

# Impact of a school-based water and hygiene intervention on child health and school attendance in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a cluster-randomised controlled trial

Sarah Bick (MSc), Alem Ezezew (MA), Charles Opondo (PhD), Baptiste Leurent (PhD), Wossen Argaw (PhD), Erin C Hunter (PhD), Oliver Cumming (MSc), Prof. Elizabeth Allen (PhD), Prof. Robert Dreibelbis (PhD)\*

\* corresponding author: Robert Dreibelbis, Department of Disease Control, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK, [robert.dreibelbis@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:robert.dreibelbis@lshtm.ac.uk), phone: +44 (0)20 7636 8636

Sarah Bick, Department of Disease Control, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

Alem Ezezew, Holster International Research and Development Consultancy, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Charles Opondo, Department of Medical Statistics, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

Baptiste Leurent, Department of Statistical Science, Faculty of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University College London, London, UK

Wossen Argaw, independent consultant, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Erin C Hunter, Department of Public Health Sciences, College of Behavioral, Social and Health Sciences, Clemson University, Clemson, USA; Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, USA; Sydney School of Public Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Oliver Cumming, Department of Disease Control, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

Elizabeth Allen, Department of Medical Statistics, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

Robert Dreibelbis, Department of Disease Control, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

## 1 **Summary**

## 2 **Background**

3 Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) interventions in schools may improve the health and school  
4 attendance of schoolchildren, particularly among post-menarcheal girls, but existing evidence is  
5 mixed. We examined the impact of an urban WASH in schools programme (Project WISE) on child  
6 health and attendance.

## 7 **Methods**

8 The WISE cluster-randomised trial, conducted in 60 public primary schools in Addis Ababa,  
9 Ethiopia over one academic year, enrolled 2–4 randomly selected classes per school (approximately  
10 100 pupils) from grades 2–8 (aged 7–16) in an 'open cohort'. Schools were assigned 1:1 by  
11 stratified randomisation to receive the intervention during the 2021/22 academic year or the  
12 2022/23 academic year (waitlist control). Masking was not possible. The intervention included  
13 improvements to drinking water storage, filtration and access, alongside handwashing stations and  
14 behaviour change promotion. Planned improvements to sanitation facilities were not realised. At  
15 four unannounced classroom visits between March and June 2022 (post-intervention,  
16 approximately every four weeks), enumerators recorded primary outcomes of roll-call absence, and  
17 pupil-reported respiratory illness and diarrhoea in the past seven days among pupils present.  
18 Analysis was by intention-to-treat. This study is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, number  
19 NCT05024890.

## 20 **Findings**

21 Of 83 eligible schools, 60 were randomly selected and assigned. In total, 6229 eligible pupils were  
22 enrolled (median per school 101·5; IQR 94–112), with 5987 enrolled at study initiation (23rd  
23 November–22nd December 2021) and the remaining 242 during follow-up. Data were available on  
24 roll-call absence for 6166 pupils (99·0%), and on pupil-reported illness for 6145 pupils (98·6%).  
25 We observed a 16% relative reduction in the odds of pupil-reported respiratory illness in the past  
26 seven days during follow-up in intervention schools vs. control schools (aOR 0·84; 95% CI 0·71–  
27 1·00; p=0·046). No effect was observed on pupil-reported diarrhoea in the past seven days (aOR  
28 1·15; 95% CI 0·84–1·59; p=0·39) nor roll-call absence (aOR 1·07; 95% CI 0·83–1·38; p=0·59). There  
29 was a small increase in menstrual care self-efficacy (aMD 3·32 on 0–100 scale; 95% CI 0·05–6·59),  
30 and no effects on the other health, wellbeing and absence secondary outcomes.

31 **Interpretation**

32 This large-scale intervention to improve WASH conditions in schools across a large city had a  
33 borderline impact on respiratory illness among schoolchildren but no effect on diarrhoeal disease  
34 nor pupil absence. Future research should establish the relationships between WASH-related illness  
35 and absence and other downstream educational outcomes.

36 **Funding**

37 Children's Investment Fund Foundation.

38 **Keywords**

39 School health, hand hygiene, water, respiratory illness, diarrhoea, school absence, Ethiopia

## 40 **Panel: Research in context**

### 41 **Evidence before this study**

42 Prior to this study, there were several systematic reviews on water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)  
43 in schools, none of which used meta-analysis methods due to heterogeneity in intervention  
44 components and outcome measures. In the most comprehensive review in 2019, McMichael  
45 reported mixed evidence for the effectiveness of WASH in schools in low-income countries across  
46 health and educational outcomes, and randomised and non-randomised studies. Prior to starting  
47 this trial, there were two randomised trials conducted exclusively in urban schools in a low- or  
48 middle-income country: a handwashing trial in Cairo, Egypt examining absence due to influenza,  
49 and a trial of hand sanitizer and respiratory hygiene in Dhaka, Bangladesh for reducing influenza-  
50 like illness and laboratory-confirmed influenza. During this study, another randomised trial in  
51 Manila, Philippines was published, with different outcomes (malnutrition and dehydration). The  
52 effectiveness of combined water, sanitation and hygiene in urban schools on respiratory illness,  
53 diarrhoea and overall absence was not known, and some previous evaluations have used school  
54 records alone to track attendance. Previous studies evaluating WASH in schools interventions have  
55 suggested that multi-component interventions may be more effective, and that specific effects on  
56 girls' absence might be observed with provision of a safe, private space to change menstrual  
57 materials.

### 58 **Added value of this study**

59 This study provides rigorous experimental evidence on the effectiveness of an urban school-based  
60 water and hygiene intervention in reducing pupil-reported respiratory illness among  
61 schoolchildren, during the COVID-19 pandemic. There was no evidence of effects on pupil-reported  
62 diarrhoea or absence, nor gender-specific effects on absence. We highlight the value of  
63 unannounced visits for absence tracking with comparison to pupil-reported absence, and the need  
64 to distinguish seasonal and pandemic illness in future trials.

### 65 **Implications of all the available evidence**

66 Our results are consistent with the mixed impacts on health and absence found in previous WASH in  
67 schools evaluations. The lack of detected effects on diarrhoea, attendance and secondary outcomes  
68 related to wellbeing and menstrual health should be considered in light of the absence of sanitation  
69 infrastructure improvements, which were not delivered until after trial completion, which may have  
70 influenced risk of diarrhoeal disease. Nonetheless, school absence is multi-factorial, and these  
71 findings temper expectations that absence can be impacted by reductions in one domain of illness  
72 and not the many other important drivers linked to poverty and gender, and few programmes are

73 likely to be able to obtain a more ambitious infrastructure and behaviour change programme at the  
74 scale of the one included in this trial, which is currently being replicated in other cities across  
75 Ethiopia.

