Household Air Pollution Intervention Tool (HAPIT)⁴¹
127 to quantify the DALYs associated with IAP under various scenarios. Both modules employ
128 Monte Carlo simulations to capture the influence of variability and uncertainty in input
129 parameters on model outputs.

130 Globally, more than half of all deaths from IAP from solid fuel are from acute lower respiratory
131 infection (ALRI) in children under 5 years of age⁴² and most diarrheal DALYs occur in children

132 under 5 years of age.⁴³ Therefore, we conducted analyses for two age groups: those under 5 years
133 of age (“under-5s”), and all other age groups combined (“over-5s”).

134 We designed the model to be used for any setting. However, we selected Uganda and Vietnam as
135 case study countries as they are in distinct regions, have different population demographics, and
136 high prevalences of boiling among household water treatment users (82% in Uganda, 91% in
137 Vietnam) and solid fuel use (96% in Uganda, 35% in Vietnam).^{5,11,13} We assumed a household
138 size of 5 people per household for both countries and that each household had one cook.^{41,44} The
139 number of children under 5 per household varied between the two countries (1 in Uganda, 0.4 in
140 Vietnam), based on the values used in the HAPIT model (See Supplemental Material, Household
141 Demographics for Vietnam and Uganda).^{41,44} The models were run for a sample population of
142 10,000 people.

143 ***Health Benefits from Boiling Drinking Water***

144 The risk of illness from contaminated drinking water is characterized using a QMRA, focusing
145 on selected reference pathogens.⁴⁵ Pathogens used in QMRAs are typically selected based on
146 global public health relevance; because they are transmitted via environmental, waterborne, and
147 foodborne routes,⁴⁶ the dominant pathogens may also depend on geographic region.⁴⁷ For this
148 study, we selected pathogens identified as leading causes of diarrhea in multisite studies of
149 diarrhea etiology in low-income countries.⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰ Based on these studies, the locations selected for
150 our modeling exercise, and previous QMRA studies,⁵¹⁻⁵³ we selected a virus (rotavirus), a
151 protozoan (*Cryptosporidium*) and a bacterium (*Campylobacter*) to quantify the risk from
152 exposure to fecally contaminated water.

153 We used a uniform distribution of *E. coli* levels for each water quality category, using most
154 probable number (MPN) ranges of: 0 MPN/100 mL for ‘safe’ water, 1-10 MPN/100 mL for
155 ‘low-risk’ water, 11-100 MPN/100 mL for ‘medium-risk’ water, and 101-1000 MPN/100 mL for
156 ‘high-risk’ water.⁵⁴ These untreated drinking water categories define baseline water qualities for
157 the model. We used fecal indicator bacteria to pathogen ratios for the three pathogens (See
158 Supplemental Material, Ratio of *E. coli* to *Campylobacter*, *Cryptosporidium*, and Rotavirus)
159 from the literature to estimate the abundance of the selected pathogens in untreated water.

160 We then estimated boiling effectiveness for the selected pathogens. The modeled intervention
161 was boiling at different levels of microbiological effectiveness to account for different field
162 conditions and household practices. The boiling effectiveness was quantified using log-reduction
163 values (LRV), defined as the base-10 logarithm of the ratio of influent to effluent pathogen
164 concentrations. The effectiveness of boiling drinking water was compiled from a literature
165 review of field and lab studies; See Supplemental Material, Log Reduction Values of *E. coli*,
166 TTC, and FC. Water boiling studies reported LRVs for different fecal indicator organisms,
167 including *E. coli*, thermotolerant coliforms (TTC), and fecal coliforms (FC). Since our modeled
168 water quality was characterized using *E. coli*, we converted TTC and FC LRVs to *E. coli* (EC)
169 LRVs⁵⁵ based on assumed ratios. Although *E. coli* to FC ratios can vary in different seasons,⁵⁶
170 the ratios were assumed to be constant throughout the year. LRV values in the literature
171 (converted to *E. coli*) ranged from 6 for lab-level boiling to -0.26 for ineffective boiling. We
172 multiplied *E. coli* LRVs by a pathogen-specific factor to quantify removal of the respective

173 pathogens (*Cryptosporidium*, *Campylobacter*, and rotavirus) (See Supplemental Material, Effect
174 of Boiling on *E. coli*, *Campylobacter*, *Cryptosporidium*, and Rotavirus).

175 We used Equation 1 to calculate the daily exposure to pathogens (E_d , in MPN),⁵⁷

$$176 \quad E_d = C * \frac{1}{R} * I * 10^{-LRV} * V \quad [1]$$

177 where C is the concentration of pathogen in the source water (MPN per liter), R is the fractional
178 mean analytical recovery (to account for success in microorganism counts) of the pathogen in the
179 sample, I is the fraction of pathogens that are infectious,^{51,57} LRV is the pathogen-specific log-
180 reduction by boiling water, and V (liters) is the daily volume of water consumed per person. We
181 assumed I and R to be 1.

182 We calculated the probability of illness from the daily exposure using dose-response
183 relationships from the literature.^{51,52,58-60} The dose-response parameters were assumed to be the
184 same regardless of age (See Supplemental Material, Dose-Response Parameters for the Selected
185 Pathogens).

186 We calculated the probability of developing disease (diarrhea) per single exposure (P_D) as the
187 product of the probability of disease given infection (P_{DI}) and the probability of infection (P_i)
188 (See Supplemental Material, Probability of Illness Given Infection and Percent Susceptible). The
189 probability of developing illness over period n, ($P_{D,n}$), was calculated using the probability of
190 disease ($P_{D,n}=1-(1-P_D)^n$) and the annual symptomatic cases ($Cases_{year}$) was calculated by
191 multiplying the yearly probability of developing illness ($P_{D,yearly}$) times the exposed
192 population.^{53,57}

193 DALYs from diarrhea (years lived with disability) were calculated by taking the disability
194 weight times the duration of disease times the probability of disease.^{52,53,57} Disability weights to
195 quantify disease severity were obtained from the literature (See Supplemental Material, Burden
196 of Disease for Each Pathogen). When calculating years of life lost, the disability weight is 1 and
197 the duration was the life expectancy minus the age at death. The remaining life expectancy at the
198 time of death was randomly selected based on the population age distribution in that country,
199 separated into two categories, children <5 years and all other ages. For disease burden, severity
200 and duration varied by pathogen (*Cryptosporidium*, *Campylobacter*, or rotavirus).⁵²

201 ***Health Impacts from Indoor Air Pollution***

202 In the air risk module, first an air pollution box model was used to estimate the 24 hour $PM_{2.5}$
203 concentrations in the household⁶¹ and then DALYs were estimated using the HAPIT model.⁴¹
204 For the air risk module, we consider two baseline scenarios: one with a household ‘already
205 cooking’ on a traditional woodstove, and one in which a household is ‘not cooking’. We consider
206 the following cookstoves as alternatives against this baseline: 1) improved wood, 2) charcoal, 3)
207 LPG, and 4) electric.^{23,62,63} Electric stoves were included to serve as an ideal counterfactual (i.e.,
208 completely clean cooking technology). We considered three categories of stove use: ‘cooking
209 only’, ‘water boiling only’, and ‘cooking and water boiling’.

210 Our model assumes stove energy is only used for cooking and water heating. The required
211 cooking energy (delivered to pot) for both the Ugandan and Vietnamese households was
212 assumed to be lognormally distributed, with a mean (standard deviation) of 11 (5.5) MJ per
213 day.^{61,64} The daily energy for water heating (E_{WH}), (Equation 2), is calculated as the energy
214 needed to heat the water from ambient temperature (T_a , assumed to be 15 °C) to boiling (100
215 °C), and then boiled for one minute. The volume of water heated (V , liters) is assumed to be
216 normally distributed with mean (standard deviation) 3.12 (1.17) liters.⁶⁵ This is converted to
217 converted to mass using density (ρ , 1000 g/L). C_p is the heat capacity of water (4.186 J g⁻¹ K⁻¹).
218 Finally, the stove is assumed to boil the water for one minute, so the product of 60 seconds (t)
219 and the power of the stove (P , in Watts) is added to get the total energy demand for heating water
220 in a household.

$$221 \quad E_{WH} = V * \rho * C_p * (100 - T_a) + Pt \quad [2]$$

222 Laboratory studies of boiling effectiveness have been conducted for numerous different
223 temperatures and durations of boiling. Generally, heating water at higher temperatures for longer
224 periods of time results in greater LRVs compared to lower temperatures and shorter periods.⁶⁶
225 The recommended boiling time in the literature ranges from 1 to 25 minutes.¹⁵ In this study, we
226 assumed that once water reaches boiling temperature (calculated as described above), it is boiled
227 at 100°C for 1 minute, based on CDC and WHO recommendations, to reach the assumed LRV.
228 The influence of elevation on boiling temperature was not considered in this analysis, but this
229 would impact the temperature and thus the length of time needed for boiling for a given LRV.

230 Once the energy demand was estimated, an air pollution box model⁶¹ was used to calculate the
231 kitchen PM_{2.5} concentration ($\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$) over 24 hours. The time for cooking and water heating is
232 calculated by the energy demand divided by the assumed stove power (Watts) and thermal
233 efficiency (See Supplemental Material, Emission Factors (EF), Stove Power (SP), and Thermal
234 Efficiency (TE) of Stoves). We assumed that cooking and water heating each occurred once per
235 day to produce all daily energy for cooking and water heating. The emissions were calculated
236 using the relevant emission factor (grams PM_{2.5} per kilogram fuel) and heating value of fuel (See
237 Supplemental Material, Heating Value of Fuels). We also assumed an ambient concentration⁶⁷ of
238 12 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ to which the indoor concentration decays after the cooking event, and a second event
239 (water heating) increased it again. If a single stove did not provide sufficient power to heat the
240 specified daily water and food allowing time for household concentrations to return to ambient
241 levels between stove uses, a second stove is used in the model simultaneously, and in this
242 scenario, we doubled emission rates. Although emission factors vary between stove operation
243 stages (e.g., startup vs steady operation),⁶⁸⁻⁷¹ we assumed a constant average emission factor.
244 This approach may underestimate 24-hour emissions, since it doesn't reflect multiple starting
245 events which can produce high emissions.⁷² For an example of the 24-hour PM_{2.5} kitchen
246 concentration for cooking and water heating, see Supplemental Material, Example Air Pollution
247 Box Model Run of 24 hour PM_{2.5} Concentration.

