Sanitation-related empowerment resources are associated with women's well-being, anxiety, and depression: findings from Bangladesh, India, Senegal, and Uganda

Thea Mink[1], Madeleine Patrick[1], Amelia Conrad[1], Tanvir Ahmed[2], Srishty Arun[3], Vinod Ramanarayanan[3], Niladri Chakraborti[4], Y. Malini Reddy[5], Abhilaasha Nagarajan[4], Tanushree Bhan[1], Sheela S. Sinharoy[1¶], Bethany A. Caruso[1¶*]

[1] Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

[2] Department of Civil Engineering, Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh

[3] Civic Fulcrum, Chennai, India

[4] Indian Institute for Human Settlements, Chennai, India

[5] Administrative Staff College of India, Hyderabad, India

*Corresponding author

Email: bcaruso@emory.edu (BAC)

¶ Authors contributed equally

Abstract

Nascent public health research has identified linkages between sanitation experiences and mental health. The present study examined associations between sanitation-related empowerment resources (Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time) and mental health outcomes (well-being, depression, and anxiety).

We conducted a secondary analysis of cross-sectional data collected in 2021-2022 from household surveys of women in Bangladesh, India, Senegal, and Uganda (n = 2,122). The primary exposures were sanitation-related empowerment resources measured using the Agency, Resources, and Institutional Structures for Sanitation-related Empowerment (ARISE) Scales. Three outcomes were assessed: subjective well-being (World Health Organization Well-being Index, WHO-5), anxiety (General Anxiety Disorder measure, GAD-2), and depression (Patient Health Questionnaire, PHQ-2). Linear regressions of the WHO-5, PHQ-2, and GAD-2 scores on the four sanitation-related empowerment resources were conducted.

Overall mean scores for well-being were moderate, and overall mean scores for anxiety and depression indicated normal prevalence (well-being mean = 17.2, SD = 5.8, depression mean = 1.1, SD = 1.4; anxiety mean = 1.0, SD = 1.4). In the adjusted well-being model, there was a positive association between Privacy and well-being ($\beta = 2.0$, $p<.001$). In the adjusted depression model, there were negative associations between Bodily Integrity and depression ($\beta = -0.3$, $p=.002$) and between Privacy and depression ($\beta = -0.4$, $p<.001$). In the adjusted anxiety model, there were negative associations between all four resources and anxiety (Bodily Integrity $\beta = -0.7$, $p<.001$; Safety and Security $\beta = -0.3$, $p=.025$; Privacy $\beta = -0.3$, $p=.037$; Time $\beta = -0.2$, $p=.009$).

Our findings provide evidence of associations between women's sanitation-related resources of Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time and mental health. Sanitation initiatives should aim to enhance and evaluate women's experiences of these resources given their potential to benefit women's mental health and well-being.

1 Introduction

Sanitation is a human right and is considered essential for preventing infectious diseases and contributing to mental and social well-being [1, 2]. Despite the critical role of sanitation for human health, 3.5 billion people still lack access to safely managed sanitation, including an estimated 419 million who practice open defecation [3]. While the World Health Organization (WHO) acknowledges the importance of sanitation on mental and social well-being, most research to date has focused on infectious disease outcomes, including understanding the burden of poor sanitation on various infectious diseases and related sequelae, like stunting, and determining what interventions are most effective at preventing diarrheal disease [4, 5]. There is also a growing understanding that inadequate sanitation can pose broader risks to women's health in particular, including maternal mortality, gender-based violence and harassment, and unmet menstrual health needs [6-11]. As a result, there has been a call for more research on non-infectious disease outcomes, including mental health and general well-being, to more comprehensively understand how sanitation can impact health [12].

A small but growing body of research has identified linkages between negative sanitation experiences and adverse mental health outcomes. A systematic review and qualitative synthesis investigating how sanitation influences mental health found that an absence of sanitation-related privacy and safety negatively influenced well-being [13]. Specifically, women reported feeling anxiety when they perceived that they were exposed or were at risk of verbal, physical, or sexual assault. Qualitative studies have documented that sanitation-related conditions, like the physical environment (e.g., barriers to access), social restrictions and conflict, and sexual violence are related to women's psychosocial stress [14-16]. Additionally, a quantitative study conducted with women in rural Odisha, India found women's negative experiences and concerns, or 'sanitation insecurity,' to be associated with depression, anxiety, and poor well-being [17]. Notably, these associations were present even when women had access to a functional household latrine. This assessment was carried out using a measure of 'sanitation insecurity' that was created for the population engaged in rural Odisha, limiting comparability across other settings. Taken together, these findings provide an important foundation for understanding how women's sanitation experiences can influence mental health. However, further research is needed, particularly quantitative research that investigates sanitation experiences across diverse populations.

Research and practice are also increasingly seeking to understand the connection between sanitation and women's empowerment [18]. Empowerment is widely acknowledged to be a complex and multi-dimensional construct, and

the ‘resources’ dimension of empowerment may be most relevant to research on sanitation and mental health [18]. In the women’s empowerment literature, Kabeer defined resources as, “not only access, but also future claims, to both material and human and social resources” [19]. Similarly, the KIT Institute’s (KIT) conceptual framework of women’s empowerment defines resources as the, “tangible and intangible capital and sources of power that women and girls have, own or use individually or collectively in the exercise of agency” [20]. The framework includes three main types of resources that are central to women’s and girls’ empowerment: Critical Consciousness, Assets (includes Social Capital, Knowledge and Skills, Time, Financial and Productive Assets), and Bodily Integrity (includes Health, Safety and Security). A recent systematic review leveraged and adapted the KIT framework to understand how sanitation research has engaged empowerment and related domains and sub-domains [18]. From the review, the resources sub-domains of Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time were the most amenable to programmatic change and seemed to have the most potential to be linked to mental health outcomes [18].

The literature suggests several ways in which sanitation-related bodily integrity, safety and security, privacy, and time may influence women’s mental health. For bodily integrity, which includes women’s choices and control over their bodies, studies have found that women restricted food and water and suppressed urination and defecation because of poor sanitation conditions, contributing to stress [10]. Similarly, women have reported a lack of sanitation-related privacy and safety, especially when openly defecating, as a source of anxiety, fear, and shame [10, 14, 15, 21-23]. Women have also reported feeling worried when they have had limited time for their sanitation needs and responsibilities [10, 14]. While sanitation-related bodily integrity, privacy, safety and security, and time are relevant to women’s mental health and well-being, there is limited quantitative research that demonstrates associations between these resources and mental health outcomes [17, 24].

This study aimed to investigate how sanitation-related resources – Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time – are associated with key mental health outcomes (well-being, depression, and anxiety).

2 Methods

2.1 Study design

We conducted a secondary analysis of cross-sectional data collected for the Measuring Urban Sanitation and Empowerment (MUSE) project, which aimed to develop and validate measures of women’s sanitation-related

empowerment in urban areas of low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [25]. Surveys were conducted with women in eight cities across five countries in Asia and Africa: Meherpur and Saidpur, Bangladesh; Narsapur, Tiruchirappalli, and Warangal, India; Dakar, Senegal; Kampala, Uganda; and Lusaka, Zambia. Data collection occurred from August 12, 2021 to May 20, 2022. Further details about the study design were described in the MUSE protocol [25].

2.2 Participants and procedures

The study's eight cities were purposively selected because of their partnership with the Citywide Inclusive Sanitation (CWIS) program. Neighborhoods in each city were also purposively selected in collaboration with CWIS partners and local officials, except in Bangladesh, where neighborhoods were randomly selected from a sampling frame of all neighborhoods in the two cities. A random walk technique was used to select households from within each neighborhood and an adult woman was recruited from each selected household. In-person surveys were implemented by trained female enumerators who were fluent in the local languages of each location. Surveys were conducted with 5,744 women (720 in Meherpur, 730 in Saidpur, 720 in Narsapur, 735 in Tiruchirappalli, 703 in Warangal, 709 in Dakar, 713 in Kampala, and 715 in Lusaka). Further information on participants and procedures is provided elsewhere [25, 26].