## 76 Introduction

77 School-aged children in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) are particularly susceptible to  
78 water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)-related morbidities including gastrointestinal<sup>1</sup> and  
79 respiratory infections,<sup>2</sup> often due to frequent social mixing.<sup>3</sup> In low-resource settings, these health  
80 risks are particularly associated with absence from school, lower test scores and dropout,<sup>4,5</sup> with  
81 implications on downstream social, occupational and health outcomes.<sup>6</sup> WASH interventions in  
82 schools are often expected to have gendered impacts: while reasons for absence and dropout are  
83 varied,<sup>5</sup> inadequate WASH conditions in schools may present barriers to attendance, including  
84 through lack of hygienic menstrual materials, disposal facilities and privacy leaving girls with  
85 limited options for menstrual hygiene management (MHM), and impacting educational  
86 progression.<sup>7</sup> Pupils' academic performance may also be affected by dehydration where there is  
87 inadequate water supply.<sup>8</sup>

88 Although WASH in schools interventions have been hypothesised to improve children's health and  
89 attendance outcomes, evidence of their impact has been mixed. A systematic review of varied WASH  
90 in schools intervention studies in low-income countries, including provision of water for drinking  
91 and handwashing, water quality, sanitation, and hygiene promotion,<sup>9</sup> found significant reductions in  
92 pupil-reported diarrhoeal disease between 29% and 50%, and reduced incidence of respiratory  
93 illness. Other studies, however, found no significant impacts or saw positive impacts for only select  
94 disease outcomes.<sup>10,11</sup> Mixed health effects are observed in other randomised trials in urban  
95 settings.<sup>12-14</sup> Impact on absence is similarly ambiguous: WASH improvements have been shown to  
96 reduce absence,<sup>9,15</sup> but only one<sup>10</sup> randomised controlled trial reports significantly lower overall  
97 absence rates. Some studies observed specific impacts on girls' absence alone,<sup>16</sup> or on absence due  
98 to diarrhoea.<sup>17</sup>

99 Access to safe WASH facilities in school environments is included under Sustainable Development  
100 Goal (SDG) 6<sup>18</sup> as essential in ensuring dignity and equity, and promoting women's equality and  
101 empowerment. To achieve access to safe WASH, interventions must ensure sustained management  
102 of water and sanitation services over time<sup>11</sup>, including consistent availability of soap and water for  
103 practicing handwashing.<sup>19</sup> Several publications highlight that combined WASH interventions versus  
104 single interventions – such as handwashing alone – may be necessary to transform school  
105 environments to the extent that the risk of illness and absence is reduced.<sup>9</sup> However there is limited  
106 robust evidence for the effectiveness of combined interventions delivered at-scale in urban settings.

107 The aim of this trial was to evaluate the effectiveness of a large-scale urban WASH in schools  
108 intervention, including water and sanitation infrastructure, behaviour change promotion and  
109 targeted MHM services, in schools in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. 'Project WISE (WASH in Schools for

110 Everyone)’, implemented by US-based NGO *Splash* in Addis Ababa public schools, is being delivered  
111 to pre-defined groups of schools on an annual basis. We hypothesised that the intervention would  
112 improve child health and school attendance, with greater impacts among post-menarcheal girls, and  
113 used unannounced attendance checks to avoid bias commonly associated with absence  
114 measurement.<sup>20</sup>

## 115 **Methods**

### 116 **Study design**

117 The WISE evaluation was a parallel two-arm school-based cluster-randomised controlled trial, with  
118 60 public primary schools in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia constituting the study clusters. We used a  
119 cluster-randomised design because the intervention evaluated was delivered at the school level and  
120 comprised changes to the whole school environment. Seventeen additional kindergarten schools  
121 were enrolled as part of a sub-study estimating the impact of Project WISE on kindergarten pupils,  
122 to be reported in a separate publication.

123 The trial was conducted over the course of one Ethiopian academic year (November 2021 to July  
124 2022; schools were open from September to July) and followed an ‘open cohort’ design to minimise  
125 participant attrition. Between two and four sentinel classrooms of pupils were randomly selected  
126 for follow-up during the year, with pupils who joined the class late, left the class, or were absent  
127 from the first visit contributing data to analysis. Follow-up consisted of four unannounced visits to  
128 sentinel classrooms post-intervention (approximately every four weeks), concurrently in  
129 intervention and control arms.

130 The study protocol (Supplementary File A) was approved by the London School of Hygiene &  
131 Tropical Medicine Research Ethics Committee (reference 17761), and the National Research Ethics  
132 Review Committee of Ethiopia (NRERC; reference A/A/H/10H02/227) prior to commencement of  
133 study activities. Under direction of the study investigators, Holster International Research and  
134 Development Consultancy was responsible for data collection.

### 135 **Participants**

136 The study population comprised primary school pupils aged 7–16 years attending schools due to  
137 receive the WISE intervention in either the 2021/2022 or 2022/2023 academic years. In order to  
138 have sufficient pupils in the eligible age range, we excluded schools without pupils in grades 2–8.  
139 We also excluded schools that received a WASH intervention in the three years prior to study  
140 activities and schools that provided education to vulnerable populations only. Sixty schools meeting  
141 these criteria were randomly selected for participation.

142 Within each participating school, between two and four classes were selected from grades 2–8. We  
143 obtained enrolment data (number of pupils and classes) for all grades in the school and estimated  
144 mean class size for each grade. In order to have sufficient older pupils for age-specific secondary  
145 outcome measures, we followed a stratified selection process, selecting one class each from grades  
146 2–5 and grades 6–8, then continued alternating from younger grades and older grades until there  
147 were estimated >100 pupils.



148 All eligible schools had consented to the receipt of the Project WISE intervention. Once the random  
149 allocation had been determined, formal consent for participation in the trial was sought from school  
150 principals *in loco parentis*, on behalf of all pupils in the school. School principals received guidance  
151 for communicating to parents, and parental information sheets and opt-out forms were distributed  
152 to all pupils in the sentinel classes at least one week before pupil enrolment; additional information  
153 sheets were provided in case of unexpected variation in class sizes and enrolment of additional  
154 pupils throughout the year. Pupils were excluded from data collection if their parent or guardian  
155 returned the opt-out form at any point and were required to give oral assent before each data  
156 collection activity.