248 To calculate the health burden from IAP, we adapted the approach of the Household Air
249 Pollution Intervention Tool (HAPIT).^{41,67} Personal exposure is estimated by multiplying the
250 modeled 24-hour PM_{2.5} kitchen concentration by an estimated ratio of personal exposures to

251 kitchen concentrations^{42,73,74} with separate ratios applied for the cook, non-cook, and children
252 under 5 of a household (See Supplemental Material, Personal Exposure to Concentration Ratios).

253 The burden of disease attributable to household PM_{2.5} pollution is calculated for lung cancer
254 (LC), ischemic heart disease (IHD), stroke, acute lower respiratory infection (ALRI), and chronic
255 obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) using 2019 background disease data, deaths & DALYS
256 ^{75,76} for Uganda and Vietnam, respectively, and disease-specific integrated exposure response
257 functions.⁷⁷ While there is no clear safe level of PM_{2.5} exposure,⁷⁷ we use the suggested
258 distribution of 5.8-8.8 µg/m³ as a counterfactual 'no effect' level.⁷⁴

259 The relative risk and the existing fraction of each country's population exposed to solid fuels
260 (i.e., fraction exposed equals the percent solid fuel users for each country) is used to calculate the
261 attributable fraction (AF) (Equation 3).⁶⁷ In calculating the attributable fraction in the model, the
262 fraction exposed is country-specific and fixed, but the relative risk varies with air pollution level.

$$263 \quad AF = \frac{FractionExposed*(RR-1)}{FractionExposed*(RR-1)+1} \quad [3]$$

264 The attributable fraction is multiplied by the DALYs or deaths from a given disease in the
265 country or region of that specific population (given location and age group) to calculate the
266 attributable burden associated with IAP.⁴¹ To calculate the fraction of DALYs from children
267 under 5, we used the fractions of children in that population and relevant under-5 DALYs for
268 each disease.

269 ***Simulations, Analysis, Statistical Tests, & Sensitivity***

270 When comparing IAP and drinking water DALYs, we define 'net DALYs' as the increase in IAP
271 DALYs minus the decrease in drinking water DALYs resulting from boiling drinking water.
272 Positive net DALYs means that the IAP DALYs increase is greater than the water DALY
273 decrease, indicating a net increase in disease burden. Negative net DALYs means the water
274 DALYs decrease is greater than the IAP increase, indicating a net health benefit.

275 We conducted Monte Carlo simulations to capture the influence of variability and uncertainty in
276 the inputs. Each simulation draws from distributions for parameters of a stove and fuel type, and
277 water boiling effectiveness and is run 1000 times in R.⁷⁸ The mean, standard deviation, and 95%
278 confidence intervals of model output are reported. Additionally, to understand the variation in
279 the outputs, the coefficient of variation (COV) (standard deviation over mean) was calculated.
280 Environmental parameters are often log-normally distributed,⁷⁹ so we used the Shapiro-Wilk test
281 to test the normality of our resulting distributions of drinking water and IAP DALYs before
282 making statistical comparisons between different scenarios. If an output distribution was log-
283 normal, it was log-transformed for hypothesis testing. We used the t-test to compare the risks
284 across the different scenarios (i.e., different stove types or water boiling scenarios). P-values less
285 than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

286 A sensitivity analysis was conducted for the IAP and drinking water QMRA models to identify
287 the specific impact of individual input variables on model output. Each input parameter was
288 individually evaluated by varying the assigned value between a minimum and maximum
289 determined based on an assessment of the variability or uncertainty of the parameter from our

290 literature review (See Supplemental Material, Parameters Varied in the Sensitivity Analysis for
291 Indoor Air Pollution and Parameters Used in the Sensitivity Analysis of the Water Risk Module).
292 Input parameters were then ranked in order of their influence on output values by taking the ratio
293 of the output values for input at its minimum and maximum values.⁸⁰

294 **Results**

295 ***DALYs from Indoor Air Pollution***

296 The simulations with the lowest to highest 24 h average PM_{2.5} kitchen concentrations (for
297 cooking and water heating scenarios) were electric, LPG, gasifier, charcoal, improved wood, and
298 traditional wood, with values ranging from 12 µg/m³ (for the electric stove) to 5587 µg/m³. The
299 average 24-hour PM_{2.5} concentration for the ‘worst-case’, traditional wood stove scenario was
300 lower for water heating alone (2109 µg/m³) than for cooking alone (3490 µg/m³), while the
301 concentration associated with both activities together was essentially the same as the sum of the
302 two activities considered separately.

303 Figure 2 shows the DALYs calculated from these PM_{2.5} values for the different stove and use
304 scenarios for each country. Though the total DALYs per 10,000 people were similar between the
305 two countries, the number of IAP DALYs associated with under-5s were higher in Uganda
306 compared to Vietnam, with the under-5s DALYs in Uganda making up 48% to 64% (depending
307 on scenario) of total, versus under-5s DALYs in Vietnam making up 5% to 8% of total DALYs.
308 DALYs significantly decrease as stove type shifts from traditional wood to LPG stoves, with
309 95.3%, 96.9%, 97.1%, and 99.9% decrease in DALYs for Uganda over-5’s, Uganda under-5s,
310 Vietnam over-5’s, and Vietnam under-5s respectively, eliminating almost all the DALYs
311 associated with IAP. For the electric stove, since it is assumed that the electric stove contributes
312 no additional PM_{2.5}, there was a 100% decrease. There are only small changes in DALYs when a
313 traditional wood stove is replaced with an improved wood stove. For example, DALYs decrease
314 by 1.0% (for Uganda children) to 11.2% (Vietnam over-5’s) for water heating and cooking when
315 switching from traditional wood stove to improved stove, indicating the limited potential for
316 health impacts from replacing traditional stoves with another basic wood stove.

317 In contrast to the additive nature of the PM_{2.5} concentration when aggregating water heating and
318 cooking, DALYs are not additive due to the log-linear nature of the dose response curve.^{81,82} As
319 a result, the DALYs associated with ‘only cooking’ and ‘water heating and cooking’ are similar
320 (e.g., mean of 377 and 386 per 10,000 people, respectively, for traditional wood stove in Uganda
321 for all ages), suggesting that the additional exposure from boiling adds a minimal increment to
322 the IAP impact. However, results in Figure 2 show that the relative increment (fractional increase
323 in DALYs from adding boiling) is slightly larger for cleaner cooking options.

324 ***DALYs from Water Contamination***

325 The total DALYs from drinking water for Uganda and Vietnam were similar, but a larger share
326 of the DALYs came from children under 5 in Uganda (21-27% compared to 12-14% in Vietnam)
327 because of the higher number of children per household in Uganda. DALYs from drinking water
328 were a strong function of untreated water quality and boiling effectiveness. For example, for
329 over-5s in Uganda, and low-risk water, health impacts ranged from 51 DALYs per 10,000 people
330 per year for lab-level boiling to 210 DALYs per 10,000 people per year from ineffective boiling,

331 compared to 220 DALYs without boiling. For high-risk water, DALYs ranged from 59 per
332 10,000 people per year for lab-level boiling to 1137 per 10,000 people per year for ineffective
333 boiling, compared with 1168 per 10,000 people per year without boiling. Using lab-level boiling
334 compared to untreated water greatly reduced adult DALYs in both Uganda and Vietnam. For
335 Ugandan children under 5, lab-level boiling decreased DALYs by 94%, 88% and 72% for high-,
336 medium-, and low-risk water, respectively, compared to ineffective boiling. Relative reductions
337 in DALYs for children under 5 in Vietnam were similar.

338 *Comparison of water and air pollution DALYs*

339 In most of our scenarios, the benefits of clean water outweighed the impacts of IAP from boiling
340 that water. Figure 3 reports the changes in DALYs for water and IAP exposures under various
341 boiling and stove scenarios. The higher fraction of DALYs for children under 5 years in Uganda
342 for both water and air reflect their higher proportion in the population. Additionally, the relative
343 contribution of the under-5s category was much greater for the IAP risk (driven by ALRI) than
344 for water.

345 All source water categories boiled with lab-level effectiveness (LRV=6) had reductions in
346 waterborne DALYs greater than increases in IAP DALYs for all stove types and stove use
347 scenarios (water heating without cooking, and water heating with cooking). For the scenario of a
348 household already cooking, and beginning to also boil their water, we found that if the source
349 water is boiled with at least the “low field”
350 effectiveness (LRV of 0.5 or greater), the decrease in drinking water DALYs from boiling was
351 greater than the increase in IAP DALYs for all scenarios of water quality, water boiling, and
352 stove types. We observe a net reduction if a household is already cooking and the water is boiled
353 with at least low field effectiveness for all water risk categories and all stove types. If a
354 household is not already cooking, there is a net benefit if medium- or high- risk water is boiled
355 with at least average field effectiveness for all stove types.

356 *Log-removal rates needed for health benefits from water boiling*

357 As another way to examine net benefits of boiling, the model was also used to determine ‘break-
358 even’ points where increases in IAP DALYs are equal to the associated decrease in drinking
359 water DALYs. Figure 4 shows the reduction in drinking water DALYs for over-5s in Uganda
360 plotted against LRVs for low-risk, medium-risk, and high-risk water qualities. The increase in
361 IAP DALYs is also shown for two stoves, traditional and LPG, and for two different use
362 scenarios, only water heating and water heating plus cooking. Where these two sets of curves
363 cross can be considered the ‘break-even’ point, or the minimum LRV required to provide a net
364 reduction in DALYs for a given stove scenario. High-risk water has a significant decrease in
365 DALYs even with low LRVs. The large decrease in pathogen exposures even with low LRVs
366 results in large health benefits. For the case of over-5s in Uganda, the intersection of the curves
367 and IAP lines show that when cooking is already taking place in a home (cooking compared to
368 cooking plus water heating), boiling drinking water with an LRV of 0.18 or greater results in a
369 net reduction in DALYs for all stove types and source water types, including the dirtiest stove
370 (traditional wood stove) and low-risk water. In the case that a household is not cooking, but starts
371 boiling water, LRVs of 0.2, 0.3, and 1 are needed for high-, medium-, and low-risk water,

372 respectively, to offset DALYs from IAP. The LRV cutoff needed to achieve net health benefits
373 increases as water quality improves (for example, an LRV of 0.2 is needed for high-risk water
374 compared to an LRV of 1 for low-risk water).