2.3 Measures

2.3.1 Outcomes

We selected three outcomes – subjective mental well-being, depression, and anxiety – to assess different components of mental health. Scores for each outcome were calculated based on the measures' guidelines, which note that scores should be used for screening and not diagnosis.

We used the WHO Well-being Index (WHO-5) to measure subjective mental well-being. The measure has five statements (e.g., my daily life has been filled with things that interest me) with response options that range from 0 ('At no time') to 5 ('All of the time'). Summed scores range can range from 0-25, with lower scores indicating poorer well-being [27].

We used the two-item Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-2) to assess depression [28]. The PHQ-2 asks the frequency over the last two weeks of feeling 'little interest or pleasure in doing things' and 'feeling down, depressed, or

hopeless,' with response options ranging from 0 ('Not at all') to 3 ('Nearly every day'). The summed score can range from 0-6 from normal to severe depression; a score of 3 or more indicates that major depressive disorder is likely [28].

We used the two-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD-2) measure to assess anxiety [29]. The GAD-2 includes two items that ask the past two-week frequency of 'feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge' and 'not being able to stop or control worrying.' Response options range from 0 ('Not at all') to 3 ('Nearly every day'). The summed score can range from 0-6 from normal to severe anxiety, and a score of 3 or more indicates that anxiety disorder is likely [29, 30].

2.3.2 Exposures

The four primary exposures were sanitation-related empowerment resources – Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time – which were measured using the validated Agency, Resources, and Institutional Structures for Sanitation-related Empowerment (ARISE) Scales [26]. ARISE definitions of Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time can be found in **Table 1.** Resources scale scores were calculated as a simple, unweighted average of all items in each scale. The average scale scores can range from 0 to 4, with higher scores indicating greater sanitation-related empowerment resources [31].

Table 1. ARISE Scale definitions for Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time

Scale[1]	Definition[2]	Factors & items in scale	Response options	Score interpretation
Bodily Integrity	Women's control over their bodies and ability to access and use their preferred sanitation location	2 factors; 8 items	1 (Never) to 4 (Always)	Higher scores indicate women have more frequent satisfaction with sanitation location and less frequent withholding and suppression
Safety and Security	Women's freedom from acts or threats of violence (physical or sexual), coercion, harassment, or force when accessing and using sanitation locations or engaging in sanitation-related decision-making processes in the public sphere	5 factors; 18 items	1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree) (For 3 factors) 1 (Never) to 4 (Always) (For 2 factors)	Higher scores indicate women have lower perception of personal and other women's risk of sanitation-related harm
Privacy	Women's ability to maintain desired levels of privacy when accessing and utilizing sanitation locations	1 factor; 5 items	1 (Never) to 4 (Always)	Higher scores indicate that women have greater privacy for sanitation
Time	Women's control over their time and labor spent on sanitation-related tasks and activities	2 factors; 6 items	1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree)	Higher scores indicate women have lower perceptions of sanitation needs and

	responsibilities as a burden on women's time

[1] All scales include reverse-coded items
[2] Sanitation location is inclusive of sanitation facilities and open defecation

2.3.3 Covariates

We made a priori decisions to include the following individual-level characteristics as covariates, based on theory and literature: life stage, self-rated physical health, highest level of completed schooling, and perceived social support [17, 32-37]. Four life stage categories were defined based on age and marital status: 1 ('Unmarried, age 49 and younger'), 2 ('Married under three years'), 3 ('Married three years or more, age 49 and younger'), and 4 ('Over 49 years of age, any marital status')[32]. Self-rated physical health was measured by one question from the PROMIS global health subscale, which asks, "In general, how would you rate your physical health?" with response options ranging from 1 ('Poor') to 5 ('Excellent')[35]. Education completed (categorized as 'primary or less', 'secondary', and 'post-secondary') was used as a proxy for wealth [36, 37]. We assessed social support with the Multidimensional Scale for Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) [33]. This 12-item scale measures perceived social support from family, friends, and significant others [33]. We used the 8 items representing family and friends, as unmarried women were less likely to have a significant other [34]. Response options range from 0 ('Completely Disagree') to 4 ('Completely Agree'), and the mean score can range from 0 to 4, with higher scores indicating greater perceived social support.

We also included sanitation environment characteristics as binary covariates: latrine sharing status ('unshared' or 'shared'), lockable latrine, lighting along the way to latrine, lighting inside latrine, and physically challenging to access or use latrine [10, 14, 15].

2.4 Data Management and Analysis

We constructed an analytic dataset by pooling the data from Meherpur, Saidpur, Tiruchirappalli, Dakar, and Kampala. We excluded observations from Narsapur, Warangal, and Lusaka, because data were not collected in those three cities for Bodily Integrity. As noted above, we calculated scale scores for each of the four sub-domains of sanitation-related resources using all items in each scale; therefore, any observations with missing data for any item(s) within a scale were dropped. Additionally, the analytic sample for anxiety excluded observations from Dakar and Kampala because data were

not collected in those two cities for the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. Social support was included as a covariate in the anxiety model, because it was associated with anxiety in the pooled three-city model (Meherpur, Saidpur, Tiruchirappalli); however, social support was excluded as a covariate in the well-being and depression models, because it was not associated with either mental health outcome in the pooled three-city models.

Using the final analytic sample of all survey respondents with complete data (n = 2,122), we calculated univariate descriptive statistics for all study variables included in the analysis and then investigated associations between sanitation-related empowerment resources and mental health outcomes. We ran linear regressions of the WHO-5, PHQ-2, and GAD-2 scores on the four resources (Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time) to calculate β coefficients. We used continuous outcome scale scores (vs. cut-off categorical scores) because we were interested in participant mental health beyond screening thresholds. For each regression analysis, we ran unadjusted and adjusted pooled models. Unadjusted models included the sanitation-related empowerment resources. Adjusted models included the sanitation-related empowerment resources, along with individual characteristics covariates and sanitation environment covariates. All models controlled for city and adjusted for neighborhood-level clustering. Individual city models are included in the **S2-S14 Tables.**

We used Stata (version 18.0) for all analyses.

2.5 Ethics statement

Study protocols were reviewed and approved by ethics review committees in each site: Emory University in Atlanta, USA (IRB00110271), Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda (MAK-SHSREC Ref No. 2019-038), Comité National d'Ethique pour la Recherche en Santé in Dakar, Senegal (SEN21/85), International Institute of Health Management Research in New Delhi, India (IRB/2020-2021/001), and International Training Network-Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology in Dhaka, Bangladesh (1.003/2022/02). Participants in all cities received compensation (either cash or in-kind) in accordance with local policies and ethical requirements. All women provided informed consent (written: Kampala, Dakar, Tiruchirappalli; verbal: Meherpur, Saidpur) before participation in the study, and verbal consent was witnessed and documented by enumerators.