157 Pupils were included in data collection regardless of age in order to minimise risk of social  
158 exclusion in the classroom if particular pupils were excluded, but only pupils aged 7–16 at  
159 enrolment were included in analysis. Some data collection activities were restricted to subgroups of  
160 pupils by age and gender.

## 161 **Randomisation and masking**

162 Randomisation was conducted in July 2021, using a random number generator in Stata version 18.0  
163 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA). From the list of 143 schools due to receive the intervention,  
164 we excluded ineligible schools (as described above), and then randomly selected 60 schools of 83  
165 eligible schools for participation. Randomisation was stratified by school size (< or ≥1200 pupils)  
166 and presence of a kindergarten (to facilitate the kindergarten sub-study). Within strata the schools  
167 were randomly ranked, and the first half of the schools assigned to the intervention  
168 (implementation during the 2021/2022 academic year). The remaining schools were assigned to  
169 the waitlist control arm, to receive the intervention in the 2022/2023 academic year, after study  
170 completion. Investigators performing the randomisation had no prior knowledge of any of the study  
171 schools. Due to the visible, prominent nature of the intervention, masking of school administrators,  
172 participants, or those delivering the intervention was not possible. Outcome assessors were not  
173 informed of treatment assignment, but might have inferred it, for example, from the distinctive  
174 WASH infrastructure components.

## 175 **Procedures**

176 The Project WISE intervention combined infrastructure and behaviour change promotion activities,  
177 so that handwashing and drinking exclusively from filtered water become normative behaviours,  
178 and girls are able to manage menses at school. Intervention design was informed by the behaviour-  
179 centred design approach<sup>21</sup> to alter behaviour through environmental cues, along with activity-based  
180 curricula, and pupil and teacher motivators. The intervention was delivered at the school level, so  
181 all children attending school were exposed to the intervention regardless of trial participation.

182 Infrastructure components included correcting water storage capacity deficits through water  
183 storage tanks; water filtration systems for drinking water; and durable plastic drinking water and  
184 handwashing stations with specific features differentiating their use and installed with taps to meet  
185 sufficient tap-to-pupil ratios. Further details and images are provided in Supplementary File B. The  
186 intervention also includes provision of new or rehabilitated toilet facilities to meet standards,  
187 however this component is managed by the Addis Ababa Education Bureau on a separate timeline  
188 and was not delivered to intervention schools until after the evaluation period.

189 Splash staff conducted a site engagement meeting with school administration and worked with the  
190 school to organise a family ‘soap drive’ and ‘menstrual pad drive’ during school registration,  
191 whereby families of pupils are encouraged to donate hygiene products to the school to ensure  
192 availability of products throughout the year. Two ‘focal teachers’ per school were trained to  
193 promote the WASH programme and organise a 20 to 30-pupil ‘hygiene club’ at each school. The one-  
194 day training for hygiene focal teachers covered safe water and water conservation, handwashing,  
195 personal hygiene, sanitation, and hygiene clubs and action planning. Two additional female focal  
196 teachers and one male focal teacher were trained to organise a ‘gender club’ focussed on MHM,  
197 which took place over two days with 20–30 girls and 20–30 boys trained on MHM. The gender club  
198 focal teachers were trained in puberty, menstrual health and discussing sensitive topics. Focal  
199 teachers then organised parent-teacher association orientation and delivered information on MHM  
200 to parents. School janitors, maintenance staff, and food handlers also received training on hygiene  
201 and operation and maintenance of infrastructure.

202 Splash staff also supported focal teachers in training the hygiene club members to influence their  
203 peers through monitoring handwashing during breaks, ensuring soap availability at handwashing  
204 stations, delivering hygiene messaging during school announcements, and assisting in planning  
205 event days promoting hygiene school-wide. Members held monthly meetings to track progress and  
206 bring issues and requests to school leadership. Within the menstrual health programme, all  
207 children aged 10 years and older received an education session on puberty and menstruation,  
208 including a Q&A session and product demonstration for girls, and a puberty workshop for boys.  
209 Peer mentoring of younger girls by older girls took place over four sessions. Menstrual health event  
210 days were also organised.

211 Interventions included behavioural ‘nudges’<sup>22</sup> to subtly guide pupils towards the intended  
212 behaviours, such as mirrors and posters at handwashing stations, and brightly coloured vests for  
213 hygiene club members to wear during handwashing monitoring.

214 School engagement and training began in November 2021, and all infrastructure components were  
215 installed (excluding sanitation infrastructure) and core training modules delivered by January 2022  
216 in all 30 intervention schools. School and pupil enrolment activities took place concurrent with

217 intervention delivery (November to December 2021); therefore, outcomes assessed at enrolment  
218 were not included in the primary impact assessment.

219 Between May and July 2021, data collection tools and methods for school and pupil enrolment and  
220 routine follow-up surveys were piloted in five randomly selected schools not included in the  
221 primary impact evaluation where Splash implemented the WISE intervention in 2020 / 2021.  
222 During piloting, in-country data collection partners followed full study procedures outlined below,  
223 with one minor variation: follow-up of sentinel classrooms occurred three weeks after enrolment  
224 and only one round of follow-up occurred. The study pilot was used to assess the logistics of field  
225 data collection, verify assumptions made in sample size calculations, and test and adapt MHM  
226 scales. Minor adjustments to class selection procedures were made as a result.

227 Data collection activities were completed in one day per school. Following school enrolment and  
228 selection of sentinel classes, a team of trained enumerators visited the classrooms and conducted a  
229 detailed enrolment survey using tablets, one-to-one with assenting pupils (approximately 15  
230 minutes), including demographic information and household WASH access, self-reported number of  
231 full- and partial-days absent in the past week, causes of absence, and symptoms of infectious  
232 disease over the preceding two and seven days. These surveys were used to create a digital roster of  
233 pupils in sentinel classes, which was automatically updated as new pupils were enrolled or left the  
234 class during the academic year. A pupil identification number was assigned internally to all pupils  
235 on the roster to anonymously link their data across surveys.

236 Between March and June 2022, enumerators conducted four unannounced follow-up visits to  
237 sentinel classes in each school. At the first three follow-ups, enumerators took attendance using the  
238 digital rosters and conducted a brief survey with each pupil present (< five minutes) collecting data  
239 only on self-reported absence, causes of absence, diarrhoea and respiratory illness in the past week.  
240 Pupils absent from the initial enrolment survey completed the enrolment survey at the first follow-  
241 up visit they were present for, and were retrospectively marked as absent from all previous visits  
242 conducted while they had been enrolled at the school. If a pupil was absent from two consecutive  
243 follow-ups, enumerators were automatically prompted to ask teachers if the pupil had dropped out  
244 of school, and, if they had, to note the date of dropout and reason for dropout if known.

