

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Socio-demographic, not environmental, risk factors explain fine-scale spatial patterns of diarrheal disease in Ifanadiana, rural Madagascar

Michelle V Evans^{1,2*}, Matthew H Bonds^{3,4}, Laura F Cordier⁴, John M Drake^{1,2}, Felana Ihantamalala^{3,4}, Justin Haruna⁴, Ann C Miller³, Courtney C Murdock^{1,2,5}, Marius Randriamanambtsoa⁹, Estelle M Raza-Fanomezananahary¹⁰, Bénédicte R. Razafinjato⁴, Andres Garchitorea^{4,11}

Supplementary Analysis of Wealth

A supplementary analysis was run using the same multi-model inference approach, but splitting the wealth index into an economic index, based on assets, and a housing index, based on housing materials and quality. Additionally, the amount of land owned by each household was separated from the economic index to use as its own variable, as initial analyses suggested that it may be driving the non-linearity in the wealth index.




Figure S1. Coefficients from logistic regression treating economic and housing indices separately. Error bars represent 95% CIs. Variables not included in the final averaged model are not plotted, and variables only included in a subset of the final top model set are plotted in grey. Variable importance is listed in the grey column.

This model fits slightly worse than the main model with an AUC of 0.645 and a Tjur's D of 0.025. The housing index covariate is not included in the final model, while the economic index remains.

Commune-level Incidence Global Models with Differing Random Effect Structures

We explored the following additional model structures that took into account spatial and temporal autocorrelation by including autoregressive errors (models 2 and 5), including the centroid of each commune as a spatially structured random effect (model 4), or including commune as a random effect (model 3 and 5).

Table S1. Comparison of initial global model error structures for commune-level incidence data. Including a random effect of commune resulted in the lowest AIC. More complex models including spatially-structured random effects or both an autoregressive error structure and a random effect of commune had convergence issues.

Model Number	Model Structure	df	AIC
1	None	16	3018.88
2	Autoregressive error	18	3001.85
3	Random effect of commune (factor)	17	2908.58
4	Spatially-structured random effect of commune	18	Did not converge
5	Autoregressive error by commune	18	Did not converge

Table S3. Top model set for commune-level incidence analysis. Seven models fell within 2 AIC of the top model and were included in the average model for the commune-level incidence analysis. Covariates not included in a model are denoted with “-”.

				socio-economic					climate			landcover				
delta	logLik	AICc	weight	water_improved	open_def	mother_ed	wealth	wealth^2	temp_lag1	rain_lag1	rain_cum6	forest	rice	developed	holiday	pivot
0.000	-1434.946	2890.293	0.093	0.534	-	-	-0.693	0.645	-0.224	-	0.183	-	-	-	0.806	0.587
0.318	-1436.142	2890.611	0.079	0.597	-	-	-0.745	-	-0.225	-	0.179	-	-	-	0.804	0.560
1.036	-1435.464	2891.329	0.056	0.713	-0.152	-	-0.829	-	-0.224	-	0.180	-	-	-	0.805	0.426
1.176	-1435.534	2891.469	0.052	0.585	-	-	-0.688	-	-0.225	-	0.179	-	-	-0.297	0.804	0.561
1.296	-1435.594	2891.589	0.049	0.775	-	-0.282	-0.705	-	-0.223	-	0.177	-	-	-	0.803	0.605
1.650	-1435.771	2891.943	0.041	0.599	-	-	-0.753	-	-0.257	0.060	0.151	-	-	-	0.807	0.556
1.721	-1435.806	2892.014	0.039	0.548	-	-	-0.866	-	-0.222	-	0.179	0.279	-	-	0.805	0.571

Healthcare Seeking Behavior Across Communes




Fig S2. Proportion of childhood DD cases where healthcare was sought at a CSB. Healthcare-seeking behavior was not consistent across sampling years for individual communes.