375 **Sensitivity Analysis**

376 Estimated reductions in DALYs from water boiling were most sensitive to following parameters
377 (listed from greatest to lowest sensitivity): source water *E. coli* levels, the assumed ratios of
378 *Cryptosporidium*, rotavirus, and *Campylobacter* to *E. coli*, age at death, dose-response
379 parameters used in the QMRA, the LRVs, and the water volume ingested. For IAP DALYs, the
380 input parameters with greatest influence (ranked from greatest to least) were: stove emission
381 factor, household air exchange rate, fuel heating value, and room volume. For the sensitivity of
382 the QMRA dose-response parameters, we varied the parameters for each of the three pathogens,
383 and the level of risk per ingested dose. Of the three pathogens considered in the QMRA,
384 rotavirus has the highest risk per dose of all the pathogens, and as a result, rotavirus exposure
385 had the largest influence on QMRA DALYs (See Supplemental Material, Sensitivity Analysis
386 Showing Net Difference in Total DALYs, Sensitivity Analysis for Water DALYs, and
387 Sensitivity Analysis for Water DALYs: Pathogen Specific Parameters).

388 **Discussion**

389 In this study, we find that in most scenarios (even at low LRVs and with high-emitting
390 cookstoves), boiling medium- and high-risk drinking water results in a net decrease in total
391 DALYs. It is estimated that 1.1 billion people drink water that is of at least moderate risk,⁸³ so
392 boiling would likely benefit these 1.1 billion people. Additionally, though 89% of the world's
393 population uses an improved drinking source, such as household connections, public standpipes,
394 boreholes, and protected wells, springs, and rainwater collection,⁸⁴ and the odds of contamination
395 are lower for so-called improved sources,⁸⁵ 10% of improved sources are still considered high
396 risk.⁸³ Thus, boiling could benefit even those using improved sources. However, in situations in
397 which a high emitting stove is used to boil water, and cooking is not already taking place in a
398 home or cooking is done on a clean stove, boiling could have a net negative impact, showing the
399 importance of considering risks from both water and air jointly.

400 Adoption of a new technology or practice is a major challenge for both water and stove
401 interventions and will impact the generalizability of our model results. For example, in an
402 intervention study in Rwanda, use of water filters and improved stoves was measured by self-
403 report and spot-check observations, and though most household used the water filter, the
404 majority continued to use traditional stoves.⁸⁶ In our model, switching from traditional wood and
405 improved stoves to LPG or electric stoves resulted in 99% reductions of PM_{2.5} and 96%
406 reductions in the IAP DALYs, showing the huge potential for benefits from clean stoves,
407 including for boiling. However, there are still many limitations to adopting LPG, including cost⁸⁷
408 and social and cultural perceptions.^{88,89} Additionally, households often combine different stove
409 and fuel types, known as “stove stacking”,⁸⁹⁻⁹¹ limiting the health benefits of a stove
410 intervention. Traditional stoves continue to be used due to their additional benefits, including
411 heating the living space, lighting the home, heating water for bathing and washing, drying,
412 smoking food, getting rid of waste, keeping insects and animals away, and social gatherings.⁹²

413 This can be especially relevant for water boiling, as previous studies have observed that
414 households continued use of fuelwood to heat water after LPG and electricity are available,^{92,93}
415 possibly due to the cost⁹⁴ of such an energy intensive task. Despite these challenges, the use of
416 polluting stoves such as biomass has continued to decrease, from 53% using polluting stoves in
417 1990 to 36% in 2020.⁵ However, there have been increases in charcoal use in many areas,⁵
418 which our model suggests only moderately reduces PM_{2.5} relative to traditional wood use.

419 Boiling effectiveness, which varies widely, is key in determining whether boiling has a net health
420 benefit. None of the field studies of boiling used for this study has observed ‘lab-quality’ LRVs,
421 and many field studies reported very low, even negative LRVs for boiling.¹⁶ Measured LRVs
422 comparing post treatment to untreated water (from the source) are influenced by source water
423 quality before it is boiled, post-boiling storage, dipping, and other sources of recontamination.^{15–}
424 ¹⁷ Thus various factors can affect the end water quality despite treatment, limiting the potential
425 benefits of boiling and resulting in a lower effective LRV. Our results show that boiling is most
426 beneficial in terms of a net reduction in scenarios with high risk water; however, homes with
427 high risk drinking water may have the highest risk of recontamination due to poor sanitation
428 practices.⁹⁵ Therefore, it is important to maintain improvements in water quality post boiling if
429 water is not immediately consumed.^{15,16,96}

430 Benefits from increasing LRVs from different water treatment methods strongly depended on
431 compliance of use⁹⁷ and full adoption of the intervention. It has been found that a few days of
432 untreated water consumption after drinking treated water can completely negate the annual
433 health benefits of drinking treated water.⁹⁸ From the literature review conducted for this study
434 on boiling LRVs, societies and cultures with higher prevalence of boiling (e.g., Vietnam) have
435 the highest LRVs.¹⁵ In countries like Zambia where boiling is not prevalent,¹³ and boiling is
436 promoted as an intervention, the LRVs tend to be much lower.¹⁶ This suggests that introducing
437 boiling as a water treatment method in a community that does not have a history of boiling
438 presents additional challenges, and likely reduces the chances of effective boiling and a net
439 decrease in DALYs.¹⁶

440 One notable alternative to boiling is chlorination, which is cheap, effective, provides residual
441 protection,^{99,100} and does not impact air quality. Chlorination has been shown to reduce the risk
442 of child diarrhea and reduce risk of stored water contamination by *E. coli*.¹⁰¹ Residual protection
443 could result in higher real-world LRVs. Unlike boiling, chlorination can be applied in several
444 different ways, such as at the source and before drinking.¹⁰² The use of chlorination at the water
445 source (such as chlorinating a pump or water source) also eliminates the need for behavior
446 change practices in the home. Chlorination has been observed to be more effective than boiling
447 for reducing *E. coli* concentrations in field settings, possibly due to insufficient heating during
448 boiling and recontamination after treatment.⁹⁹ The residual disinfection in household storage
449 provided by chlorination provides a notable advantage over boiling. However, there are several
450 limitations related to chlorination, including challenges with the supply chain¹⁰³ and managing
451 its use (including frequency and amount of added chlorine).¹⁰⁴ There are also limitations in the
452 effectiveness of chlorination. One study found that combining chlorination with boiling did not
453 lower *E. coli* contamination in stored water or lower risk of diarrhea compared with boiling

454 alone.⁹⁹ There are conflicting data on the effectiveness of boiling versus chlorination. In one
455 laboratory-based study, boiling was more effective in inactivating *E. coli* and environmental
456 bacteria compared to chlorination and pasteurization.¹⁰⁵ Additionally, chlorine has limited
457 effectiveness in inactivating viruses and protozoa.¹⁰⁶ However, in a study of a commercial
458 chlorination product in drinking water, chlorination was found to be associated with lower *E. coli*
459 contamination and diarrhea rates in children under 5 years than boiling.⁹⁹ Other downsides of
460 chlorination include production of byproducts, taste/odor concerns which can lead to low
461 adoption, and cost, which is low, but remains a consideration.¹⁰⁶ Both boiling and chlorination
462 have tradeoffs; however, our study suggests that the minimal IAP impacts associated with
463 boiling should likely not be the central factor in deciding whether boiling or chlorination is the best
464 option for a household.

465 The cost of stoves and fuels were not considered in this study. However, cost is a major factor in
466 whether a household adopts drinking water treatment¹⁰⁷ or improved stoves.^{108,109} Cost-benefit
467 analyses have been conducted for cookstoves. For example, one study compared capital,
468 operation and maintenance, and environmental costs to benefits such as health, supply, ease of
469 operation, and safety and found the lowest cost-benefit ratio for traditional biomass cookstoves
470 (lower than improved biomass), second lowest for dung, and the highest for biogas, charcoal, and
471 LPG.¹¹⁰ Another study including only improved stoves (including LPG and improved
472 cookstoves), had the lowest cost to benefit ratio for LPG and highest for improved biomass
473 stoves.¹¹¹ While study assumptions and approaches vary, these findings highlight the potential
474 challenges facing users in switching to improved and cleaner stoves. A cost benefit analysis on
475 water treatment showed the benefits of the filters outweighed the costs only when including
476 aesthetic benefits, not health benefits alone.¹¹² A cost-benefit analysis for a combined cookstove
477 and water treatment intervention (an improved stove and water filter) in Rwanda showed that
478 benefits from fuelwood savings, time savings, and environmental and health improvements
479 outweighed the cost.³³ However, fuel savings among new water filter users were found only for
480 households who previously boiled their water, not for households which had not treated their
481 water previously.³³ A cost benefit analysis comparing boiling with various stove/fuel options
482 could expand on our findings and add another dimension to the tradeoffs we explore. Many clean
483 stoves (e.g. electric, LPG) may be currently cost-prohibitive in low-income settings.¹¹³
484 Additionally, countries with high adoption of LPG due to subsidies (e.g. Ecuador) retain
485 substantial solid fuel use.¹¹⁴ In order to implement effective IAP and WASH interventions, cost
486 effective solutions for both should be prioritized.

487 ***Strengths and Limitations***

488 Our model is designed to give insights into possible tradeoffs when addressing multiple
489 environmental health risks. Because the focus of this study was to develop a model framework
490 applicable to many countries and scenarios with a focus on exploring health tradeoffs rather than
491 detailed not contextual differences, this study used many of the same values (e.g., emission
492 factors, fuel efficiency, water *E. coli* levels) for Uganda and Vietnam. Some inputs were country
493 specific, such as demographic parameters. Use of context-specific data on parameters such as
494 stove type or source water quality would enable a more accurate and detailed analysis of options.
495 Some such data are available for our case study countries, such as stove emission factors^{115,116}

496 and source drinking water quality^{117,118} specific to Vietnam and Uganda, water boiling
497 effectiveness in Vietnam,¹⁵ and studies of water boiling habits in Uganda.¹¹⁹ Additionally, some
498 related studies have been done which could be points of comparison, including indoor air
499 pollution levels in Vietnam¹²⁰ and Uganda.¹²¹ Our study could be refined by using available data
500 specific to Uganda and Vietnam. However, data for the same settings that covers the multiple
501 dimensions in our analysis (e.g. boiling and air quality data for individual, or nationally
502 representative, settings in a given country) is not available. Therefore, targeted field study of
503 water boiling, pathogen levels in pre- and post-treated water, and indoor air pollution
504 concentrations could be beneficial to evaluate boiling in a real-world setting.