245 At the final follow-up, attendance was taken and all outcomes were assessed, including wellbeing  
246 and menstrual health outcomes. Pupils meeting inclusion criteria for the Strengths and Difficulties  
247 Questionnaire<sup>23</sup> (aged 11 and above), and the menstrual health measures (post-menarcheal girls  
248 aged ten and above) were identified and given their pupil identification number to link their  
249 records with these self-completed paper-based questionnaires.

250 Age or date of birth (if known) and gender were self-reported by pupils at enrolment. At the final  
251 follow-up, age and date of birth were double-checked to ensure accuracy and updated. Age at  
252 enrolment was calculated based on the updated records.

## 253 **Outcomes**

254 All outcomes were measured at the individual participant level. The primary health outcomes were  
255 pupil-reported diarrhoea (defined as occurrence of at least three loose stools in a 24-hour period)  
256 and pupil-reported respiratory illness (defined as occurrence of cough, sneezing or rhinorrhoea) in  
257 the past seven days. Both were recorded at each follow-up visit as dichotomous variables. The  
258 primary absence outcome was roll-call absence, recorded at each follow up as a dichotomous  
259 variables.

260 Secondary outcomes were pupil-reported absence (number of full days reported absent out of  
261 number of days of reporting in the past week); pupil-reported diarrhoea and pupil-reported  
262 respiratory illness in the past two days; Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ-25)<sup>23</sup> total  
263 difficulties score, a widely used measure of pupil behavioural and mental health challenges  
264 designed for use among school-aged children that has been used in a number of Sub-Saharan  
265 African countries,<sup>24</sup> measured among children aged 11–16 at final follow-up; Self-efficacy in  
266 Addressing Menstrual Needs Scale (SAMNS-26)<sup>25</sup> total score, a measure of girls' confidence in  
267 addressing their menstrual needs; and Menstrual Practice Needs Scale (MPNS-36)<sup>26</sup> total score, a  
268 measure of how well current menstrual practices are perceived to meet the girls' needs, with  
269 SAMNS-26 and MPNS-36 both measured among post-menarcheal girls aged 10–16 at final follow-  
270 up.

271 Other outcomes were absence due to illness, diarrhoea, and respiratory illness; seven- and two-day  
272 occurrence of earache (negative control for illness outcomes, as earache is not feasibly affected by  
273 the intervention); child subjective wellbeing assessed through a smiley faces visual analogue (1–5  
274 scale, with 5 being the best mood possible and 1 the worst); Sanitation-related Quality of Life  
275 (SanQoL-5) applying attribute weights from a study in Ethiopia [preprint];<sup>27</sup> change in gender  
276 parity in school enrolment over the academic year using the adjusted gender parity index;<sup>28</sup> and  
277 SAMNS-26 and MPNS-36 sub-scales.

## 278 **Statistical analysis**

279 Sample size calculations were based on estimating the mean difference between arms in pupil-level  
280 proportions of illness or absence across the follow-ups. Assuming the mean pupil-level proportions  
281 of follow-ups reporting diarrhoea in the control group was 0.08 (SD 0.05), a two-sided type I error  
282 ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.05, and intracluster correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.15 (conservatively; ICC estimates for  
283 pupil-reported illness outcomes in our pilot study ranged from 0.07–0.10), we estimated 50 schools

284 (25 per arm) with 100 children per school was sufficient to detect a reduction in the mean  
285 proportion of follow-ups with diarrhoea of 0.016 (standardised effect size 0.32). This standardised  
286 effect size equates to a reduction in mean proportion of follow-ups reporting respiratory infection  
287 of 0.084 and a reduction of 0.022 in the mean proportion of follow-ups absent as assessed through  
288 roll call at each follow up, based on SD estimates from pilot data. Schools were oversampled to  
289 account for cluster attrition; we randomised 60 schools to meet the sample size of 50 schools with  
290 17% attrition.

291 The statistical analysis plan was pre-registered on 1st March 2023<sup>29</sup> before allocation was revealed.  
292 Analyses were done by intention-to-treat. Characteristics of the children and schools at enrolment  
293 were summarised by treatment arm. Statistical analyses of the outcomes were conducted at the  
294 individual level with mixed effects regression models, using logistic (for pupil-reported illness, roll-  
295 call absence and causes of absence outcomes), binomial (pupil-reported absence i.e. number of days  
296 reported absent with offset of number of days of reporting), linear (SDQ-25, SAMNS-26, MPNS-36,  
297 SanQoL-5 and gender parity in enrolment), and ordered logistic (subjective wellbeing) regression  
298 models as appropriate. We additionally carried out a confirmatory analysis based on the mean  
299 proportion of episodes per pupil. Analyses included a random effect for school and analyses based  
300 on repeated measures included an additional random effect for pupil-level clustering, and assumed  
301 a constant treatment effect across time-points. Primary estimates of effectiveness were calculated  
302 using a basic model adjusting for stratification factors alone: school size and presence of  
303 kindergarten classes. Further adjustments in secondary analyses were made for school grade and  
304 gender, and a fully adjusted model also adjusted for school location by sub-city, and time-point in  
305 analyses of repeated measures. Interaction tests were used to examine the differential effect of the  
306 intervention by gender, and across time-points on the three primary outcomes. We examined  
307 factors associated with missing outcome data (due to absence) at the final follow-up, and conducted  
308 exploratory sensitivity analyses of primary outcomes adjusting for factors associated with  
309 missingness. Sensitivity analysis including all pupils enrolled in the sentinel classes regardless of  
310 age was also performed. We used Stata version 18.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) for all  
311 analyses.

312 This trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT05024890.

### 313 **Role of the funding source**

314 The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data  
315 interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in  
316 the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

## 317 Results

318 Of the 143 schools due to receive the intervention in 2021/2022 or 2022/2023, 83 were eligible  
319 (Figure 1) for the trial. None of the 60 schools that were randomly selected and consented to  
320 participation during school enrolment (2nd to 22nd November 2021) withdrew from the study. In  
321 total, 6,455 pupils were enrolled at any point in the trial, and 6,229 were later determined to be  
322 eligible by age. Of those eligible, 5,987 were enrolled during pupil enrolment (23rd November to  
323 22nd December 2021) and the remaining 242 were enrolled during follow-up, due to absence at  
324 enrolment (231) or joining the class midway through the academic year (11). Eighty-two pupils left  
325 classes (dropped out of school) during the study, most commonly due to transferring school or  
326 leaving the area. The number of pupils contributing data to outcome assessments is shown for each  
327 time-point in figure 1 and each analysis table; a detailed summary of observations for each outcome  
328 is found in Supplementary Table 1. For roll-call attendance, 6,166 (99·0%) pupils were registered in  
329 the sentinel classes (whether or not they were present) during follow-up, i.e. had not dropped out  
330 before the first follow-up. For pupil-reported repeated measures, 6,145 (98·6%) were present for at  
331 least one follow-up, balanced between study arms.