3 Results

3.1 Sample size and socio-demographic characteristics

185 The analytic sample included 2,122 participants with a mean age of 35 years (SD = 11.5), and included 414
186 unmarried women (20%), 83 women married under three years (4%), 1,407 women married three years or more (66%), and
187 218 over age 49 with any marital status (10%). The largest proportion (49%) reported completing secondary school, 36%
188 reported completing primary or less, and 15% reported completing post-secondary. The mean social support score was 3.1
189 (SD = 0.7), indicating high family and friend social support. A majority of the participants (71%) reported 'good', 'very good',
190 or 'excellent' physical health. For sanitation environment, 69% reported having an unshared latrine, 92% reported being
191 able to lock their latrine from the inside, 86% reported sufficient lighting inside their latrine, 93% reported sufficient lighting
192 along the way to their latrine, and 10% reported that they experienced physical challenges with using their latrine (**Table 2).**
193

Table 2. Demographic and sanitation environment characteristics of women respondents, by city (n = 2,122)

	City											
	Meherpur		Saidpur		Tiruchirappalli		Dakar		Kampala		Total	
	390		659		304		260		509		2,122	
Age mean, SD	34.6	9.8	32.3	9.2	33.2	8.4	44.2	15.7	34.0	12.2	34.7	11.5
Social support score[1] mean, SD	2.9	0.6	3.1	0.6	3.2	0.9	.	.	.	.	3.1	0.7
Life stage n, %												
Unmarried, age 49 and younger	8	2.1	75	11.4	39	12.8	34	13.1	258	50.7	414	19.5
Married under 3 years	14	3.6	31	4.7	15	4.9	5	1.9	18	3.5	83	3.9
Married 3 years or more, age 49 and younger	337	86.4	519	78.8	246	80.9	127	48.8	178	35.0	1407	66.3
Over 49 years, any marital status	31	7.9	34	5.2	4	1.3	94	36.2	55	10.8	218	10.3
Completed schooling n, %												
Primary or less	111	28.5	224	34.0	68	22.4	164	63.1	201	39.5	768	36.2
Secondary	228	58.5	371	56.3	136	44.7	68	26.2	233	45.8	1036	48.8
Post-Secondary	51	13.1	64	9.7	100	32.9	28	10.8	75	14.7	318	15.0
Self-rated physical health n, %												
Poor	9	2.3	5	0.8	4	1.3	9	3.5	19	3.7	46	2.2
Fair	149	38.2	291	44.2	22	7.2	60	23.1	49	9.6	571	26.9
Good	171	43.8	230	34.9	127	41.8	134	51.5	173	34.0	835	39.3
Very good	54	13.8	108	16.4	69	22.7	53	20.4	218	42.8	502	23.7
Excellent	7	1.8	25	3.8	82	27.0	4	1.5	50	9.8	168	7.9
Latrine sharing status n, %												
Shared	63	16.2	49	7.4	68	22.4	76	29.2	395	77.6	651	30.7
Unshared	327	83.8	610	92.6	236	77.6	184	70.8	114	22.4	1471	69.3
Latrine is lockable from inside n, %												
Yes	332	85.1	636	96.5	294	96.7	243	93.5	441	86.6	1946	91.7

No	58	14.9	23	3.5	10	3.3	17	6.5	68	13.4	176	8.3
Sufficient lighting inside latrine n, %												
Yes	351	90.0	633	96.1	296	97.4	241	92.7	302	59.3	1823	85.9
No	39	10.0	26	3.9	8	2.6	19	7.3	207	40.7	299	14.1
Sufficient lighting along way to latrine n, %												
Yes	380	97.4	643	97.6	301	99.0	235	90.4	408	80.2	1967	92.7
No	10	2.6	16	2.4	3	1.0	25	9.6	101	19.8	155	7.3
Physically challenging to use latrine n, %												
Yes	43	11.0	9	1.4	85	28.0	9	3.5	69	13.6	215	10.1
No	347	89.0	650	98.6	219	72.0	251	96.5	440	86.4	1907	89.9

[1] Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support data were not collected in Dakar and Kampala

3.2 Scores for well-being, depression, and anxiety

The overall mean scores for mental well-being were above the threshold of 13, indicating better well-being (mean = 17.2, SD = 5.8), though 19% (412) had well-being scores below 13, indicating poor well-being **(Fig 1 and Table 3)**. The overall mean scores for anxiety and depression were below the threshold of 3, indicating lower frequency of experiencing symptoms of both outcomes (depression mean = 1.1, SD = 1.4; anxiety mean = 1.0, SD = 1.4); however, 17% (356) had depression scores of 3 or more, indicating major depression disorder was likely and 12% (257) had anxiety scores of 3 or more, indicating anxiety disorder was likely **(Fig 1 and Table 3).** Well-being scores were moderately negatively correlated with anxiety and depression scores, and anxiety and depression scores were strongly positively correlated **(S1 Table).**

Fig 1. Boxplots of mental health outcome scores (well-being, depression, and anxiety), by city

Table 3. Mental health outcome scores (well-being, depression, and anxiety), by city

	City											
Mental Health Outcome	Meherpur		Saidpur		Tiruchirappalli		Dakar		Kampala		Total	
WHO-5 well-being score												
N		390		659		304		260		509		**2122**
Mean, SD	15.8	5.7	17.9	4.5	15	7.9	17.7	5.7	18.4	5.4	17.2	5.8
N, Proportion < 13 (poor well-being)	113	29.0	76	11.5	97	31.9	48	18.5	78	15.3	412	19.4
PHQ-2 depression score												
N		390		659		304		260		509		**2122**
Mean, SD	1.5	1.6	0.7	1.0	2.2	1.3	0.3	0.8	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.4
N, Proportion ≥ 3 (major depressive disorder likely)	87	22.3	37	5.6	141	46.4	9	3.5	82	16.1	356	16.8

GAD-2 anxiety score												
N		390		659		304		260		509		**2122**
Mean, SD	1.5	1.6	0.6	1.0	1.1	1.4	0.6	0.8	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.4
N, Proportion ≥ 3 (anxiety disorder likely)	82	21.0	31	4.7	47	15.5	9	3.5	88	17.3	257	12.1

3.3 Scores for sanitation-related Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time

The overall scores for Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, and Privacy were high and the overall score for Time was moderately high (Bodily Integrity mean = 3.7, SD = 0.4; Safety and Security mean = 3.5, SD = 0.4; Privacy mean = 3.8, SD = 0.5; Time mean = 3.2, SD = 0.5) (**Table 4)**.

Table 4. Sanitation-related empowerment resources scores of women respondents, by city

	City																	
	Meherpur			Saidpur			Tiruchirappalli			Dakar			Kampala			Total		
Resources	N	mean	SD	N	mean	SD	N	mean	SD	N	mean	SD	N	mean	SD	N	mean	SD
Bodily Integrity	390	3.7	0.4	659	3.9	0.2	304	3.8	0.3	260	3.7	0.4	509	3.5	0.4	**2122**	3.7	0.4
Safety and Security	390	3.5	0.4	659	3.7	0.3	304	3.4	0.4	260	3.5	0.3	509	3.5	0.4	**2122**	3.5	0.4
Privacy	390	3.4	0.9	659	3.9	0.2	304	3.8	0.4	260	3.9	0.3	509	3.7	0.4	**2122**	3.8	0.5
Time	390	3.1	0.5	659	3.2	0.5	304	3.1	0.5	260	2.8	0.5	509	3.4	0.5	**2122**	3.2	0.5

3.4 Regression results

We found that higher scores for each of the four sub-domains of sanitation-related resources were associated with higher scores for well-being and lower scores for depression and anxiety. Individual city models were more mixed in their associations between the resources and mental health outcomes.

3.4.1 Well-being

In the pooled adjusted well-being model, there was a positive association between Privacy and well-being (β = 2.0, p<.001), indicating that for each one-point increase in sanitation-related Privacy, well-being scores increased by two points. Well-being was not associated with Bodily Integrity (β = 0.9, p=.147), Safety and Security (β = 0.0, p=.964), or Time (β = 0.9, p=.084) **(Table 5).**

222

Table 5. Association between sanitation-related empowerment resources sub-domains and **well-being (WHO-5)**, in the pooled sample