505 Various assumptions used in our IAP modeling could be addressed with more specific input data
506 or targeted measurements. For example, some of the stoves used in our model had poor
507 efficiency, low stove power and low fuel heating values, and thus they are challenged to meet a
508 households water boiling needs. For these stoves, it is assumed that the stove is used up to 24
509 hours for the household's cooking needs (as opposed to using multiple stoves for a shorter
510 period). This simplifies the model and avoids assumptions about stove use timing, but is not
511 realistic. The emission factors used for the stoves are averages even though emission factors
512 change throughout the combustion process.^{68,69,71} However, limited data are available on phase-
513 specific emission factors, which necessitated the use of averages. Emission rates are assumed to
514 be the same for cooking and water heating for this study, but are likely different, since it has
515 been shown that varying cooking styles (e.g., frying vs boiling) are associated with different
516 emission rates.¹²² However, lacking cooking- and boiling-specific emissions for Uganda and
517 Vietnam, averages values were used as a reasonable assumption. Another important
518 simplification is our assumption that a single stove was used for all household uses, ignoring
519 stove stacking.^{89,123}

520 The box model used to calculate 24-hour PM_{2.5} has been found to overestimate
521 concentrations,^{61,124,125} and so modeled exposures are likely biased high. Depending on where the
522 actual PM_{2.5} exposure falls on the dose response curve, this means we could be over- or under-
523 estimating the net change in DALYs due to the added activity for boiling. For example, if the
524 PM_{2.5} with and without boiling falls above where the curves 'plateau', the difference in DALYs
525 we estimated could be smaller than in reality.

526
527 Our modeled values can be compared with past published field measurements. We estimated
528 mean 24 h PM_{2.5} concentrations ranging from 1797 µg/m³ to 5212 µg/m³, 721 µg/m³ to 2068
529 µg/m³, and 14 µg/m³ to 16 µg/m³ for traditional wood, improved wood and LPG stove use
530 cases, respectively. In a cross-sectional study in India in four states, the measured mean 24-hour
531 PM_{2.5} concentrations were 590 µg/m³ in the kitchen for a traditional wood stove, and 179 µg/m³
532 in the kitchen for LPG.¹²⁶ In another study in India of an improved stoves intervention, 24 h
533 PM_{2.5} for LPG stoves ranged from 70 to 103 µg/m³, and was around 500 µg/m³ for households
534 using a traditional three stone fire.¹²⁷ A study in Nepal found 24 h PM_{2.5} of 80 µg/m³ for electric
535 stoves and 630 µg/m³ for traditional mud wood stoves.¹²⁸ These findings suggest that we both
536 overestimate the impacts of traditional cooking and the benefits of 'realistic' clean stove
537 adoption in many settings. For example, our model calculated substantially lower values for
538 LPG-using households compared to the field studies, suggesting we may overestimate the

539 benefits of LPG use. Our modeled values for traditional wood stoves were higher than the field
540 studies. Our estimated 24 h $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations for improved biomass stoves are similar to
541 those observed for traditional wood stoves in several field studies, suggesting a bias in model
542 parameters used as defaults. The is potentially at least partly due to stove stacking in the field
543 studies, since many study households used multiple stoves.¹²⁸
544

545 That modeled $PM_{2.5}$ values for traditional stoves are much higher than typically observed in field
546 studies suggests that assumptions in IAP model (which is used in WHO assessments) lead to
547 estimates substantially higher than reality. However in our application, such a high bias in model
548 results is likely conservative (overestimates IAP impacts while boiling with traditional biomass),
549 and further emphasizes our finding that water boiling typically has a net benefit, even if using a
550 very high-emitting stove. The relative differences we found between exposures associated with
551 different stoves is fairly representative of real-world observations. For example, a 48% reduction
552 in cooking area $PM_{2.5}$ was measured during an improved wood stove intervention study in
553 Rwanda,⁸⁶ relative to our average modeled reductions of 62% for $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations for a
554 similar scenario ($3490 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $1334 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for traditional and improved stoves, respectively).
555 However, as acknowledged above, the log-linearity of the $PM_{2.5}$ dose-response curves means that
556 depending on the pre-/post-boiling combination, the modeling could over- or underestimate the
557 DALYs associated with the addition of boiling. Future work can explore this using a re-
558 calibrated model, or representative field observations.
559

560 Our results can also be compared with previous indoor air quality modeling studies. The study
561 presenting the indoor air pollution box model used here estimated kitchen concentrations during
562 cooking, with 24-hr averages ranging from $15 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for LPG to $1975 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for traditional
563 stoves.⁶¹ The estimated $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations for wood stoves from our study using the model are
564 higher, due to different emission factor, stove power, and thermal efficiency inputs for the
565 traditional stoves. A study in China used this air pollution box model in a more sophisticated
566 way with substantially more household data to refine assumptions. This study used inputs from
567 past field studies in China, assigned a ventilation index based on observations of cooking area
568 ventilation (presumably via a chimney or other active ventilation), and information on cooking
569 and living area location to scale the model air exchange rate. This study reported average
570 modeled kitchen $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations of $79 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for households using biomass to boil water,
571 with the three homes with poor ventilation having an average of $148.3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.¹⁹ Our estimated
572 $PM_{2.5}$ from water heating was significantly higher, likely due to the inclusion of a ventilation
573 parameter and stove emission factors specific to China,^{19,129} so a direct comparison is likely not
574 warranted. However, this study provides an example of how IAP modeling can be refined for
575 future studies of specific locations.

576 Environmental factors outside the home may also have an important influence on IAP not
577 addressed in our model. For example, although ambient air pollution levels in LMICs vary
578 widely across countries and between urban and rural areas,^{81,130} we assumed a fixed background
579 ambient $PM_{2.5}$ concentration of $12 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. If actual ambient air pollution levels are higher, $PM_{2.5}$
580 exposure levels are shifted higher on the dose response curves, resulting in a smaller additional
581 risk from the increment of $PM_{2.5}$ from boiling water. We also considered only cooking and water
582 heating, and did not consider space heating, even though many countries in the world where

583 boiling is common are located in cold regions.^{11,13} Additionally, it is assumed that boiling is only
584 used for drinking water, not for making tea or bathing. However, if a household is burning fuel
585 for space heating or other reasons, and boiling can be done simultaneously, no additional IAP
586 DALYs could be incurred to boil water.

587 Several simplifying assumptions made in the water module also influence our results. For
588 example, though we separated by population over and under 5, we assumed a constant
589 probability of death for all ages. However, this likely leads to an underestimation of the years of
590 life lost due to death from diarrhea since children have the greatest risk of death and disease from
591 diarrheal diseases.¹³¹ Children do not have a fully developed immunity which makes them more
592 susceptible to diarrheal illnesses, which is not accounted for in the dose-response curves used in
593 the modeling. Therefore, if child-specific dose-response curves were available and used, the
594 benefits of boiling would likely be greater.

595 We estimated pathogen levels based on fecal indicator bacteria (i.e., *E. coli*) levels, which are
596 imperfectly correlated with the selected pathogens.¹³² Further, pathogens present in drinking
597 water vary widely by country and across seasons.¹³³ We expect that the results would vary
598 widely based on the pathogens selected, as has been found in previous studies.¹³⁴ Our results
599 were highly sensitive to parameters related to pathogen risk. Thus, pathogen-specific water
600 quality data would be helpful to characterize risks associated with pre- and post-boiling water.
601 Limited data exist, but new methods (with their own associated limitations) are expanding the
602 potential for pathogen specific data, such as the use of TaqMan array cards for environmental
603 samples.¹³⁵ Additionally, water quality in LMICS can be highly temporally variable, with spikes
604 in contamination, and intermittent exposure to contaminated drinking water can negate the
605 benefits of improved water access.

606 DALYs are used for comparative risk assessment, including environmental risks such as IAP and
607 water contamination. DALYs allow comparison across risk categories, and are the common
608 metric used in the Global Burden of Disease estimates.¹³⁶ Estimates for DALYs from air
609 pollution and water are calculated using very different approaches, which we adopted for this
610 study. Additionally, though DALYs account for the years of life lost and years lived with
611 disability, they don't perfectly capture the acute versus chronic nature of disease, which is an
612 important difference between IAP and water risks. Using these different methods to compare
613 different risks and outcomes is an inherent limitation in the comparative risk assessment
614 approach. However, we took this approach as it is the most widely used approach to compare
615 diverse risk factors. Future work can examine other methods to calculate and compare the risks
616 from drinking water and IAP, including field studies to provide context-specific findings to
617 compare against the broad insights from this scoping analysis.

618 **Conclusions**

619 To our knowledge, this is the first study to compare water and air pollution DALYs for scenarios
620 of household cooking and water boiling to determine if boiling water has a net benefit regardless
621 of stove and fuel type. Our model identified certain scenarios that, if risks for water and air are
622 considered separately, could suggest DALY reductions but that due to combined effects
623 ultimately results in net positive DALYs. For example, if a household that does not cook their

624 food is encouraged to boil water on a wood stove, they would experience increased air pollution
625 exposure that may outweigh benefits of ineffectual water boiling. However, this scenario is
626 likely an exception, and our modeling suggests that boiling even at low log-removal rates has net
627 health benefits for medium- and high-risk source water, even if using relatively high-emitting
628 stove. In contrast, when treating low-risk source water, boiling effectiveness and cookstove type
629 influence whether net health benefits result from the practice. We recommend further field
630 investigations to jointly assess health effects associated with contaminated drinking water and
631 indoor air pollution and the development and evaluation of interventions to mitigate both
632 exposures. Due to uncertainties and assumptions in the model, we recommend that country or
633 context-specific inputs, and ideally studies of boiling and indoor air pollution, with empirical
634 measurements of water and air quality, be conducted to improve understanding of the health
635 risks and tradeoffs and evaluate our model. Specifically, more information on household-specific
636 parameters, including pathogen contamination in water, stove types, and cooking and boiling
637 energy requirements, and linking emissions to indoor air pollution and exposure, could improve
638 the model. Future efforts should empirically measure air pollution concentrations (to estimate
639 health impacts) and diarrhea during field studies of different boiling methods and stove types, to
640 both provide better input parameters and improve our ability to model risk tradeoffs.

641 **Funding**

642 This work was supported by the Energy Poverty Pire in Southern Africa Project (National
643 Science Foundation award #1743741). EF acknowledges support from the NC State Global One
644 Health Fellowship.

645 **Acknowledgements**

646 Special thanks to Sean Daly for his suggestions and feedback on this project. Thank you to
647 Cheryl Weyant for providing feedback on the writing. We would like to dedicate this paper to
648 the memory of Haley Foard, a North Carolina State University undergraduate researcher who
649 contributed to the initial literature review and research in the initial phase of the project during
650 Summer 2020.