332 Of all eligible children enrolled, 52·6% were girls, the mean age was 12·1 years (SD 2·5), few (27%)  
333 had at least a basic sanitation service at home, but the majority (63%) reported their household  
334 having at least a basic water supply (Table 1). Pupils missing at final follow-up were similar to those  
335 present, except earning money for the household was associated with missingness (data not  
336 shown). There was a slight difference in school size across arms; other characteristics were  
337 balanced. Of the girls aged ten and above at the final follow-up, 48·5% (588/1212) in control  
338 schools and 45·3% (581/1063) in intervention schools had reached menarche, with median  
339 reported age at menarche 13 in both arms.

340 The mean proportion of follow-ups where pupils reported diarrhoea in the past seven days (co-  
341 primary health outcome) was 0·073 in control schools and 0·083 in intervention schools (Table 2),  
342 with no significant difference between study arms in the primary analysis adjusting for clustering  
343 and stratification factors (aOR 1·15; 95% CI 0·84 to 1·59; p=0·39). The mean proportion of follow-  
344 ups reporting respiratory illness in the past seven days (co-primary health outcome) was 0·278 in  
345 control schools and 0·248 in intervention schools, corresponding to a 16% relative reduction in the  
346 odds of pupil-reported respiratory illness in the past seven days during follow-up in the primary  
347 analysis (aOR 0·84; 95% CI 0·71 to 1·00; p=0·046). Mean proportion of follow-ups absent from roll-  
348 call was similar between arms (0·103 in control schools vs. 0·106 in intervention schools), with no  
349 significant difference in odds of absence (aOR 1·07; 95% 0·83 to 1·38; p=0·59) in the primary  
350 analysis.

351 Models with further covariate adjustments produced similar results (Supplementary Table 2), as  
352 did analysis based on mean differences in pupil-level proportions (Supplementary Table 3).

353 Among the secondary outcomes, effects on pupil-reported diarrhoea and respiratory illness in the  
354 past two days were similar in direction to the respective seven-day outcomes but with no evidence  
355 of differences between arms (Table 2). Pupils reported absence at a much lower rate than roll-call  
356 absence (mean proportion of school days reported absent was 0·056 in control schools and 0·055 in  
357 intervention schools), with no evidence of a difference between arms. We observed a small increase  
358 in SAMNS-26 total score in the intervention arm vs. control of three points on a 0–100 scale (mean  
359 difference 3·32; 95% CI 0·05 to 6·59;  $p=0\cdot046$ ). There was no evidence of differences in either  
360 MPNS-36 total score or SDQ-25 total difficulties score between arms.

361 We observed no evidence of effects on other outcomes, including causes of absence, pupil-reported  
362 earache (negative control for pupil-reported illness), subjected wellbeing measured through a  
363 smiley faces visual analogue scale, menstrual health sub-scales, and gender parity in enrolment  
364 (Supplementary Table 4), with the exception of past-week absence due to diarrhoea (aOR 0·59;  
365 95% CI 0·37 to 0·93;  $p=0\cdot024$ ), which was very rarely reported (mean proportion of follow-ups of  
366 0·008 in controls schools vs. 0·005 in intervention schools).

367 There was some evidence of effect modification by gender ( $p=0\cdot021$ ) for pupil-reported respiratory  
368 illness in the past seven days, with a greater intervention effect observed in boys (Figure 2).  
369 Findings for pupil-reported diarrhoea and roll-call absence were consistent across genders ( $p$ -value  
370 for interaction 0·96 and 0·54, respectively). There was no evidence of group-time interaction for  
371 pupil-reported respiratory illness ( $p=0\cdot31$ ) or diarrhoea ( $p=0\cdot67$ ), or roll-call absence ( $p=0\cdot89$ ).

372 Sensitivity analyses including all children in enrolled classes regardless of age, and adjusting for  
373 responsibility for household income generation (predictor of missingness at final follow-up) both  
374 produced similar findings (Supplementary Table 5).

## 375 Discussion

376 In the WISE cluster-randomised trial, we found a borderline significant reduction in pupil-reported  
377 respiratory illness in the past seven days, and no evidence of reductions in diarrhoea or absence  
378 from school. These results point to the potential success of Project WISE at interrupting  
379 transmission of respiratory pathogens by increasing handwashing with soap, as hand hygiene  
380 interventions have been associated with reductions in risk of acute respiratory illness of 24% for  
381 school-aged children in LMICs.<sup>2</sup> This finding is notable in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, an  
382 active global threat during the study period (2021–2022), suggesting that school-based WASH can  
383 prevent disease amid social mixing at school, even when pupils have limited WASH access at home.

384 The lack of impact on pupil-reported diarrhoea may not be surprising given that schools received  
385 water and hygiene components but not intended upgraded toilet facilities within the study duration  
386 – access to clean sanitation facilities that safely remove excreta can be critical to interrupt  
387 transmission of faecal-oral pathogens.<sup>30</sup> Providing safe, private spaces to change may be more  
388 important than menstrual products or sanitation technology in addressing menstruation-related  
389 absence<sup>31</sup> – one explanation for the lack of effect on girls' absence and the inconsistent effects on  
390 menstrual health outcomes, with only a small increase in menstrual care self-efficacy observed.  
391 School absence and wellbeing are multi-factorial; it seems feasible that the intervention (as  
392 received) may not have addressed enough factors to observe psychosocial and educational impacts.

393 The mixed effects of the WISE intervention on illness and absence are consistent with the existing  
394 literature,<sup>9</sup> including multiple rigorous randomised trials.<sup>19,32-34</sup> Impacts of WASH in schools are  
395 often context-specific and affected by factors such as local water access or underlying disease  
396 prevalence in the population.<sup>9</sup> The high rates of past-week respiratory illness in this population  
397 (mean proportion of follow-ups with the outcome in the control arm 0·276) compared to other  
398 primary outcomes (0·073 and 0·103 for diarrhoea and absence, respectively) may have contributed  
399 to observing an effect for this outcome alone. We were unable to distinguish COVID-19 from other  
400 respiratory infections; it is unknown whether this high prevalence would persist in subsequent  
401 years.