	Sanitation-related empowerment resources				Sanitation-related empowerment resources + individual characteristics + sanitation environment + city			
	Model 1 | Unadjusted				**Model 2 | Adjusted**			
Parameter	Estimate	SE	(95% CI)	p value	Estimate	SE	(95% CI)	p value
Intercept	0.02	1.97	-3.9 3.9	0.990	1.37	2.91	-4.4 7.1	0.638
Sanitation-related empowerment sub-domains								
Bodily Integrity	**1.34**	0.43	0.5 2.2	0.002	**0.85**	0.58	-0.3 2.0	0.147
Safety and Security	**0.38**	0.63	-0.9 1.6	0.548	**0.03**	0.71	-1.4 1.4	0.964
Privacy	**2.07**	0.32	1.4 2.7	<0.000	**1.98**	0.33	1.3 2.6	<0.001
Time	**0.97**	0.50	0.0 2.0	0.054	**0.85**	0.49	-0.1 1.8	0.084
Life stage (Stage 1: Unmarried, age 49 and younger as referent)								
Stage 2: Married under 3 years					-0.67	0.61	-1.9 0.5	0.270
Stage 3: Married 3 years or more, age 49 and younger					-1.41	0.34	-2.1 -0.7	<0.001
Stage 4: Over 49 years, any marital status					-1.13	0.79	-2.7 0.4	0.157
Education completed (Primary or less as referent)								
Secondary					0.48	0.32	-0.2 1.1	0.140
Post-secondary					0.34	0.44	-0.5 1.2	0.437
Self-rated physical health (Poor health as referent)								
Fair					1.58	0.79	0.0 3.1	0.048
Good					3.39	0.80	1.8 5.0	<0.001
Very good					5.43	0.92	3.6 7.3	<0.001
Excellent					3.60	1.30	1.0 6.2	0.007
City					0.21	0.07	0.1 0.3	0.002
Unshared latrine					-0.39	0.39	-1.2 0.4	0.320
Latrine is lockable					-0.84	0.44	-1.7 0.0	0.061
Sufficient latrine lighting inside latrine					0.51	0.40	-0.3 1.3	0.204
Sufficient latrine lighting along way to latrine					-0.39	0.57	-1.5 0.7	0.493
Physically challenging to access or use latrine					-2.93	0.72	-4.4 -1.5	<0.001

Models are clustered by neighborhood ID
Participants = 2122, Neighborhoods = 102

223

224 For individual-level characteristics, there was a negative association between women who were married for three
225 years or more and their subjective well-being (β = -1.4, p<.001). Additionally, there were positive associations of self-rated
226 physical health categories (fair through excellent, compared to poor health as referent) and well-being. For sanitation
227 environment characteristics, there was a negative association between reporting physical challenges accessing or using
228 latrines and well-being (β = -2.9, p<.001) **(Table 5)**.

229 In the individual city adjusted well-being models, we observed mixed associations between the four sub-domains
230 and well-being. There were positive associations in two cities between Bodily Integrity and well-being (Saidpur β = 5.1,
231 p<.001; Dakar β = 3.9, p=.011), as well as between Time and well-being (Saidpur β = 1.4, p=.022; Tiruchirappalli β = 5.9,
232 p<.001), but no associations between either Bodily Integrity or Time and well-being in the other cities. In contrast, for
233 Safety and Security, we observed a positive association with well-being in one city, Dakar (β = 5.0, p=.008), an inverse
234 association in another city, Tiruchirappalli (β = -8.1, p<.001), and no association in the remaining three cities. Similarly, for
235 Privacy, we observed positive associations in two cities (Meherpur β = 1.5, p<.001; Kampala β = 2.7, p<.001), an inverse
236 association in one city, Dakar (β = -3.6, p<.001), and no associations in the remaining two cities **(S2-S6 Tables)**.

237 ### 3.4.2 Depression

238 In the pooled adjusted depression model, there were negative associations between Bodily Integrity and
239 depression (β = -0.3, p=.002) and between Privacy and depression (β = -0.4, p<.001). Safety and Security was not associated
240 with depression (β = 0.1, p=.578), nor was Time (β = -0.1, p=.110) **(Table 6)**.
241

Table 6. Association between sanitation-related empowerment resources sub-domains and **depression (PHQ-2)**, in the pooled sample

	Sanitation-related empowerment resources				Sanitation-related empowerment resources + individual characteristics + sanitation environment + city			
	Model 1 | Unadjusted				**Model 2 | Adjusted**			
Parameter	Estimate	SE	(95% CI)	p value	Estimate	SE	(95% CI)	p value
Intercept	5.12	0.48	4.2 6.1	<0.000	5.24	0.45	4.3 6.1	<0.000
Sanitation-related empowerment sub-domains								
Bodily Integrity	**-0.47**	0.12	-0.7 -0.2	<0.000	**-0.30**	0.10	-0.5 -0.1	0.002
Safety and Security	**-0.22**	0.10	-0.4 0.0	0.028	**0.06**	0.11	-0.2 0.3	0.578
Privacy	**-0.41**	0.10	-0.6 -0.2	<0.000	**-0.42**	0.08	-0.6 -0.3	<0.001
Time	**0.03**	0.10	-0.2 0.2	0.774	**-0.13**	0.08	-0.3 0.0	0.110
Life stage (Stage 1: Unmarried, age 49 and younger as referent)								
Stage 2: Married under 3 years					0.03	0.13	-0.2 0.3	0.815
Stage 3: Married 3 years or more, age 49 and younger					0.17	0.08	0.0 0.3	0.026
Stage 4: Over 49 years, any marital status					-0.30	0.14	-0.6 0.0	0.030
Education completed (Primary or less as referent)								
Secondary					0.04	0.06	-0.1 0.2	0.503
Post-secondary					-0.02	0.09	-0.2 0.2	0.841
Self-rated physical health (Poor health as referent)								

Fair	-0.46	0.22	-0.9	0.0	0.036
Good	-0.99	0.23	-1.4	-0.5	<0.001
Very good	-1.41	0.25	-1.9	-0.9	<0.001
Excellent	-1.01	0.24	-1.5	-0.5	<0.001
City	-0.19	0.02	-0.2	-0.2	<0.001
Unshared latrine	0.21	0.08	0.0	0.4	0.012
Latrine is lockable	0.07	0.12	-0.2	0.3	0.552
Sufficient latrine lighting inside latrine	0.26	0.14	0.0	0.5	0.066
Sufficient latrine lighting along way to latrine	0.13	0.16	-0.2	0.4	0.426
Physically challenging to access or use latrine	0.49	0.15	0.2	0.8	0.002

Models are clustered by neighborhood ID
Participants = 2122, Neighborhoods = 102

For individual-level characteristics, there were mixed associations for life stage, with a positive association between 'stage 3: married three years or more' and depression (β = 0.2, p=.026) and a negative association between 'stage 4: over 49 years old' and depression (β = -0.3, P=.030). All self-rated physical health categories (fair through excellent, with poor health as referent) were negatively associated with depression. For sanitation environment characteristics, there was a positive association between having an unshared latrine and depression (β = 0.2, p=.012). Additionally, experiencing physical challenges to access or use a latrine was positively associated with depression scores (β = 0.5, p=.002) **(Table 6)**.

In the individual city adjusted depression models, we observed fewer associations between the four sub-domains and depression, compared to the results for well-being, but the observed associations were more consistent in their directionality. Specifically, there were negative associations between three of the sanitation-related empowerment resources (Bodily Integrity, Privacy, Time) and depression **(S7-S11 Tables)**. Bodily Integrity was negatively associated with depression in two of the five cities (Saidpur β = -1.1, p<.001; Dakar β = -0.3, p=.005). Similarly, Privacy was negatively associated with depression in two of the five cities (Dakar β = -0.9, p=.003; Kampala β = -0.8, p=.001). Time was negatively associated with depression in one city (Saidpur β = -0.4, p=.002). Safety and Security was not associated with depression in any of the five individual city models.

3.4.3 Anxiety

In the pooled adjusted anxiety model, there were negative associations between all four sanitation-related empowerment resources and anxiety (Bodily Integrity β = -0.7, p<.001; Safety and Security β = -0.3, p=.025**;** Privacy β = -0.3, p=.037; Time β = -0.2, p=.009) **(Table 7)**.