651 **Appendices**

652 **Appendix 1: Key Assumptions for Indoor Air Pollution DALYs Calculation**

- 653 • Use of an indoor air pollution box model ¹²⁵
- 654 • Kitchen characteristics assumed to be the same in all scenario, with volume of 30 (sd 15) m³
655 and air exchange rate of 25 hr⁻¹ (sd 15) ⁶¹.
- 656 • Only considered disease burdens from 5 outcomes: Stroke, ALRI, IHD, Lung Cancer, and
657 COPD.
- 658 • Used Country Level Disease Burdens for a single year, 2019.
- 659 • Assumed the same exposure to concentration ratio regardless of location.
- 660 • Used a single average PM_{2.5} emission factor over the entire burning process.
- 661 • Assumed all cooking and all water heating each occurred one time per day.
- 662 • Does not consider space heating.
- 663 • Assumes ambient air pollution level of 12 µg/m³.

- 664 • Used integrated exposure response functions to calculate risk for each disease outcome⁷⁷
- 665 • Integrated exposure function assumes 1) exposure to PM_{2.5} from diverse combustion sources
- 666 is associated with increased mortality; 2) they are a function of PM_{2.5} mass inhaled
- 667 concentration across all combustion particle sources and composition; 3) there is no
- 668 interaction between different exposure types⁷⁷
- 669 • Used counter-factual exposure value of a distribution of around 7 µg/m³ for the IAP
- 670 exposure response model.⁷⁷

671 **Appendix 2: Key Assumptions for Drinking Water DALYs Calculation**

- 672 • Characterized risk using three indicator pathogens.
- 673 • Assumed disease burden is based on calculating DALYs from *E. Coli*.
- 674 • Assumed constant ratios for converting disease pathogens to *E. Coli*.
- 675 • Assume three categories of water risk level.
- 676 • Neglected post boiling recontamination.
- 677 • Assumed boiling takes place one time per day.
- 678 • Assumed all ages are at the same risk from the disease and uses same calculations for all
- 679 ages.
- 680 • Age difference is the only demographic difference.

681 **References**

- 682 1. WHO/UNICEF. *Progress on Household Drinking Water, Sanitation and Hygiene*.
- 683 WHO/UNICEF Joint; 2020. [https://www.who.int/news/item/01-07-2021-billions-of-people-](https://www.who.int/news/item/01-07-2021-billions-of-people-will-lack-access-to-safe-water-sanitation-and-hygiene-in-2030-unless-progress-quadruples-warn-who-unicef)
- 684 [will-lack-access-to-safe-water-sanitation-and-hygiene-in-2030-unless-progress-quadruples-](https://www.who.int/news/item/01-07-2021-billions-of-people-will-lack-access-to-safe-water-sanitation-and-hygiene-in-2030-unless-progress-quadruples-warn-who-unicef)
- 685 [warn-who-unicef](https://www.who.int/news/item/01-07-2021-billions-of-people-will-lack-access-to-safe-water-sanitation-and-hygiene-in-2030-unless-progress-quadruples-warn-who-unicef)
- 686 2. IHME. Diarrheal diseases — Level 3 cause. Published 2022.
- 687 https://www.healthdata.org/results/gbd_summaries/2019/diarrheal-diseases-level-3-cause
- 688 3. Prüss-Ustün A, Wolf J, Bartram J, et al. Burden of disease from inadequate water,
- 689 sanitation and hygiene for selected adverse health outcomes: An updated analysis with a
- 690 focus on low- and middle-income countries. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. 2019;222(5):765-
- 691 777. doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2019.05.004
- 692 4. Troeger C, Colombara DV, Rao PC, et al. Global disability-adjusted life-year estimates of
- 693 long-term health burden and undernutrition attributable to diarrhoeal diseases in children
- 694 younger than 5 years. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018;6(3):e255-e269. doi:10.1016/S2214-
- 695 109X(18)30045-7
- 696 5. Stoner O, Lewis J, Martínez IL, Gumy S, Economou T, Adair-Rohani H. Household
- 697 cooking fuel estimates at global and country level for 1990 to 2030. *Nat Commun*.
- 698 2021;12(1):5793. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-26036-x
- 699 6. Desai MA, Mehta S, Smith KR, World Health Organization, Protection of the Human
- 700 Environment. *Indoor Smoke from Solid Fuels: Assessing the Environmental Burden of*
- 701 *Disease at National and Local Levels*. Protection of the Human Environment, World Health
- 702 Organization; 2004.

- 703 7. Dherani M, Pope D, Mascarenhas M, Smith KR, Weber M, Bruce N. Indoor air pollution
704 from unprocessed solid fuel use and pneumonia risk in children aged under five years: a
705 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2008;86(5):390-398.
706 doi:10.2471/BLT.07.044529
- 707 8. Sonogo M, Pellegrin MC, Becker G, Lazzerini M. Risk Factors for Mortality from Acute
708 Lower Respiratory Infections (ALRI) in Children under Five Years of Age in Low and
709 Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Observational
710 Studies. Sankoh OA, ed. *PLOS ONE.* 2015;10(1):e0116380.
711 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0116380
- 712 9. IHME. Air pollution - Level 2 risk. Published 2022.
713 [https://www.healthdata.org/results/gbd_summaries/2019/air-pollution-level-2-](https://www.healthdata.org/results/gbd_summaries/2019/air-pollution-level-2-risk#:~:text=Summary%20In%202019%2C%20air%20pollution,%C2%B749)%20deaths%20in%202019.)
714 [risk#:~:text=Summary% 20In% 202019% 2C% 20air% 20pollution,% C2% B749\)% 20deaths% 20in% 202019.](https://www.healthdata.org/results/gbd_summaries/2019/air-pollution-level-2-risk#:~:text=Summary%20In%202019%2C%20air%20pollution,%C2%B749)%20deaths%20in%202019.)
715
- 716 10. Clasen T, Rosa G. Consistency of Use and Effectiveness of Household Water Treatment
717 among Indian Households Claiming to Treat Their Water. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*
718 2017;97(1):259-270. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.16-0428
- 719 11. Rosa G, Clasen T. Estimating the Scope of Household Water Treatment in Low- and
720 Medium-Income Countries. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2010;82(2):289-300.
721 doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2010.09-0382
- 722 12. Cohen A, Colford JM. Effects of Boiling Drinking Water on Diarrhea and Pathogen-
723 Specific Infections in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-
724 Analysis. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2017;97(5):1362-1377. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.17-0190
- 725 13. Geremew A, Damtew YT. Household water treatment using adequate methods in sub-
726 Saharan countries: evidence from 2013–2016 Demographic and Health Surveys. *J Water*
727 *Sanit Hyg Dev.* 2020;10(1):66-75. doi:10.2166/washdev.2019.107
- 728 14. CDC, USAID. Household Water Treatment Options in Developing Countries: Boiling.
729 Published online January 2009. <http://www.ehproject.org/PDF/ehkm/boiling2009.pdf>
- 730 15. Clasen T, Thao DH, Boisson S, Shipin O. Microbiological Effectiveness and Cost of
731 Boiling to Disinfect Drinking Water in Rural Vietnam. *Environ Sci Technol.*
732 2008;42(12):4255-4260. doi:10.1021/es7024802
- 733 16. Psutka R, Peletz R, Michelo S, Kelly P, Clasen T. Assessing the Microbiological
734 Performance and Potential Cost of Boiling Drinking Water in Urban Zambia. *Environ Sci*
735 *Technol.* 2011;45(14):6095-6101. doi:10.1021/es2004045
- 736 17. Rosa G, Huaylinos ML, Gil A, Lanata C, Clasen T. Assessing the Consistency and
737 Microbiological Effectiveness of Household Water Treatment Practices by Urban and Rural
738 Populations Claiming to Treat Their Water at Home: A Case Study in Peru. Ibekwe AM,
739 ed. *PLoS ONE.* 2014;9(12):e114997. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0114997

- 740 18. Prihartono N, Adisasmita A, Costello C, Damayanti R, Prasetyo S, Syarif S. Water
741 Preparation Practices in South Kalimantan, Indonesia. *J Diarrhoeal Dis Res.*
742 1994;12(4):279-286.
- 743 19. Cohen A, Pillarisetti A, Luo Q, et al. Boiled or Bottled: Regional and Seasonal Exposures
744 to Drinking Water Contamination and Household Air Pollution in Rural China. *Environ*
745 *Health Perspect.* 2020;128(12):127002. doi:10.1289/EHP7124
- 746 20. World Health Organization. Technical Brief: Boil Water. Published online January 2015.
747 Accessed January 22, 2021.
748 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/155821/WHO_FWC_WSH_15.02_eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/155821/WHO_FWC_WSH_15.02_eng.pdf?sequence=1)
749 ?sequence=1
- 750 21. Zhao B, Zheng H, Wang S, et al. Change in household fuels dominates the decrease in
751 PM_{2.5} exposure and premature mortality in China in 2005–2015. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S*
752 *A.* 2018;115(49):12401-12406. doi:10.1073/pnas.1812955115
- 753 22. Mensah JT, Adu G. An empirical analysis of household energy choice in Ghana. *Renew*
754 *Sustain Energy Rev.* 2015;51:1402-1411. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.050
- 755 23. Gould CF, Urpelainen J. LPG as a clean cooking fuel: Adoption, use, and impact in rural
756 India. *Energy Policy.* 2018;122:395-408. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2018.07.042
- 757 24. Banerjee M, Prasad R, Rehman IH, Gill B. Induction stoves as an option for clean cooking
758 in rural India. *Energy Policy.* 2016;88:159-167. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2015.10.021
- 759 25. Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. *The State of the Global Clean and Improved*
760 *Cooking Sector.* World Bank; 2015. Accessed September 1, 2020.
761 <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/21878/96499.pdf>
- 762 26. Champion WM, Grieshop AP. Pellet-Fed Gasifier Stoves Approach Gas-Stove Like
763 Performance during in-Home Use in Rwanda. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2019;53(11):6570-
764 6579. doi:10.1021/acs.est.9b00009
- 765 27. Njenga M, Iiyama M, Jamnadass R, et al. Gasifier as a cleaner cooking system in rural
766 Kenya. *J Clean Prod.* 2016;121:208-217. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.01.039
- 767 28. Pope D, Bruce N, Dherani M, Jagoe K, Rehfuess E. Real-life effectiveness of ‘improved’
768 stoves and clean fuels in reducing PM_{2.5} and CO: Systematic review and meta-analysis.
769 *Environ Int.* 2017;101:7-18. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2017.01.012
- 770 29. Bailis R, Cowan A, Berrueta V, Masera O. Arresting the Killer in the Kitchen: The
771 Promises and Pitfalls of Commercializing Improved Cookstoves. *World Dev.*
772 2009;37(10):1694-1705. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.03.004
- 773 30. Clasen T, Smith KR. Let the “A” in WASH Stand for Air: Integrating Research and
774 Interventions to Improve Household Air Pollution (HAP) and Water, Sanitation and