402 Strengths of the study include the 'open-cohort' design that allowed minimal participant attrition,  
403 and absence triangulated through multiple measurement approaches – we provide evidence that  
404 pupil-reported absence is under-reported compared to roll-call absence. The use of pupil-reported  
405 measures for health outcomes is a limitation; using more 'objective' measures, such as stool-based  
406 pathogen detection versus self-reported diarrhoea,<sup>35</sup> would help to minimise reporting bias, and  
407 enable differentiation of COVID-19 versus other respiratory infections. Concerns around bias in  
408 measuring illness among attendees are mitigated by the lack of differential absence rates between



409 study arms, however it is possible some illnesses were missed by not following absentees. Follow-  
410 up was limited to one academic year for logistical reasons, so we are unable to evaluate the long-  
411 term impacts, or the additional effect of the sanitation component once received. With one  
412 borderline significant effect among three primary outcomes (without correction for multiple  
413 comparisons), we were unable to obtain strong evidence for the effectiveness of the intervention.  
414 For practical reasons we were limited in the number of schools that could be randomised; it is  
415 possible that the intervention had smaller effects only detectable with a larger cluster-randomised  
416 trial.

417 This study provides evidence that a school-based water and hygiene intervention implemented on a  
418 large scale across a large city can impact respiratory illness among schoolchildren, and  
419 demonstrated the utility of unannounced visits for absence tracking. However, the greater impact  
420 observed among boys remains unexplained, and future evaluations should include methods to  
421 differentiate pandemic and seasonal infection. Further research is warranted to establish the  
422 relationships between WASH-related illness and downstream educational outcomes – including  
423 illness-related and overall absence, educational progression, and gender parity in education – and  
424 strengthen understanding of the expected impacts of WASH in schools across multiple domains.

## Contributors

SB contributed to methodology, formal analysis, accessed and verified underlying data, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing, decision to submit. AE contributed to project administration, methodology, writing – review & editing. CO, WA, EH and EA contributed to methodology, writing – review & editing. BL contributed to methodology, accessed and verified underlying data, writing – review & editing. OC contributed to conceptualisation, methodology, writing – review & editing. RD contributed to conceptualisation, methodology, supervision, writing – review & editing, decision to submit. All authors approved the final version and accepted responsibility for publication.

## Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

## Data sharing

Deidentified participant data, a data dictionary defining each field in the set, and code to reproduce analyses using Stata will be made available in the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine's Data Repository (<https://datacompass.lshtm.ac.uk>) with publication.

## Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the Children's Investment Fund Foundation, grant number 1907-03868. The authors would like to acknowledge the teachers, parents and pupils of the 60 schools in Addis Ababa who participated in the study and gave generously of their class time for this research. We also thank the *Splash* teams in Addis Ababa and Seattle for their assistance in the conduct of the study and coordination with schools. Lastly, we thank the survey staff from Holster International Research and Development Consultancy for their considerable efforts in data collection.

## References

1. Walker CL, Black RE. Diarrhoea morbidity and mortality in older children, adolescents, and adults. *Epidemiol Infect* 2010; **138**(9): 1215–26.
2. Ross I, Bick S, Ayieko P, et al. Effectiveness of handwashing with soap for preventing acute respiratory infections in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2023; **401**(10389): 1681–90.
3. Stehle J, Voirin N, Barrat A, et al. High-resolution measurements of face-to-face contact patterns in a primary school. *Plos One* 2011; **6**(8): e23176.
4. Lamdin DJ. Evidence of student attendance as an independent variable in education production functions. *J Educ Res* 1996; **89**(3): 155–62.
5. Ampiah JG, Adu-Yeboah C. Mapping the incidence of school dropouts: a case study of communities in Northern Ghana. *Comp Educ* 2009; **45**(2): 219–32.
6. Gakidou E, Cowling K, Lozano R, Murray CJ. Increased educational attainment and its effect on child mortality in 175 countries between 1970 and 2009: a systematic analysis. *Lancet* 2010; **376**(9745): 959–74.
7. Phillips-Howard PA, Caruso B, Torondel B, Zulaika G, Sahin M, Sommer M. Menstrual hygiene management among adolescent schoolgirls in low- and middle-income countries: research priorities. *Glob Health Action* 2016; **9**: 33032.
8. Chard AN, Trinies V, Edmonds CJ, Sogore A, Freeman MC. The impact of water consumption on hydration and cognition among schoolchildren: Methods and results from a crossover trial in rural Mali. *Plos One* 2019; **14**(1): e0210568.
9. McMichael C. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in Schools in Low-Income Countries: A Review of Evidence of Impact. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019; **16**(3): 359.
10. Bowen A, Ma H, Ou J, et al. A cluster-randomized controlled trial evaluating the effect of a handwashing-promotion program in Chinese primary schools. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2007; **76**(6): 1166–73.
11. Duijster D, Monse B, Dimaisip-Nabuab J, et al. 'Fit for school' - a school-based water, sanitation and hygiene programme to improve child health: Results from a longitudinal study in Cambodia, Indonesia and Lao PDR. *BMC Public Health* 2017; **17**(1): 302.
12. Talaat M, Afifi S, Dueger E, et al. Effects of hand hygiene campaigns on incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza and absenteeism in schoolchildren, Cairo, Egypt. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2011; **17**(4): 619–25.
13. Biswas D, Ahmed M, Roguski K, et al. Effectiveness of a Behavior Change Intervention with Hand Sanitizer Use and Respiratory Hygiene in Reducing Laboratory-Confirmed Influenza among Schoolchildren in Bangladesh: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2019; **101**(6): 1446–55.
14. Sangalang SO, Lemence ALG, Ottong ZJ, et al. School water, sanitation, and hygiene (WaSH) intervention to improve malnutrition, dehydration, health literacy, and handwashing: a cluster-randomised controlled trial in Metro Manila, Philippines. *BMC Public Health* 2022; **22**(1): 2034.