Table 7. Association between sanitation-related empowerment resources sub-domains and **anxiety (GAD-2)**, in the pooled sample

	Sanitation-related empowerment resources				Sanitation-related empowerment resources + individual characteristics + sanitation environment + city			
	Model 1 | Unadjusted				**Model 2 | Adjusted**			
Parameter	Estimate	SE	(95% CI)	p value	Estimate	SE	(95% CI)	p value
Intercept	7.38	0.58	6.2 8.5	<0.000	7.87	0.82	6.2 9.5	<0.001
Sanitation-related empowerment sub-domains								
Bodily Integrity	**-0.88**	0.15	-1.2 -0.6	<0.000	**-0.67**	0.15	-1.0 -0.4	<0.001
Safety and security	**-0.35**	0.14	-0.6 -0.1	0.016	**-0.33**	0.14	-0.6 0.0	0.025
Privacy	**-0.24**	0.14	-0.5 0.0	0.081	**-0.25**	0.12	-0.5 0.0	0.037
Time	**-0.28**	0.08	-0.4 -0.1	<0.000	**-0.23**	0.08	-0.4 -0.1	0.009
Life stage (Stage 1: Unmarried, age 49 and younger as referent)								
Stage 2: Married under 3 years					0.05	0.18	-0.3 0.4	0.776
Stage 3: Married 3 years or more, age 49 old and younger					0.18	0.10	0.0 0.4	0.075
Stage 4: Over 49 years, any marital status					0.49	0.21	0.1 0.9	0.024
Education completed (Primary or less as referent)								
Secondary					0.06	0.08	-0.1 0.2	0.488
Post-secondary					0.02	0.10	-0.2 0.2	0.863
Self-rated physical health (Poor health as referent)								
Fair					-0.86	0.41	-1.7 -0.1	0.037
Good					-1.24	0.42	-2.1 -0.4	0.004
Very good					-1.56	0.44	-2.4 -0.7	0.001
Excellent					-1.53	0.43	-2.4 -0.7	0.001
Social Support					-0.24	0.07	-0.4 -0.1	0.001
City					-0.06	0.01	-0.1 0.0	<0.001
Unshared latrine					0.13	0.12	-0.1 0.4	0.259
Latrine is lockable					0.30	0.16	0.0 0.6	0.077
Sufficient latrine lighting inside latrine					0.20	0.22	-0.2 0.6	0.363
Sufficient latrine lighting along way to latrine					-0.07	0.28	-0.6 0.5	0.808
Physically challenging to access or use latrine					0.41	0.16	0.1 0.7	0.012

Models are clustered by neighborhood ID
Participants = 1353, Neighborhood = 90

For individual-level characteristics, there was a positive association between life stage (stage 4: over 49 years old, any marital status) and anxiety (β =0.5, p=.024). Additionally, self-rated physical health categories (fair through excellent, with poor health as referent) were negatively associated with anxiety, and social support scores were negatively associated with anxiety (β = -0.2, p=.001). For sanitation environment characteristics, experiencing physical challenges to access or use a latrine was positively associated with anxiety (β = 0.4, p=.012) **(Table 7)**.

In the individual city adjusted anxiety models, as with depression, there were negative associations between three of the sanitation-related empowerment resources (Bodily integrity, Safety and Security, Time) and anxiety **(S12-S14 Tables)**. Bodily Integrity was negatively associated with anxiety in two of the three cities (Saidpur $\beta = -0.9$, $p<.001$; Tiruchirappalli $\beta = -0.6$, $p=.030$). Safety and Security was negatively associated with anxiety in one of the three cities (Tiruchirappalli $\beta = -0.7$, $p=.001$). Time was also negatively associated with anxiety in one city (Saidpur $\beta = -0.5$, $p=.001$). Unlike for well-being or depression, Privacy was not associated with anxiety in any of the three individual city models.

4 Discussion

This study examined relationships between sanitation-related empowerment resources (Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time) and mental health outcomes (well-being, depression, and anxiety) among women in urban areas of Bangladesh, India, Senegal, and Uganda. Higher Privacy scores were associated with higher well-being scores (indicating better subjective mental well-being) and lower depression and anxiety scores (indicating lower frequency of experiencing symptoms of depression and anxiety). In addition, higher Bodily Integrity scores were associated with lower depression and anxiety scores. Notably, higher scores for all four sanitation-related resources (Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time) were associated with lower anxiety scores. There was variation across city models, including mixed associations between resources and well-being.

Our study provides insights into women's mental health in urban areas across multiple LMIC settings. Overall, while mean well-being scores were moderate and mean depression and anxiety scores were in the normal range, 19% of women had scores suggesting poor overall well-being, 17% had scores suggesting depression, and 12% had scores suggesting anxiety. Further, scores varied across cities, with greater proportions of women having scores suggesting poor mental health in Meherpur, Bangladesh and Tiruchirappalli, India. Globally, depression and anxiety are among the top ten leading causes of disease burden, and both disorders are 50% more common in women compared to men [38]. Leading mental health experts have called for further understanding of the causes of mental health, and although this study only looked at associations, our findings suggest that women's sanitation-related resources may influence their mental health [38]. Our results provide support for these calls and reinforce the critical need for greater attention to women's mental health, particularly in LMIC settings.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine relationships between sanitation-related Bodily Integrity and mental health outcomes. Across contexts, we found higher Bodily Integrity scores (women having greater control over their bodies and ability to access and use their preferred sanitation location) were associated with lower scores for both depression and anxiety, indicating lower frequency of symptoms of depression and anxiety. We also found sanitation-related Bodily Integrity to be associated with higher well-being in two cities (Saidpur and Dakar). Aspects of women's bodily integrity, like suppressing urination and defecation urges and withholding food and water, have been increasingly discussed in sanitation research [18]. While these behaviors have been described as a form of bodily control, research demonstrates that women practice these behaviors to cope with unsupportive physical and social sanitation environments [7, 10, 14, 39-41]. As such, this exertion of bodily control is likely out of necessity, not preference, and may explain why Bodily Integrity was found to be associated with anxiety and depression across locations and with general well-being in two. For example, perceptions of sanitation facility cleanliness, privacy, safety, and adequacy (e.g., disposal bins for menstrual materials) can motivate suppression and withholding, as can social expectations, like deprioritizing personal needs to meet familial expectations (e.g., childcare, cooking), or limiting urination and defecation to specific times (e.g., dusk, dawn) to preserve dignity [10, 42-46]. A forthcoming study with women in Kampala, Uganda and Tiruchirappalli, India found that 93% of women in both populations reported suppression and 38% in Kampala and 16% in Tiruchirappalli reported withholding food and water; women's negative perceptions of Privacy, Safety and Security, and their personal health were all associated with increased odds of withholding [47]. The link our study found between Bodily Integrity and mental health demonstrates that an inability to meet needs or be satisfied with sanitation environments are not merely unfortunate inconveniences, but issues that pose real risks to women that should be addressed.

Our finding that higher sanitation-related Privacy scores were associated with higher scores for well-being and lower scores for depression and anxiety adds to our understanding of the relationship between sanitation-related privacy and women's mental health. Notably, we found Privacy scores to be associated with well-being and anxiety scores regardless of whether women had access to unshared sanitation facilities such as individual household latrines. This result aligns with a systematic review that found an absence of privacy influenced negative well-being and associated dimensions, like anxiety [13]. Sclar et al., identified that this pattern for privacy existed for women who practiced open defecation and for those who used unshared latrines, not only highlighting the importance of privacy across sanitation environments but emphasizing that access to an unshared facility can enable, but does not guarantee, privacy [13]. Our findings show that

320 privacy is important to mental health, and that sanitation initiatives have an opportunity to improve women's mental
321 health by enhancing sanitation-related privacy.

322 The observed inverse association between sanitation-related Safety and Security scale scores and anxiety scores
323 aligns with other research documenting women and girls' fears related to safety and security threats when accessing
324 sanitation. These included fear of harassment and non-partner physical and sexual violence, especially for those who
325 practiced open defecation or used sanitation facilities outside the home [18]. These fears were often linked to features of
326 sanitation facilities or locations such as lighting, lockability, and/or distance, and were especially intense for adolescent
327 girls, young women, and minorities [8, 9, 14, 15, 18, 44, 48]. These types of fears may provoke anxiety more so than
328 depression or overall poor well-being, which may explain why we did not observe an association between Safety and
329 Security and the other two outcomes in our sample. In our study, individual city models indicated that the relationship
330 between Safety and Security with anxiety was largely driven by the sample from Tiruchirappalli, which aligns with other
331 research from India, specifically from urban slums in Bhubaneswar where women reported fear of sexual assault when
332 accessing sanitation [14, 44]. Of the three cities in which we measured anxiety (Meherpur, Saidpur, and Tiruchirappalli), the
333 percentage of respondents who used a shared latrine was highest in Tiruchirappalli, which may further contribute to the
334 observed association.