- 775 Hygiene (WaSH) in Low-Income Settings. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2019;127(2):025001.
776 doi:10.1289/EHP4752
- 777 31. World Bank. Access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking (% of population) -
778 Uganda. Published 2022. Accessed February 14, 2022.
779 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.CFT.ACCS.ZS?locations=UG>
- 780 32. Price R. “Clean” Cooking Energy in Uganda – technologies, impacts, and key barriers and
781 enablers to market acceleration. Published online August 2017:23.
- 782 33. Barstow C, Bluffstone R, Silon K, Linden K, Thomas E. A cost-benefit analysis of
783 livelihood, environmental and health benefits of a large scale water filter and cookstove
784 distribution in Rwanda. *Dev Eng.* 2019;4:100043. doi:10.1016/j.deveng.2019.100043
- 785 34. Kirby MA, Nagel CL, Rosa G, et al. Effects of a large-scale distribution of water filters and
786 natural draft rocket-style cookstoves on diarrhea and acute respiratory infection: A cluster-
787 randomized controlled trial in Western Province, Rwanda. Tumwine JK, ed. *PLOS Med.*
788 2019;16(6):e1002812. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002812
- 789 35. Pope D, Johnson M, Fleeman N, et al. Are cleaner cooking solutions clean enough? A
790 systematic review and meta-analysis of particulate and carbon monoxide concentrations and
791 exposures. *Environ Res Lett.* 2021;16(8):083002. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ac13ec
- 792 36. WHO. *WHO Global Air Quality Guidelines: Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀),
793 Ozone, Nitrogen Dioxide, Sulfur Dioxide and Carbon Monoxide.*; 2021. Accessed January
794 27, 2022. <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240034228>
- 795 37. Gibney K, Sinclair M, O’Toole J, Leder K. Using disability-adjusted life years to set health-
796 based targets: A novel use of an established burden of disease metric. *J Public Health
797 Policy.* 2013;34(3):439-446. doi:10.1057/jphp.2013.22
- 798 38. Devleesschauwer B, Havelaar AH, Maertens de Noordhout C, et al. Calculating disability-
799 adjusted life years to quantify burden of disease. *Int J Public Health.* 2014;59(3):565-569.
800 doi:10.1007/s00038-014-0552-z
- 801 39. Havelaar AH, Melse, JM. *Quantifying Public Health Risk in the WHO Guidelines for
802 Drinking-Water Quality: A Burden of Disease Approach.* World Health Organization; 2003.
803 https://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/rivmrep.pdf?ua=1
- 804 40. Asikainen A, Carrer P, Kephelopoulos S, Fernandes E de O, Wargocki P, Hänninen O.
805 Reducing burden of disease from residential indoor air exposures in Europe
806 (HEALTHVENT project). *Environ Health.* 2016;15(S1):S35. doi:10.1186/s12940-016-
807 0101-8
- 808 41. Pillarisetti A, Mehta S, Smith KR. HAPIT, the Household Air Pollution Intervention Tool,
809 to evaluate the health benefits and cost-effectiveness of clean cooking interventions. In:
810 Thomas EA, ed. *Broken Pumps and Promises: Incentivizing Impact in Environmental
811 Health.* Springer International Press; 2016:147-169.

- 812 42. Bruce N, Rehfuess E, Mehta S, Hutton G, Smith KR. Indoor Air Pollution. In: *Disease*
813 *Control Priorities in Developing Countries*. 2nd ed. The International Bank for
814 Reconstruction and Development/ The World Bank; 2006.
- 815 43. Karambizi NU, McMahan CS, Blue CN, Temesvari LA. Global estimated Disability-
816 Adjusted Life-Years (DALYs) of diarrheal diseases: A systematic analysis of data from 28
817 years of the global burden of disease study. Goli S, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(10):e0259077.
818 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0259077
- 819 44. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *Patterns*
820 *and Trends in Household Size and Composition: Evidence from a United Nations Dataset*.
821 United Nations; 2019.
822 https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/ageing/household_size_and_composition_technical_report.pdf
823
- 824 45. World Health Organization. Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment: Application for
825 Water Safety Management. Published online 2016. Accessed March 1, 2021.
826 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/246195/9789241565370-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/246195/9789241565370-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
827 [eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/246195/9789241565370-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
- 828 46. Kundu A, Wuertz S, Smith WA. Quantitative microbial risk assessment to estimate the risk
829 of diarrheal diseases from fresh produce consumption in India. *Food Microbiol*.
830 2018;75:95-102. doi:10.1016/j.fm.2018.01.017
- 831 47. Tian P, Yang D, Shan L, et al. Concurrent Detection of Human Norovirus and Bacterial
832 Pathogens in Water Samples from an Agricultural Region in Central California Coast.
833 *Front Microbiol*. 2017;8:1560. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.01560
- 834 48. Kotloff KL, Blackwelder WC, Nasrin D, et al. The Global Enteric Multicenter Study
835 (GEMS) of Diarrheal Disease in Infants and Young Children in Developing Countries:
836 Epidemiologic and Clinical Methods of the Case/Control Study. *Clin Infect Dis*.
837 2012;55(suppl_4):S232-S245. doi:10.1093/cid/cis753
- 838 49. Lanata CF, Fischer-Walker CL, Olascoaga AC, et al. Global Causes of Diarrheal Disease
839 Mortality in Children <5 Years of Age: A Systematic Review. Sestak K, ed. *PLoS ONE*.
840 2013;8(9):e72788. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0072788
- 841 50. Platts-Mills JA, Babji S, Bodhidatta L, et al. Pathogen-specific burdens of community
842 diarrhoea in developing countries: a multisite birth cohort study (MAL-ED). *Lancet Glob*
843 *Health*. 2015;3(9):e564-e575. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(15)00151-5
- 844 51. Bivins AW, Sumner T, Kumpel E, et al. Estimating Infection Risks and the Global Burden
845 of Diarrheal Disease Attributable to Intermittent Water Supply Using QMRA. *Environ Sci*
846 *Technol*. 2017;51(13):7542-7551. doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b01014
- 847 52. Machdar E, van der Steen NP, Raschid-Sally L, Lens PNL. Application of Quantitative
848 Microbial Risk Assessment to analyze the public health risk from poor drinking water

- 849 quality in a low income area in Accra, Ghana. *Sci Total Environ.* 2013;449:134-142.
850 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.01.048
- 851 53. Uprety S, Dangol B, Nakarmi P, et al. Assessment of microbial risks by characterization of
852 *Escherichia coli* presence to analyze the public health risks from poor water quality in
853 Nepal. *Int J Hyg Environ Health.* 2020;226:113484. doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2020.113484
- 854 54. Odonkor ST, Mahami T. *Escherichia coli* as a Tool for Disease Risk Assessment of
855 Drinking Water Sources. *Int J Microbiol.* 2020;2020:1-7. doi:10.1155/2020/2534130
- 856 55. Hachich EM, Di Bari M, Christ APG, Lamparelli CC, Ramos SS, Sato MIZ. Comparison of
857 thermotolerant coliforms and *Escherichia coli* densities in freshwater bodies. *Braz J*
858 *Microbiol.* 2012;43(2):675-681. doi:10.1590/S1517-83822012000200032
- 859 56. Hathaway JM, Krometis LH, Hunt WF. Exploring Seasonality in *Escherichia coli* and
860 Fecal Coliform Ratios in Urban Watersheds. *J Irrig Drain Eng.* 2014;140(4):04014003.
861 doi:10.1061/(ASCE)IR.1943-4774.0000700
- 862 57. Murphy HM, Thomas MK, Schmidt PJ, Medeiros DT, McFADYEN S, Pintar KDM.
863 Estimating the burden of acute gastrointestinal illness due to *Giardia*, *Cryptosporidium*,
864 *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* O157 and norovirus associated with private wells and small water
865 systems in Canada. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2016;144(7):1355-1370.
866 doi:10.1017/S0950268815002071
- 867 58. Haas CN, Rose J, Gerba C. *Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment.* Wiley & sons; 1999.
- 868 59. Medema GJ, Teunis PFM, Havelaar AH, Haas CN. Assessment of the dose-response
869 relationship of *Campylobacter jejuni*. *Int J Food Microbiol.* 1996;30(1-2):101-111.
870 doi:10.1016/0168-1605(96)00994-4
- 871 60. Westrell T. *Microbial Risk Assessment and Its Implications for Risk Management in Urban*
872 *Water Systems.* 2004.
- 873 61. Johnson M, Lam N, Brant S, Gray C, Pennise D. Modeling indoor air pollution from
874 cookstove emissions in developing countries using a Monte Carlo single-box model. *Atmos*
875 *Environ.* 2011;45(19):3237-3243. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.03.044
- 876 62. Lewis JJ, Bhojvaid V, Brooks N, et al. Piloting Improved Cookstoves in India. *J Health*
877 *Commun.* 2015;20(sup1):28-42. doi:10.1080/10810730.2014.994243
- 878 63. Menghwani V, Zerriffi H, Dwivedi P, Marshall JD, Grieshop A, Bailis R. Determinants of
879 Cookstoves and Fuel Choice Among Rural Households in India. *EcoHealth.* 2019;16(1):21-
880 60. doi:10.1007/s10393-018-1389-3
- 881 64. Habib G, Venkataraman C, Shrivastava M, Banerjee R, Stehr JW, Dickerson RR. New
882 methodology for estimating biofuel consumption for cooking: Atmospheric emissions of
883 black carbon and sulfur dioxide from India: BIOFUEL COMBUSTION AND