15. Sclar GD, Garn JV, Penakalapati G, et al. Effects of sanitation on cognitive development and school absence: A systematic review. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* 2017; **220**(6): 917–27.
16. Freeman MC, Greene LE, Dreibelbis R, et al. Assessing the impact of a school-based water treatment, hygiene and sanitation programme on pupil absence in Nyanza Province, Kenya: a cluster-randomized trial. *Trop Med Int Health* 2012; **17**(3): 380–91.
17. Trinies V, Garn JV, Chang HH, Freeman MC. The Impact of a School-Based Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Program on Absenteeism, Diarrhea, and Respiratory Infection: A Matched-Control Trial in Mali. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2016; **94**(6): 1418–25.
18. UNICEF WHO. Core Questions and Indicators for Monitoring WASH in Schools in the Sustainable Development Goals. *World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland* 2016.
19. Freeman MC, Clasen T, Dreibelbis R, et al. The impact of a school-based water supply and treatment, hygiene, and sanitation programme on pupil diarrhoea: a cluster-randomized trial. *Epidemiol Infect* 2014; **142**(2): 340–51.
20. Benschaul-Tolonen A, Zulaika G, Nyothach E, et al. Pupil Absenteeism, Measurement, and Menstruation: Evidence from Western Kenya. *CDEP-CGEG Working Paper* 2019; (74).
21. Aunger R, Curtis V. Behaviour Centred Design: towards an applied science of behaviour change. *Health Psychol Rev* 2016; **10**(4): 425–46.
22. Hollands GJ, Shemilt I, Marteau TM, et al. Altering micro-environments to change population health behaviour: towards an evidence base for choice architecture interventions. *BMC Public Health* 2013; **13**: 1218.
23. Goodman R, Meltzer H, Bailey V. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a pilot study on the validity of the self-report version. *Int Rev Psychiatry* 2003; **15**(1–2): 173–7.
24. Hoosen N, Davids EL, de Vries PJ, Shung-King M. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) in Africa: a scoping review of its application and validation. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health* 2018; **12**(1): 6.
25. Hunter EC, Murray SM, Sultana F, et al. Development and validation of the Self-Efficacy in Addressing Menstrual Needs Scale (SAMNS-26) in Bangladeshi schools: A measure of girls' menstrual care confidence. *Plos One* 2022; **17**(10): e0275736.
26. Hennegan J, Nansubuga A, Smith C, Redshaw M, Akullo A, Schwab KJ. Measuring menstrual hygiene experience: development and validation of the Menstrual Practice Needs Scale (MPNS-36) in Soroti, Uganda. *BMJ Open* 2020; **10**(2): e034461.
27. [preprint] Akter F, Banze N, Capitine I, et al. The Sanitation-related Quality of Life index (SanQoL-5)–validity and reliability in rural and urban settings in Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, and Zambia. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3887658/v1>
28. Fiske EB. World atlas of gender equality in education: Unesco; 2012.
29. Bick S, Opondo C, Leurent B, Allen E, Dreibelbis R. WISE Evaluation – Statistical Analysis Plan. 01/03/2023 2023. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.22194298>.
30. Wolf J, Hubbard S, Brauer M, et al. Effectiveness of interventions to improve drinking water, sanitation, and handwashing with soap on risk of diarrhoeal disease in children in low-income and middle-income settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2022; **400**(10345): 48–59.

31. Murnane RJ, Ganimian A. Improving educational outcomes in developing countries: Lessons from rigorous impact evaluations. *NBER Working Paper* 2014; (w20284).
32. Chard AN, Garn JV, Chang HH, Clasen T, Freeman MC. Impact of a school-based water, sanitation, and hygiene intervention on school absence, diarrhea, respiratory infection, and soil-transmitted helminths: results from the WASH HELPS cluster-randomized trial. *J Glob Health* 2019; **9**(2): 020402.
33. Caruso BA, Freeman MC, Garn JV, et al. Assessing the impact of a school-based latrine cleaning and handwashing program on pupil absence in Nyanza Province, Kenya: a cluster-randomized trial. *Trop Med Int Health* 2014; **19**(10): 1185–97.
34. Mbakaya BC, Lee P, Lee RLT. Effect of a school-based hand hygiene program for Malawian children: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Am J Infect Control* 2019; **47**(12): 1460–4.
35. Brown J, Cumming O. Stool-Based Pathogen Detection Offers Advantages as an Outcome Measure for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Trials. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2020; **102**(2): 260–1.

## Figure legends

*Figure 1. Trial profile*

*Figure 2. Gender-disaggregated intervention effects on primary outcomes*

143 schools in initial 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 school lists developed by *Splash*

60 excluded  
due to school serving only limited populations (special needs, secondary only, KG only) or prior *Splash* interventions

83 schools eligible

23 not randomised  
Note: schools are not allocated to the trial. Implementation status may be different but data will not be collected

60 randomised

Enrolment  
Nov–Dec 2021

**30 control schools allocated and enrolled**  
121 pupils ineligible (not aged 7–16)  
3119 eligible pupils in selected classes at enrolment.  
Median per school 103 (IQR 96–112)  
3026 (97.0%) present for initial enrolment survey.  
Median per school 100 (IQR 91–109)

**30 intervention schools allocated and enrolled**  
105 pupils ineligible (not aged 7–16)  
3099 eligible pupils in selected classes at enrolment.  
Median per school 104 (IQR 92–113)  
2961 (95.6%) present for initial enrolment survey.  
Median per school 100 (IQR 87–108)

8 pupils joined selected classes

39 pupils left classes  
16 moved from area  
9 transferred school  
2 illness / health  
2 family responsibilities  
1 employment  
1 academic performance  
8 unknown

1 pupil joined selected classes

22 pupils left classes  
11 moved from area  
3 transferred school  
3 illness / health  
1 family responsibilities  
1 behavioural issues  
3 unknown

Follow-up 1  
Mar 2022

3088 eligible pupils in selected classes at follow-up 1.  
Median per school 100 (IQR 95–112)  
2915 (94.4%) present for follow-up 1. Median per school 95.5 (IQR 89–103)

3078 eligible pupils in selected classes at follow-up 1.  
Median per school 104 (IQR 92–112)  
2867 (93.4%) present for follow-up 1. Median per school 94 (IQR 86–105)

1 pupil joined selected classes

1 pupil left classes  
1 behavioural issues

1 pupil joined selected classes

7 pupils left classes  
1 moved from area  
1 transferred school  
1 illness / health  
1 employment  
1 academic performance  
2 unknown

Follow-up 2  
Mar–Apr 2022

3088 eligible pupils in selected classes at follow-up 2.  
Median per school 100 (IQR 95–112)  
2871 (93.0%) present for follow-up 2. Median per school 94 (IQR 88–104)

3072 eligible pupils in selected classes at follow-up 2.  
Median per school 104 (IQR 90–112)  
2874 (93.6%) present for follow-up 2. Median per school 96.5 (IQR 86–104.5)

4 pupils left classes  
1 moved from area  
3 unknown

7 pupils left classes  
3 moved from area  
1 transferred school  
1 illness / health  
2 unknown