335 This study also provides evidence that higher Time scores (indicating greater control over time and labor related to
336 sanitation) were associated with lower anxiety scores. Studies have documented that women need to spend considerable
337 time meeting personal sanitation needs, particularly if they need to travel to open defecation fields or shared latrines, as
338 well as for household sanitation chores and caring for the sanitation needs of dependents [10, 41, 49-52]. Earlier qualitative
339 research found that women have reported feeling anxiety and worry when they do not have access to latrines, have to
340 queue at latrines, or have experienced conflict at home for taking too long to meet sanitation needs [14, 53, 54]. Women
341 have also had to change their time of day for meeting sanitation needs to cope with a lack of privacy, safety, or access [10,
342 14]. The association between Time scores and anxiety scores suggests that time spent on sanitation needs and household
343 responsibilities can be a burden and negatively affect women's mental health.

344 4.1 Implications for research and practice

Our findings provide further evidence linking women's sanitation-related experiences to mental health and is the latest study to find that access to sanitation infrastructure alone is not enough to meet the needs of women [12, 13, 17]. As such, sanitation initiatives need to move beyond a narrow focus on feces management and should strive to improve women's experiences related to Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time resources. Specifically, sanitation facilities should be intentionally designed, situated, operated, and maintained to enhance women's experiences [15, 55, 56]. Existing guidance suggests design elements for female-friendly toilets, including proper lighting, lockable doors, and disposal bins [55, 56]. Other features like additional stalls in shared latrines to reduce queuing time and enough space for both women and dependents requiring toileting care, like children, may give women greater control over their time and labor spent on sanitation [55]. Similarly, guidance exists on gender-inclusive approaches that engage women to provide feedback and input on where and how facilities should be designed and placed [57]. Previous large-scale efforts that failed to include women in decision-making, placed household toilets in locations considered unacceptable, not private, and inconvenient, and so they were not used as a result [58]. Encouragingly, the recently published *Priority Gender-Specific Indicators for WASH Monitoring Under SDG Targets 6.1 and 6.2* recommends a new set of indicators for national and global monitoring that assess perceptions of cleanliness, privacy, and safety at the individual level [59]. These indicators are meant to further motivate practitioners and policymakers to consider how they can influence women's bodily integrity, safety and security, privacy, and time in sanitation programming.

Our study further demonstrates the value of measuring sub-domains of empowerment—in particular, Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time—as independent constructs, to understand gender-specific experiences related to sanitation in urban settings. For example, as noted above, in our pooled regression models, Privacy was the only one of the four sub-domains included in our study that was significantly associated with all three mental health outcomes (well-being, depression, and anxiety). While scale scores for Privacy were generally high across our study populations in the five cities, there were still women with privacy concerns. Future research and programs could use the ARISE Privacy scale, for example, to identify populations (or sub-populations) with lower Privacy scores and target these populations for future privacy-related infrastructural improvements. We recommend using the ARISE scales before sanitation programming begins to assess baseline needs and to measure changes in women's mental wellbeing during and after programs end. The ARISE scales can also be used to examine causal relationships between programs, sub-domains of empowerment, and health and

371 well-being outcomes for women. While the ARISE scales are designed for urban settings, other validated tools exist for rural
372 settings, such as the WASH-GEM, which can be used to measure similar constructs [60].

373 4.2 Strengths and limitations

374 This work contributes to a nascent body of research identifying linkages between sanitation-related experiences
375 and mental health outcomes. Our study leverages data from urban contexts in four countries, demonstrating that
376 relationships between sanitation-related resources and mental well-being are not limited to specific contexts or settings. In
377 addition, the research uses measures of sanitation-related empowerment that have been developed and rigorously
378 validated for use across urban contexts in Africa and South Asia, allowing for the consistent measurement of sub-domains
379 of empowerment across populations.

380 This study also has several limitations, which should be considered when interpreting the results. Our sample did
381 not include non-binary or transgender populations, as well as women sanitation workers, who have different sanitation and
382 mental health experiences [61-63]. Our analysis did not include several variables that may be associated with mental
383 health, such as wealth or housing quality [64]. While we were not able to control for wealth and assets in our models, we
384 included a variable for highest completed education in our analysis, as more years of education have been shown to have a
385 protective effect on mortality across economic contexts [37]. Additionally, we note that mental health measures have been
386 predominantly developed based on Western medicine-derived constructs [65, 66]. Our assessments of well-being,
387 depression, and anxiety were not based on local perceptions of these outcomes; rather, we used the previously validated
388 WHO-5, PHQ-2, and GAD-2 measures.

389 5 Conclusion

390 Overall, our findings support existing calls for a more comprehensive view of sanitation, which considers the
391 intersectional needs of women. Our results demonstrate important linkages between women's sanitation-related resources
392 of Bodily Integrity, Safety and Security, Privacy, and Time and mental health. Thus, sanitation infrastructure should include
393 features to improve women's bodily integrity, safety and security, privacy, and control over time. Evaluations of sanitation
394 interventions, programs, and environments should incorporate assessments of sanitation-related resources and mental
395 health outcomes for comprehensive assessments of impact beyond mere infrastructure availability. Sanitation-users'

396 perceptions of their resources are crucial, particularly for women. It is important to center their experiences in intervention

397 design and policymaking to ensure that sanitation investments contribute to – and do not detract from – overall well-being.

398

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Deepa Karthykeyan, Kun Zhang, Arjun Sharma, and Josephine Goma of Athena Infonomics; Shravya Narakula, Thejasweeni Bingisetty, and Vimalan Karunakaran of Civic Fulcrum; Catherine Mwanje of CME Solutions; Amadou Ba of People and Data; Alauddin Ahmed, Makfe Farah, Rakib Uddin Ahmed, and Samina of ITN-BUET; Kazi Amin of WaterAid Bangladesh; Tahmid Hossain of Practical Action; and Shaila Shahid of the Department of Public Health Engineering of the Bangladesh government for support, coordination, and supervision of study activities. We extend our gratitude to all members of the data collection teams in each city. We are also grateful to the Citywide Inclusive Sanitation (CWIS) partners for their input and support, especially Allan Nkurunziza and Hilda Sande Kwesiga of Kampala Capital City Authority. We are grateful to all study participants for sharing their time and contributing to the research.

409 # References

410 1. Guidelines on sanitation and health. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2018.

411 2. United Nations General Assembly. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 17 December 2015: The human
412 rights to safe drinking water and sanitation. 2015.

413 3. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2022: special focus on gender. New York:
414 United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and World Health Organization (WHO), 2023.

415 4. Freeman MC, Garn JV, Sclar GD, Boisson S, Medlicott K, Alexander KT, et al. The impact of sanitation on infectious
416 disease and nutritional status: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2017;220(6):928-49.

417 5. Wolf J, Hubbard S, Brauer M, Ambelu A, Arnold BF, Bain R, et al. Effectiveness of interventions to improve drinking
418 water, sanitation, and handwashing with soap on risk of diarrhoeal disease in children in low-income and middle-income
419 settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2022;400(10345):48-59.

420 6. Benova L, Cumming O, Campbell OM. Systematic review and meta-analysis: association between water and
421 sanitation environment and maternal mortality. Trop Med Int Health. 2014;19(4):368-87.

422 7. Kulkarni S, O'Reilly K, Bhat S. No relief: lived experiences of inadequate sanitation access of poor urban women in
423 India. Gend Dev. 2017;25(2):167-83.

424 8. Jadhav A, Weitzman A, Smith-Greenaway E. Household sanitation facilities and women's risk of non-partner sexual
425 violence in India. BMC Public Health. 2016;16(1):1139.