- 884 ATMOSPHERIC EMISSIONS. *Glob Biogeochem Cycles*. 2004;18(3):n/a-n/a.
885 doi:10.1029/2003GB002157
- 886 65. Hossain MA, Rahman MM, Murrill M, et al. Water consumption patterns and factors
887 contributing to water consumption in arsenic affected population of rural West Bengal,
888 India. *Sci Total Environ*. 2013;463-464:1217-1224. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.06.057
- 889 66. Sanciolo P, Monis P, Blackbeard J, Salveson A, Ryan G, Gray S. Pasteurisation for the
890 Production of Class A Water. Published online 2015.
- 891 67. Pillarisetti A, Mehta S, Smith KR. Household Air Pollution Intervention Tool (HAPIT III).
892 *Clean Cook Alliance*. Published online 2015.
893 <https://www.cleancookingalliance.org/resources/450.html>
- 894 68. Cereceda-Balic F, Toledo M, Vidal V, et al. Emission factors for PM_{2.5}, CO, CO₂, NO_x,
895 SO₂ and particle size distributions from the combustion of wood species using a new
896 controlled combustion chamber 3CE. *Sci Total Environ*. 2017;584-585:901-910.
897 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.01.136
- 898 69. Deng M, Zhang S, Shan M, et al. The impact of cookstove operation on PM_{2.5} and CO
899 emissions: A comparison of laboratory and field measurements. *Environ Pollut*.
900 2018;243:1087-1095. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2018.09.064
- 901 70. Roden CA, Bond TC, Conway S, Pinel ABO. Emission Factors and Real-Time Optical
902 Properties of Particles Emitted from Traditional Wood Burning Cookstoves. *Environ Sci
903 Technol*. 2006;40(21):6750-6757. doi:10.1021/es052080i
- 904 71. Roden CA, Bond TC, Conway S, Osorto Pinel AB, MacCarty N, Still D. Laboratory and
905 field investigations of particulate and carbon monoxide emissions from traditional and
906 improved cookstoves. *Atmos Environ*. 2009;43(6):1170-1181.
907 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.05.041
- 908 72. Thompson RJ, Li J, Weyant CL, et al. Field Emission Measurements of Solid Fuel Stoves
909 in Yunnan, China Demonstrate Dominant Causes of Uncertainty in Household Emission
910 Inventories. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2019;53(6):3323-3330. doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b07040
- 911 73. Bates MN, Pokhrel AK, Chandyo RK, et al. Kitchen PM_{2.5} concentrations and child acute
912 lower respiratory infection in Bhaktapur, Nepal: The importance of fuel type. *Environ Res*.
913 2018;161:546-553. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.11.056
- 914 74. Lim SS, Vos T, Flaxman AD, et al. A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and
915 injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a
916 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet*.
917 2012;380(9859):2224-2260. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61766-8
- 918 75. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 (GBD
919 2019) Population Estimates 1950-2019. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation.

- 920 Published January 28, 2021. [http://ghdx.healthdata.org/sites/default/files/record-attached-](http://ghdx.healthdata.org/sites/default/files/record-attached-files/IHME_GBD_2019_POP_1950_2019_INFO_SHEET_Y2021M01D28.PDF)
921 [files/IHME_GBD_2019_POP_1950_2019_INFO_SHEET_Y2021M01D28.PDF](http://ghdx.healthdata.org/sites/default/files/record-attached-files/IHME_GBD_2019_POP_1950_2019_INFO_SHEET_Y2021M01D28.PDF)
- 922 76. Vos T, Barber RM, Bell B, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and
923 years lived with disability for 301 acute and chronic diseases and injuries in 188 countries,
924 1990-2013: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *The*
925 *Lancet*. 2015;386(9995):743-800. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60692-4
- 926 77. Burnett RT, Pope CA, Ezzati M, et al. An Integrated Risk Function for Estimating the
927 Global Burden of Disease Attributable to Ambient Fine Particulate Matter Exposure.
928 *Environ Health Perspect*. 2014;122(4):397-403. doi:10.1289/ehp.1307049
- 929 78. R Core Team. A language and environment for statistical computing. Published online
930 2021. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 931 79. Andersson A. Mechanisms for log normal concentration distributions in the environment.
932 *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):16418. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-96010-6
- 933 80. Mattioli MCM, Davis J, Boehm AB. Hand-to-Mouth Contacts Result in Greater Ingestion
934 of Feces than Dietary Water Consumption in Tanzania: A Quantitative Fecal Exposure
935 Assessment Model. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2015;49(3):1912-1920. doi:10.1021/es505555f
- 936 81. Apte JS, Marshall JD, Cohen AJ, Brauer M. Addressing Global Mortality from Ambient
937 PM_{2.5}. *Env Sci Technol*. Published online 2015:10.
- 938 82. Grieshop AP, Marshall JD, Kandlikar M. Health and climate benefits of cookstove
939 replacement options. *Energy Policy*. 2011;39(12):7530-7542.
940 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.03.024
- 941 83. Bain R, Cronk R, Hossain R, et al. Global assessment of exposure to faecal contamination
942 through drinking water based on a systematic review. *Trop Med Int Health*.
943 2014;19(8):917-927. doi:10.1111/tmi.12334
- 944 84. World Health Organization, UNICEF. *Progress on Sanitation and Drinking Water 2013*
945 *Update.*; 2013. [https://www.unwater.org/app/uploads/2020/04/WHOUNICEF-Joint-](https://www.unwater.org/app/uploads/2020/04/WHOUNICEF-Joint-Monitoring-Programme-for-Water-Supply-and-Sanitation-JMP-%E2%80%932013-Update.pdf)
946 [Monitoring-Programme-for-Water-Supply-and-Sanitation-JMP-%E2%80%932013-](https://www.unwater.org/app/uploads/2020/04/WHOUNICEF-Joint-Monitoring-Programme-for-Water-Supply-and-Sanitation-JMP-%E2%80%932013-Update.pdf)
947 [Update.pdf](https://www.unwater.org/app/uploads/2020/04/WHOUNICEF-Joint-Monitoring-Programme-for-Water-Supply-and-Sanitation-JMP-%E2%80%932013-Update.pdf)
- 948 85. Bain R, Cronk R, Wright J, Yang H, Slaymaker T, Bartram J. Fecal Contamination of
949 Drinking-Water in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-
950 Analysis. Hunter PR, ed. *PLoS Med*. 2014;11(5):e1001644.
951 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001644
- 952 86. Rosa G, Majorin F, Boisson S, et al. Assessing the Impact of Water Filters and Improved
953 Cook Stoves on Drinking Water Quality and Household Air Pollution: A Randomised
954 Controlled Trial in Rwanda. Hills RK, ed. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9(3):e91011.
955 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0091011

- 956 87. Pye A, Ronzi S, Mbatchou Ngahane BH, Puzzolo E, Ashu AH, Pope D. Drivers of the
957 Adoption and Exclusive Use of Clean Fuel for Cooking in Sub-Saharan Africa: Learnings
958 and Policy Considerations from Cameroon. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
959 2020;17(16):5874. doi:10.3390/ijerph17165874
- 960 88. Bielecki C, Wingenbach G. Rethinking improved cookstove diffusion programs: A case
961 study of social perceptions and cooking choices in rural Guatemala. *Energy Policy*.
962 2014;66:350-358. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.082
- 963 89. Shankar AV, Quinn AK, Dickinson KL, et al. Everybody stacks: Lessons from household
964 energy case studies to inform design principles for clean energy transitions. *Energy Policy*.
965 2020;141:111468. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111468
- 966 90. Ochieng CA, Zhang Y, Nyabwa JK, Otieno DI, Spillane C. Household perspectives on
967 cookstove and fuel stacking: A qualitative study in urban and rural Kenya. *Energy Sustain
968 Dev*. 2020;59:151-159. doi:10.1016/j.esd.2020.10.002
- 969 91. Piedrahita R, Dickinson KL, Kanyomse E, et al. Assessment of cookstove stacking in
970 Northern Ghana using surveys and stove use monitors. *Energy Sustain Dev*. 2016;34:67-76.
971 doi:10.1016/j.esd.2016.07.007
- 972 92. Ruiz-Mercado I, Masera O. Patterns of Stove Use in the Context of Fuel–Device Stacking:
973 Rationale and Implications. *EcoHealth*. 2015;12(1):42-56. doi:10.1007/s10393-015-1009-4
- 974 93. Martínez-Negrete M, Martínez R, Joaquín R, Sheinbaum C, Masera OR. Is modernization
975 making villages more energy efficient? A long-term comparative end-use analysis for
976 Cheranatzicurin village, Mexico. *Energy Sustain Dev*. 2013;17(5):463-470.
977 doi:10.1016/j.esd.2013.05.004
- 978 94. Ozoh O, Okwor T, Adetona O, et al. Cooking Fuels in Lagos, Nigeria: Factors Associated
979 with Household Choice of Kerosene or Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG). *Int J Environ Res
980 Public Health*. 2018;15(4):641. doi:10.3390/ijerph15040641
- 981 95. Rufener S, Mäusezahl D, Mosler HJ, Weingartner R. Quality of Drinking-water at Source
982 and Point-of-consumption - Drinking Cup As a High Potential Recontamination Risk: A
983 Field Study in Bolivia. *J Health Popul Nutr*. 2010;28(1):34-41.
984 doi:10.3329/jhpn.v28i1.4521
- 985 96. Heitzinger K, Rocha CA, Quick RE, et al. The challenge of improving boiling: lessons
986 learned from a randomized controlled trial of water pasteurization and safe storage in Peru.
987 *Epidemiol Infect*. 2016;144(10):2230-2240. doi:10.1017/S0950268816000236
- 988 97. Enger KS, Nelson KL, Rose JB, Eisenberg JNS. The joint effects of efficacy and
989 compliance: A study of household water treatment effectiveness against childhood diarrhea.
990 *Water Res*. 2013;47(3):1181-1190. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2012.11.034

- 991 98. Hunter PR, Zmirou-Navier D, Hartemann P. Estimating the impact on health of poor
992 reliability of drinking water interventions in developing countries. *Sci Total Environ.*
993 2009;407(8):2621-2624. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.01.018
- 994 99. Fagerli K, Trivedi KK, Sodha SV, et al. Comparison of boiling and chlorination on the
995 quality of stored drinking water and childhood diarrhoea in Indonesian households.
996 *Epidemiol Infect.* 2017;145(15):3294-3302. doi:10.1017/S0950268817002217
- 997 100. Sobsey MD, Handzel T, Venczel L. Chlorination and safe storage of household drinking
998 water in developing countries to reduce waterborne disease. *Water Sci Technol.*
999 2003;47(3):221-228. doi:10.2166/wst.2003.0199
- 1000 101. Arnold BF, Colford JM. TREATING WATER WITH CHLORINE AT POINT-OF-USE
1001 TO IMPROVE WATER QUALITY AND REDUCE CHILD DIARRHEA IN
1002 DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS. *Am*
1003 *J Trop Med Hyg.* 2007;76(2):354-364. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2007.76.354
- 1004 102. Sikder M, String G, Kamal Y, Farrington M, Rahman AS, Lantagne D. Effectiveness of
1005 water chlorination programs along the emergency-transition-post-emergency continuum:
1006 Evaluations of bucket, in-line, and piped water chlorination programs in Cox's Bazar.
1007 *Water Res.* 2020;178:115854. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115854
- 1008 103. Dössegger L, Tournefier A, Germann L, et al. Assessment of low-cost, non-electrically
1009 powered chlorination devices for gravity-driven membrane water kiosks in eastern Uganda.
1010 *Waterlines.* 2021;40(2):92-106. doi:10.3362/1756-3488.20-00014
- 1011 104. Nouiri I. Optimal design and management of chlorination in drinking water networks: a
1012 multi-objective approach using Genetic Algorithms and the Pareto optimality concept. *Appl*
1013 *Water Sci.* 2017;7(7):3527-3538. doi:10.1007/s13201-017-0620-7
- 1014 105. Wan K, Zheng S, Ye C, et al. Ancient Oriental Wisdom still Works: Removing ARGs in
1015 Drinking Water by Boiling as compared to Chlorination. *Water Res.* 2022;209:117902.
1016 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2021.117902
- 1017 106. Lantagne DS, Quick R, Mintz ED. HOUSEHOLD WATER TREATMENT AND SAFE:
1018 STORAGE OPTIONS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A REVIEW OF CURRENT
1019 IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES: Published online 2006:22.
- 1020 107. Shrestha K, Thapa B, Aihara Y, et al. Hidden Cost of Drinking Water Treatment and Its
1021 Relation with Socioeconomic Status in Nepalese Urban Context. *Water.* 2018;10(5):607.
1022 doi:10.3390/w10050607
- 1023 108. Levine DI, Cotterman C. What Impedes Efficient Adoption of Products? Evidence from
1024 Randomized Variation in Sales Offers for Improved Cookstoves in Uganda. Published
1025 online January 1, 2011:30.