Follow-up 3  
Apr–May 2022

3084 eligible pupils in selected classes at follow-up 3.  
Median per school 100 (IQR 95–112)  
2609 (84.6%) present for follow-up 3. Median per school 91 (IQR 78–98)

3065 eligible pupils in selected classes at follow-up 3.  
Median per school 104 (IQR 90–112)  
2619 (85.5%) present for follow-up 3. Median per school 87 (IQR 77–99)

Final follow-up  
May–June 2022

3084 eligible pupils in selected classes at final follow-up. Median per school 100 (IQR 95–112)  
2661 (87.1%) present for final follow-up. Median per school 88.5 (IQR 82–99)


3065 eligible pupils in selected classes at final follow-up. Median per school 104 (IQR 90–112)  
2578 (85.4%) present for final follow-up. Median per school 86.5 (IQR 79–98)

Analysis


**30 control schools included in analysis**  
3128 eligible pupils in selected classes enrolled in study. Median per school 103 (IQR 96–114)  
3089 (98.8%) remain in selected classes at any follow-up. Median per school 100 (IQR 95–112)  
3075 (98.3%) present for at least one follow-up. Median per school 99.5 (IQR 95–112)

**30 intervention schools included in analysis**  
3101 eligible pupils in selected classes enrolled in study. Median per school 104 (IQR 92–113)  
3079 (99.3%) remain in selected classes at any follow-up. Median per school 104 (IQR 92–112)  
3071 (99.0%) present for at least one follow-up. Median per school 103.5 (IQR 91–112)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.08.24305021>; this version posted April 10, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Favours Intervention      Favours Control



.5

1

2

## Tables

	<i>Control</i>	<i>Intervention</i>
Number of pupils	3128	3101
Age in years, mean (SD)	12.2 (2.5)	12.0 (2.5)
Female gender	1674 (53.5%)	1603 (51.7%)
Time taken to travel to school, median (IQR)	15 (10, 30)	15 (10, 30)
Household responsibilities		
Collecting water	1666 (53.4%)	1741 (56.2%)
Earning money for household	75 (2.4%)	72 (2.3%)
Childcare	973 (31.1%)	945 (30.5%)
Household members, median (IQR)	5 (4, 6)	5 (4, 6)
At least basic household water supply*	1912 (61.1%)	1993 (64.3%)
At least basic household sanitation†	857 (27.4%)	815 (26.3%)
Number of schools	30	30
Sub-city		
Addis Ketema	3 (10.0%)	2 (6.7%)
Akaky Kality	2 (6.7%)	6 (20.0%)
Arada	3 (10.0%)	4 (13.3%)
Bole	2 (6.7%)	4 (13.3%)
Gulelle	3 (10.0%)	3 (10.0%)
Kirkos	5 (16.7%)	2 (6.7%)
Kolfe Keraniyo	5 (16.7%)	3 (10.0%)
Lemi Kura	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)
Lideta	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.0%)
Nifas Silk Lafto	5 (16.7%)	2 (6.7%)
Number of grades, median (IQR)	8 (8, 8)	8 (8, 8)
Number of pupils, median (IQR)	1112.5 (400, 1527)	935.5 (618, 1617)
Gender parity in enrolment,‡ mean (SD)	1.09 (0.11)	1.10 (0.10)
Number of disabled pupils, median (IQR)	33 (14, 75)	34 (18, 68)
Mean class size, mean (SD)	48.8 (12.7)	46.3 (9.3)
Number of classes enrolled in the study		
2	22 (73.3%)	19 (63.3%)
3	5 (16.7%)	10 (33.3%)
4	3 (10.0%)	1 (3.3%)

**Table 1. Characteristics of participants and schools at enrolment**

\*Defined as an improved facility not shared with other households. †Defined as drinking water from an improved source, with collection time not more than 30 minutes roundtrip. ‡Adjusted gender parity index.<sup>28</sup>



	Control		Intervention		Intervention effect		
	Pupils	Mean prop. of follow-ups with illness (SD)	Pupils	Mean prop. of follow-ups with illness (SD)	aOR* (95% CI)	p-value	ICC
Pupil-reported diarrhoea in past 7 days†	3075	0.073 (0.151)	3069	0.083 (0.160)	1.15 (0.83, 1.59)	0.39	0.088
Pupil-reported diarrhoea in past 2 days	3075	0.042 (0.112)	3070	0.050 (0.127)	1.22 (0.82, 1.83)	0.32	0.13
Pupil-reported respiratory illness in past 7 days†	3075	0.276 (0.269)	3070	0.248 (0.257)	0.84 (0.71, 1.00)	0.046	0.025
Pupil-reported respiratory illness in past 2 days	3075	0.187 (0.230)	3070	0.171 (0.219)	0.88 (0.73, 1.06)	0.18	0.029
	Pupils	Mean prop. of follow-ups absent (SD)	Pupils	Mean prop. of follow-ups absent (SD)	aOR* (95% CI)	p-value	ICC
Roll-call absent†	3088	0.103 (0.171)	3078	0.106 (0.171)	1.07 (0.83, 1.38)	0.59	0.051
	Pupils	Mean prop. of school days reported absent (SD)	Pupils	Mean prop. of school days reported absent (SD)	aOR* (95% CI)	p-value	ICC
Pupil-reported full-day absence in past week	3075	0.056 (0.090)	3070	0.055 (0.082)	1.01 (0.75, 1.36)	0.93	0.067
	Pupils	Mean score (SD)	Pupils	Mean score (SD)	aMD (95% CI)	p-value	ICC
SDQ-15 total difficulties score (0–40)	1829	10.1 (6.0)	1675	10.0 (6.0)	0.03 (-0.62, 0.68)	0.94	0.028
SAMNS-26 total score (0–100)	545	69.1 (17.9)	438	72.3 (18.6)	3.32 (0.05, 6.59)	0.046	0.060
MPNS-36 total score (0–3)	530	1.92 (0.39)	406	1.91 (0.39)	-0.01 (-0.08, 0.06)	0.81	0.051

**Table 2. Intervention effects on primary and secondary outcomes**

*Note:* Analyses include all eligible children with outcome data at the relevant follow-up. For repeated measures, we calculated a proportion of available follow-ups with illness / absent for each participant, and the mean and SD of these proportions across participants are shown. Analyses were adjusted for stratification variables (school size < or ≥1200 pupils, and presence of a kindergarten), with further adjusted models reported in Supplementary Table 2. All analyses included a random effect for school, and analyses based on repeated measures included an additional random effect for pupil-level clustering and assumed a constant treatment effect across time-points. \*For dichotomous outcomes, the estimated differences in means are reported in Supplementary Table 3. †Primary outcomes.