426 9. Winter SC, Barchi F. Access to sanitation and violence against women: evidence from Demographic Health Survey
427 (DHS) data in Kenya. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2016;26(3):291-305.

428 10. Caruso BA, Clasen TF, Hadley C, Yount KM, Haardörfer R, Rout M, et al. Understanding and defining sanitation
429 insecurity: women's gendered experiences of urination, defecation and menstruation in rural Odisha, India. BMJ Glob
430 Health. 2017;2(4):e000414.

431 11. Goddard S, Sommer M. Menstrual health and hygiene management and Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in
432 urban slums: Gaps in the evidence and recommendations. J Gend Water. 2020;7(1).

433 12. Wolf J, Johnston RB, Ambelu A, Arnold BF, Bain R, Brauer M, et al. Burden of disease attributable to unsafe drinking
434 water, sanitation, and hygiene in domestic settings: a global analysis for selected adverse health outcomes. Lancet.
435 2023;401(10393):2060 - 71.
436 13. Sclar GD, Penakalapati G, Caruso BA, Rehfuess EA, Garn JV, Alexander KT, et al. Exploring the relationship between
437 sanitation and mental and social well-being: A systematic review and qualitative synthesis. Soc Sci Med. 2018;217:121-34.
438 Epub 2018/10/14. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.09.016. PubMed PMID: 30316053.
439 14. Sahoo KC, Hulland KR, Caruso BA, Swain R, Freeman MC, Panigrahi P, et al. Sanitation-related psychosocial stress: a
440 grounded theory study of women across the life-course in Odisha, India. Soc Sci Med. 2015.
441 15. Shiras T, Cumming O, Brown J, Muneme B, Nala R, Dreibelbis R. Shared latrines in Maputo, Mozambique: exploring
442 emotional well-being and psychosocial stress. BMC Int Health Hum R. 2018;18. doi: 10.1186/s12914-018-0169-z. PubMed
443 PMID: WOS:000439937600001.
444 16. Bisung E, Elliott SJ. Psychosocial impacts of the lack of access to water and sanitation in low-and middle-income
445 countries: a scoping review. J Water Health. 2017;15(1):17-30. doi: 10.2166/wh.2016.158. PubMed PMID:
446 WOS:000394230100002.
447 17. Caruso BA, Cooper HLF, Haardorfer R, Yount KM, Routray P, Torondel B, et al. The association between women's
448 sanitation experiences and mental health: A cross-sectional study in Rural, Odisha India. SSM Popul Health. 2018;5:257-66.
449 Epub 2018/08/11. doi: 10.1016/j.ssmph.2018.06.005. PubMed PMID: 30094321; PubMed Central PMCID:
450 PMCPMC6077264.
451 18. Caruso BA, Conrad A, Patrick M, Owens A, Kviten K, Zarella O, et al. Water, sanitation, and women's
452 empowerment: A systematic review and qualitative metasynthesis. PLOS Water. 2022;1(6):e0000026.
453 19. Kabeer N. Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. Dev
454 Change. 1999;30(3):435-64.
455 20. van Eerdewijk A, Wong F, Vaast C, Newton J, Tyszler M, Pennington A. White paper: A conceptual model of women
456 and girls' empowerment. Amsterdam Royal Tropical Institute (KIT, 2017.
457 21. Hirve S, Lele P, Sundaram N, Chavan U, Weiss M, Steinmann P, et al. Psychosocial stress associated with sanitation
458 practices: experiences of women in a rural community in India. J Water Sanit Hyg Dev. 2015;5(1):115-26.

459 22. MacRae ER, Clasen T, Dasmohapatra M, Caruso BA. 'It's like a burden on the head': Redefining adequate menstrual
460 hygiene management throughout women's varied life stages in Odisha, India. PLoS One. 2019;14(8):e0220114.
461 23. Bisung E, Elliott SJ. 'Everyone is exhausted and frustrated': exploring psychosocial impacts of the lack of access to
462 safe water and adequate sanitation in Usoma, Kenya. J Water Sanit Hyg Dev. 2016:washdev2016122.
463 24. Winter SC, Obara LM, Barchi F. Environmental correlates of health-related quality of life among women living in
464 informal settlements in Kenya. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2019;16(20). doi: 10.3390/ijerph16203948. PubMed PMID:
465 WOS:000494779100162.
466 25. Sinharoy SS, Conrad A, Patrick M, McManus S, Caruso BA. Protocol for development and validation of instruments
467 to measure women's empowerment in urban sanitation across countries in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa: the Agency,
468 Resources and Institutional Structures for Sanitation-related Empowerment (ARISE) scales. BMJ Open. 2022;12(2):e053104.
469 26. Sinharoy S, Xia D, Patrick M, McManus S, Chipungu J, Reddy M, et al. The Agency, Resources, and Institutional
470 Structures for Sanitation-related Empowerment (ARISE) scales: Psychometric evaluation across Asia and Africa. Preprint
471 (version 1). 2024. doi: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4571408/v1.
472 27. World Health Organization. The World Health Organization-Five Well-being index (WHO-5). Geneva: World Health
473 Organization, 2024.
474 28. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The Patient Health Questionnaire-2 - Validity of a two-item depression
475 screener. Med Care. 2003;41(11):1284-92. doi: 10.1097/01.Mlr.0000093487.78664.3c. PubMed PMID:
476 WOS:000186270500008.
477 29. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW, Monahan PO, Löwe B. Anxiety disorders in primary care:: Prevalence,
478 impairment, comorbidity, and detection. Ann Inter Med. 2007;146(5):317-25. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-146-5-200703060-
479 00004. PubMed PMID: WOS:000244829600001.
480 30. Plummer F, Manea L, Trepel D, McMillan D. Screening for anxiety disorders with the GAD-7 and GAD-2: a
481 systematic review and diagnostic metaanalysis. Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2016;39:24-31. doi:
482 10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2015.11.005. PubMed PMID: WOS:000371244000004.
483 31. Sinharoy SS, McManus S, Patrick M, Mink T, Xia D, McKinley N, et al. The Agency Resources, and Institutional
484 Structures for Sanitation-Related Empowerment (ARISE) scales: User guide. 2023.

485 32. Parakh P. Gender issues in life event research in India: A critical appraisal of the presumptive stressful life events
486 scale. Asian journal of psychiatry. 2011;4(1):19-21. doi: 10.1016/j.ajp.2011.01.001. PubMed PMID: 23050909.
487 33. Zimet GD, Dahlem NW, Zimet SG, Farley GK. The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. J Pers Assess.
488 1988;52(1):30-41.
489 34. Mohanty J, Ahn J, Chokkanathan S. Adoption disclosure: experiences of Indian domestic adoptive parents. Child
490 Fam Soc Work. 2014.
491 35. Pilkonis P, Yu L, Dodds N, Johnston K, Maihoefer C, Lawrence S. Validation of the depression item bank from the
492 Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS®) in a three-month observational study. J Psychiatr
493 Res. 2014;56:112-9. doi: doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2014.05.010.
494 36. Sinharoy SS, Chery L, Patrick M, Conrad A, Ramaswamy A, Stephen A, et al. Prevalence of heavy menstrual bleeding
495 and associations with physical health and wellbeing in low-income and middle-income countries: a multinational cross-
496 sectional study. Lancet Glob Health. 2023;11(11):E1775-E84. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(23)00416-3. PubMed PMID:
497 WOS:001104130000001.
498 37. Balaj M, Henson CA, Aronsson A, Aravkin A, Beck K, Degail C, et al. Effects of education on adult mortality: a global
499 systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Public Health. 2024;9(3):e155-e65. doi: 10.1016/s2468-2667(23)00306-7.
500 PubMed PMID: WOS:001208538500001.
501 38. GBD 2019 Mental Disorders Collaborators. Global, regional, and national burden of 12 mental disorders in 204
502 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet Psychiatry.
503 2022;9(2):137-50.
504 39. Panchang SV, Joshi P, Kale S. Women 'holding it'in urban India: Toilet avoidance as an under-recognized health
505 outcome of sanitation insecurity. Glob Public Health. 2021:1-14.
506 40. Pouramin P, Nagabhatla N, Miletto M. A systematic review of water and gender interlinkages: Assessing the
507 intersection with health. Front Water. 2020;2:6.
508 41. Khanna T, Das M. Why gender matters in the solution towards safe sanitation? Reflections from rural India. Glob
509 Public Health. 2016;11(10):1185-201. doi: 10.1080/17441692.2015.1062905. PubMed PMID: WOS:000386829000001.
510 42. Routray P, Schmidt W-P, Boisson S, Clasen T, Jenkins MW. Socio-cultural and behavioural factors constraining
511 latrine adoption in rural coastal Odisha: an exploratory qualitative study. BMC Public Health. 2015;15(1):880.