- 1026 109. Seguin R, Flax VL, Jagger P. Barriers and facilitators to adoption and use of fuel pellets
1027 and improved cookstoves in urban Rwanda. Raynes-Greenow CH, ed. *PLOS ONE*.
1028 2018;13(10):e0203775. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0203775
- 1029 110. Patel S, Khandelwal A, Leavey A, Biswas P. A model for cost-benefit analysis of cooking
1030 fuel alternatives from a rural Indian household perspective. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev*.
1031 2016;56:291-302. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2015.11.047
- 1032 111. Irfan M, Cameron MP, Hassan G. Interventions to mitigate indoor air pollution: A cost-
1033 benefit analysis. Cavallaro F, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(9):e0257543.
1034 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0257543
- 1035 112. Sköld NP, Bergion V, Lindhe A, Keucken A, Rosén L. Risk-Based Evaluation of
1036 Improvements in Drinking Water Treatment Using Cost-Benefit Analysis. *Water*.
1037 2022;14(5):782. doi:10.3390/w14050782
- 1038 113. Troncoso K, Segurado P, Aguilar M, Soares da Silva A. Adoption of LPG for cooking in
1039 two rural communities of Chiapas, Mexico. *Energy Policy*. 2019;133:110925.
1040 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2019.110925
- 1041 114. Gould CF, Schlesinger S, Toasa AO, et al. Government policy, clean fuel access, and
1042 persistent fuel stacking in Ecuador. *Energy Sustain Dev*. 2018;46:111-122.
1043 doi:10.1016/j.esd.2018.05.009
- 1044 115. Bhattacharya SC, Albina DO, Salam PA. Emission factors of wood and charcoal-fired
1045 cookstoves. *Biomass Bioenergy*. Published online 2002.
- 1046 116. Hankey S, Sullivan K, Kinnick A, et al. Using objective measures of stove use and indoor
1047 air quality to evaluate a cookstove intervention in rural Uganda. *Energy Sustain Dev*.
1048 2015;25:67-74. doi:10.1016/j.esd.2014.12.007
- 1049 117. Pham TL, Tran THY, Tran TT, Ngo XQ, Nguyen XD. Assessment of surface water quality
1050 in a drinking water supply reservoir in Vietnam: a combination of different indicators.
1051 *Rendiconti Lincei Sci Fis E Nat*. 2022;33(3):653-662. doi:10.1007/s12210-022-01086-5
- 1052 118. Morgan CE, Bowling JM, Bartram J, Kayser GL. Attributes of drinking water, sanitation,
1053 and hygiene associated with microbiological water quality of stored drinking water in rural
1054 schools in Mozambique and Uganda. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. 2021;236:113804.
1055 doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2021.113804
- 1056 119. Maniragaba F, Nzabona A, Lwanga C, Ariho P, Kwagala B. Factors that influence safe
1057 water drinking practices among older persons in slums of Kampala: Analyzing disparities in
1058 boiling water. Daniel D, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2023;18(9):e0291980.
1059 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0291980
- 1060 120. Vo TLH, Shimada Y, Yoneda M. INDOOR CONCENTRATION AND PERSONAL
1061 EXPOSURE TO PARTICULATE MATTER IN VIETNAM: A COUNTRY REPORT. *J*

- 1062 *Jpn Soc Civ Eng Ser G Environ Res.* 2020;76(5):I_415-I_431.
1063 doi:10.2208/jscej.76.5_I_415
- 1064 121. Wafula ST, Nalugya A, Mendoza H, et al. Indoor air pollutants and respiratory symptoms
1065 among residents of an informal urban settlement in Uganda: A cross-sectional study.
1066 Barone-Adesi F, ed. *PLOS ONE.* 2023;18(8):e0290170. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0290170
- 1067 122. Buonanno G, Morawska L, Stabile L. Particle emission factors during cooking activities.
1068 *Atmos Environ.* 2009;43(20):3235-3242. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.03.044
- 1069 123. Baiyegunhi LJS, Hassan MB. Rural household fuel energy transition: Evidence from Giwa
1070 LGA Kaduna State, Nigeria. *Energy Sustain Dev.* 2014;20:30-35.
1071 doi:10.1016/j.esd.2014.02.003
- 1072 124. Islam MM. Evaluation of Cookstove Technologies in a Field Intervention Trial in Rural
1073 India: Quantifying Indoor Air Quality and Emissions Performance. Published online
1074 December 14, 2020. <https://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/handle/1840.20/38493>
- 1075 125. Johnson M, Piedrahita R, Pillarisetti A, et al. Modeling approaches and performance for
1076 estimating personal exposure to household air pollution: A case study in Kenya. *Indoor Air.*
1077 2021;31(5):1441-1457. doi:10.1111/ina.12790
- 1078 126. Balakrishnan K, Ghosh S, Ganguli B, et al. State and national household concentrations of
1079 PM_{2.5} from solid cookfuel use: Results from measurements and modeling in India for
1080 estimation of the global burden of disease. *Environ Health.* 2013;12(1):77.
1081 doi:10.1186/1476-069X-12-77
- 1082 127. Islam MM, Wathore R, Zerriffi H, Marshall JD, Bailis R, Grieshop AP. Assessing the
1083 Effects of Stove Use Patterns and Kitchen Chimneys on Indoor Air Quality during a
1084 Multiyear Cookstove Randomized Control Trial in Rural India. *Environ Sci Technol.*
1085 2022;56(12):8326-8337. doi:10.1021/acs.est.1c07571
- 1086 128. Pokhrel AK, Bates MN, Acharya J, et al. PM_{2.5} in household kitchens of Bhaktapur,
1087 Nepal, using four different cooking fuels. *Atmos Environ.* 2015;113:159-168.
1088 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.04.060
- 1089 129. Shen G. Changes from traditional solid fuels to clean household energies – Opportunities in
1090 emission reduction of primary PM_{2.5} from residential cookstoves in China. *Biomass*
1091 *Bioenergy.* 2016;86:28-35. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2016.01.004
- 1092 130. Chafe ZA, Brauer M, Klimont Z, et al. Household Cooking with Solid Fuels Contributes to
1093 Ambient PM_{2.5} Air Pollution and the Burden of Disease. *Environ Health Perspect.*
1094 2014;122(12):7.
- 1095 131. Fischer Walker CL, Perin J, Aryee MJ, Boschi-Pinto C, Black RE. Diarrhea incidence in
1096 low- and middle-income countries in 1990 and 2010: a systematic review. *BMC Public*
1097 *Health.* 2012;12(1):220. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-220

- 1098 132. Wu J, Long SC, Das D, Dorner SM. Are microbial indicators and pathogens correlated? A
1099 statistical analysis of 40 years of research. *J Water Health*. 2011;9(2):265-278.
1100 doi:10.2166/wh.2011.117
- 1101 133. Sadik NJ, Uprety S, Nalweyiso A, et al. Quantification of multiple waterborne pathogens in
1102 drinking water, drainage channels, and surface water in Kampala, Uganda, during seasonal
1103 variation. *GeoHealth*. 2017;1(6):258-269. doi:10.1002/2017GH000081
- 1104 134. Owens CEL, Angles ML, Cox PT, Byleveld PM, Osborne NJ, Rahman MB.
1105 Implementation of quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) for public drinking
1106 water supplies: Systematic review. *Water Res*. 2020;174:115614.
1107 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115614
- 1108 135. Lappan R, Henry R, Chown SL, et al. Monitoring of diverse enteric pathogens across
1109 environmental and host reservoirs with TaqMan array cards and standard qPCR: a
1110 methodological comparison study. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2021;5(5):e297-e308.
1111 doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00051-6
- 1112 136. Murray CJL, Vos T, Lozano R, et al. Disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) for 291
1113 diseases and injuries in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden
1114 of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet*. 2012;380(9859):2197-2223. doi:10.1016/S0140-
1115 6736(12)61689-4
- 1116




Figure 1 Overview of methods to calculate and compare drinking water DALYs and IAP DALYs




Figure 2 Mean DALYs from indoor air pollution for Different Stove and Use Scenarios for Uganda (A) and Vietnam (B). Error bars show +/- one standard deviation. Baseline is no stove use. DALYs calculated for scenarios of cooking only, water boiling, and water boiling plus cooking. Under-5s refers to children less than 5 years of age and over-5s as all other age groups combined.





Figure 3 Mean change in DALYs from boiling drinking water with different stove types for under-5s and over-5s in Uganda (A) and Vietnam (B) for different stove types and use (assuming households either previously cooked and did not cook), and for different water source qualities and boiling effectiveness. The error bars show +/- one standard deviation from Monte Carlo simulations.




Figure 4 Absolute value of change in DALYs from boiling in water (reduction in Drinking Water DALYs and increase in IAP DALYs) versus boiling log removal value (LRV) for homes in Uganda, considering over-5s only. The increase in DALYs, compared to baselines of both cooking and not cooking, are shown for LPG and traditional stoves. Water risk levels of low, medium, and high *E. coli* levels are shown. Inset shows a zoomed in version of the large panel with same axes to show tradeoffs at low LRVs.