512 43. Bhatt N, Budhathoki SS, Lucero-Prisno DEI, Shrestha G, Bhattachan M, Thapa J, et al. What motivates open
513 defecation? A qualitative study from a rural setting in Nepal. PLoS One. 2019;14(7). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0219246.
514 PubMed PMID: WOS:000484918700047.
515 44. Hulland KR, Chase RP, Caruso BA, Swain R, Biswal B, Sahoo KC, et al. Sanitation, stress, and life stage: A systematic
516 data collection study among women in Odisha, India. PLoS One. 2015;10(11):e0141883.
517 45. Winter S, Barchi F, Dzombo MN. Drivers of women's sanitation practices in informal settlements in sub-Saharan
518 Africa: a qualitative study in Mathare Valley, Kenya. Int J Environ Health Res. 2018;28(6):609-25. doi:
519 10.1080/09603123.2018.1497778. PubMed PMID: WOS:000445651200004.
520 46. Datta A, Ahmed N. Intimate infrastructures: The rubrics of gendered safety and urban violence in Kerala, India.
521 Geoforum. 2020;110:67-76. doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.01.016. PubMed PMID: WOS:000521513400007.
522 47. Sinclair E, Hüls, A., Patrick, M., Arun, S., Ramanarayanan, V., Sinharoy, S. S., Caruso, B. A. Association of privacy,
523 safety and security, and health with sanitation-related withholding and suppression among women in urban Uganda and
524 India (Forthcoming).
525 48. Corburn J, Hildebrand C. Slum sanitation and the social determinants of women's health in Nairobi, Kenya. J
526 Environ Public Health. 2015;2015:209505. doi: 10.1155/2015/209505. PubMed PMID: MEDLINE:26060499.
527 49. Scott K, George AS, Harvey SA, Mondal S, Patel G, Ved R, et al. Beyond form and functioning: Understanding how
528 contextual factors influence village health committees in northern India. Figshare; 2017.
529 50. Baker KK, Padhi B, Torondel B, Das P, Dutta A, Sahoo KC, et al. From menarche to menopause: A population-based
530 assessment of water, sanitation, and hygiene risk factors for reproductive tract infection symptoms over life stages in rural
531 girls and women in India. PLoS One. 2017;12(12). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0188234. PubMed PMID:
532 WOS:000417110700010.
533 51. Winter S, Dreibelbis R, Barchi F. Women's sanitation practices in informal settlements: A multi-level analysis of
534 factors influencing utilisation in Nairobi, Kenya. Glob Public Health. 2019;14(5):663-74. doi:
535 10.1080/17441692.2018.1534256. PubMed PMID: WOS:000461065000005.
536 52. Gonsalves GS, Kaplan EH, Paltiel AD. Reducing sexual violence by increasing the supply of toilets in Khayelitsha,
537 South Africa: A mathematical model. PLoS One. 2015;10(4). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0122244. PubMed PMID:
538 WOS:000353711600011.

539 53. Bapat M, Agarwal I. Our needs, our priorities; women and men from the slums in Mumbai and Pune talk about
540 their needs for water and sanitation. Environment and Urbanization. 2003;15(2):71-86.
541 54. Babbar K, Das U, Ashraf S, Shpenev A, Bicchieri C. Unlocking the role of social norms: How they shape women's
542 public toilet usage in India. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2023;109(5):1177-86. doi:
543 10.4269/ajtmh.23-0220. PubMed PMID: WOS:001130915100023.
544 55. Schmitt ML, Clatworthy D, Ogello T, Sommer M. Making the case for a female-friendly toilet. Water. 2018;10(9).
545 doi: ARTN 1193
546 10.3390/w10091193. PubMed PMID: WOS:000448821900085.
547 56. USAID W, WSUP. Female-friendly public and community toilets: a guide for planners and decision makers. London,
548 UK: WaterAid, 2018.
549 57. Spasojevic D, Batagol B, Prescott M, Nasir S, Mansfield R, Rahlina I, et al. Reflecting on water and wanitation
550 infrastructure: A toolkit for WASH practitioners on gender and socially inclusive participatory design approaches in urban
551 informal settlements. . 2022.
552 58. Routray P, Torondel B, Clasen T, Schmidt W-P. Women's role in sanitation decision making in rural coastal Odisha,
553 India. PLoS One. 2017;12(5):e0178042.
554 59. Caruso BA, Chipungu J, Hennegan J, Motivans A, Pandolfelli L, Patrick M, et al. Priority gender-specific indicators
555 for WASH monitoring under SDG targets 6.1 and 6.2: Recommendations for national and global monitoring. 2024.
556 60. MacArthur J, Chase RP, Gonzalez D, Kozole T, NicolettiI C, Toeur V, et al. Investigating impacts of gender-
557 transformative interventions in water, sanitation, and hygiene: Structural validity, internal reliability and measurement
558 invariance of the water, sanitation, and hygiene–Gender equality measure (WASHGEM). PLOS Water. 2024;3(10). doi:
559 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pwat.0000233.
560 61. Dubey P, Muthusamy S, Watkins SL, Baker KK, Story WT, Afifi RA. A qualitative inquiry into the lived experiences of
561 menstrual health and hygiene in the transgender and non-binary people in urban areas of India. Int J Transgend Health.
562 2024. doi: 10.1080/26895269.2024.2362915. PubMed PMID: WOS:001241976500001.

563 62. Defreyne J, Motmans J, T'Sjoen G. Healthcare costs and quality of life outcomes following gender affirming surgery
564 in trans men: a review. Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res. 2017;17(6):543-56. doi:
565 10.1080/14737167.2017.1388164. PubMed PMID: WOS:000415840300005.
566 63. Monteiro TS, Nalini R. Mental health at the intersections of marginalization: A conceptual model to explore the
567 mental health concerns of women sanitation workers in India. Asian Soc Work Policy Rev. 2021;15(2):102-11. doi:
568 10.1111/aswp.12223. PubMed PMID: WOS:000618191700001.
569 64. Lund C, Breen A, Flisher AJ, Kakuma R, Corrigall J, Joska JA, et al. Poverty and common mental disorders in low and
570 middle income countries: A systematic review. Soc Sci Med. 2010;71(3):517-28. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.04.027.
571 PubMed PMID: WOS:000280120100013.
572 65. Kleinman A. Rethinking Psychiatry: From Cultural Category to Personal Experience. New York: MacMillan
573 Publishing Co.; 1988. 256 p.
574 66. Lavender H, Khondoker A, Jones R. Understandings of depression: an interview study of Yoruba, Bangladeshi and
575 White British people. Fam Pract. 2006;23(6):651-8. doi: doi:10.1093/fampra/cml043.

576

Supporting information captions

S1 - S14 Tables


1.a Well-being scores (WHO-5)
WHO-5 Score
25
20
15
10
5
0
Meherpur
Saidpur
Tiruchirappalli
Dakar
Kampala
Maximum score
Quartile
Median
Quartile
Minimum score
Mean
Threshold
1.b Depression scores (PHQ-2)
PHQ-2 Score
6
4
2
0
Meherpur
Saidpur
Tiruchirappalli
Dakar
Kampala
1.c Anxiety scores (GAD-2)
GAD-2 Score
6
4
2
0
Meherpur
Saidpur
Tiruchirappalli
Dakar
Kampala

Figure