

 Open access • Posted Content • DOI:10.1101/2021.04.02.438233

Impact of an Urban Sanitation Intervention on Enteric Pathogen Detection in Soils

— [Source link](#) 

Drew Capone, David Berendes, Oliver Cumming, David A. Holcomb ...+7 more authors

Institutions: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, University of London, Georgia Institute of Technology ...+2 more institutions

Published on: 02 Apr 2021 - bioRxiv (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory)

Topics: Population

Related papers:

- [Human fecal and pathogen exposure pathways in rural Indian villages and the effect of increased latrine coverage](#)
- [Enteric pathogens from water, hands, surface, soil, drainage ditch, and stream exposure points in a low-income neighborhood of Nairobi, Kenya](#)
- [Fecal Fingerprints of Enteric Pathogen Contamination in Public Environments of Kisumu, Kenya associated with Human Sanitation Conditions and Domestic Animals](#)
- [Occurrence of Host-Associated Fecal Markers on Child Hands, Household Soil, and Drinking Water in Rural Bangladeshi Households](#)
- [Human fecal contamination of water, soil, and surfaces in households sharing poor-quality sanitation facilities in Maputo, Mozambique.](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/impact-of-an-urban-sanitation-intervention-on-enteric-4zqx0p2l3u>

IMPACT OF AN URBAN SANITATION INTERVENTION ON ENTERIC PATHOGEN DETECTION IN SOILS

Authors: Drew Capone¹, David Berendes², Oliver Cumming³, David Holcomb⁴, Jackie Knee³, Konstantinos T. Konstantinidis⁵, Karen Levy⁶, Rassul Nalá⁷, Benjamin B. Risk⁸, Jill Stewart¹, Joe Brown^{1*}

1. Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, United States of America
2. Waterborne Disease Prevention Branch, Division of Foodborne, Waterborne, and Environmental Diseases, National Center for Emerging Zoonotic and Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America
3. Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom
4. Department of Epidemiology, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, United States of America
5. Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, 311 Ferst Drive, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America
6. Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, University of Washington, 2980 15th Ave NE, Seattle, Washington, United States of America
7. Ministério da Saúde, Instituto Nacional de Saúde Maputo, Maputo, Mozambique
8. Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

*Corresponding author: Joe Brown

Phone: +1 919-360-8752

Email: joebrown@unc.edu

Address: 135 Dauer Dr, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

ABSTRACT

Environmental fecal contamination is common in many low-income cities, contributing to a high burden of enteric infections and associated negative sequelae. To evaluate the impact of a shared onsite sanitation intervention in Maputo, Mozambique on enteric pathogens in the domestic environment, we collected 179 soil samples at shared latrine entrances from intervention (n= 49) and control (n= 51) compounds during baseline (pre-intervention) and after 24 months (post-intervention) as part of the Maputo Sanitation Trial. We tested soils for the presence of nucleic acids associated with 20 enteric pathogens using a multiplex reverse transcription qPCR platform. We detected at least one pathogen-associated target in 91% (163/179) of soils and a median of 3 (IQR=1.5, 5) pathogens. Using a difference-in-difference analysis and adjusting for compound population, visibly wet soil, sun exposure, wealth, temperature, animal presence, and visible feces, we estimate the intervention reduced the probability of ≥ 1 pathogen detected by 15% (adjusted prevalence ratio, aPR=0.85; 95% CI: 0.70, 1.0) and the total number of pathogens detected by 35% (aPR =0.65; 0.44, 0.95) in soil 24 months following the intervention. These results suggest that the intervention reduced the presence of some fecal contamination in the domestic environment, but pathogen detection remained prevalent 24-months following the introduction of new latrines.

INTRODUCTION

Onsite sanitation systems are designed to sequester human feces away from human contact and prevent the transport of fecal-oral pathogens through well-understood transmission pathways.¹

Large-scale, rigorous randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of onsite sanitation systems – including sanitation alone and combinations of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) interventions – have found mixed effects on health outcomes, such as diarrhea and child growth.^{2–7} Assessing the impact of WASH interventions on enteric pathogens in the environment can improve our understanding of pathogen transmission from an infected individual to a new host via the environment, a core intermediate outcome of these trials. Such data may help explain why some WASH interventions observed improved health outcomes and others did not.⁸

There is a growing body of literature that soils contaminated by feces in public and domestic environments pose infection risks.^{9–13} In health impact trials that assess improved onsite sanitation systems, soils are assessed to measure how effectively the intervention sequestered human feces.^{14–18} Latrines and septic tanks are useful barriers against the transport of human feces into the environment. However, enteric pathogens may still move into soils through open defecation¹⁹, unhygienic pit emptying^{20,21}, fecally contaminated greywater^{22,23}, improper disposal of children's feces or anal cleansing materials^{24,25}, latrine flooding^{20,26,27}, animal feces^{28–30}, or subsurface transport from unlined pits^{31–33}. Domestic soils contaminated by enteric pathogens can pose infection risks beyond incidental³⁴ and direct³⁵ soil ingestion: contaminated soil may be transported to hands, food, fomites, or household stored water.³⁶ For these reasons, soils may be a useful matrix to assess the impact of onsite sanitation interventions.

Detecting enteric pathogens via molecular methods is increasingly used to assess the impact of WASH interventions on the transport of these pathogens through the environment.^{37–39}

Molecular detection of pathogens offers additional insights, as health impact studies have historically relied on fecal indicator bacteria (FIB), as a proxy for enteric pathogens for reasons of cost, capacity and feasibility.^{17,36,40–42} However, a 2016 meta-analysis⁴³ found that improved sanitation had no effect on the presence of FIB in the environment, possibly because these indicators are often pervasive in low-income settings^{15,16,36,44–46} and common FIB, like *E. coli*, may be naturalized in the environment^{47–49}.

The Maputo Sanitation (MapSan) Trial was the first rigorous controlled before-and-after trial to evaluate the effect of an urban onsite sanitation intervention on child health.^{24,50,51} We conducted the trial in low-income, informal neighborhoods in Maputo, Mozambique, where WASH conditions are poor, and the burden of enteric disease is high.^{20,24,44,52} Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP, a non-governmental organization) delivered the intervention to compounds composed of household clusters that shared sanitation and courtyard space. The intervention was built inside the compound boundary and was part of the households' living environment. WSUP replaced shared onsite sanitation systems in poor condition with pour-flush toilets that included septic tanks and soak-away pits (Text S1). Control compounds were concurrently enrolled from the same or adjacent neighborhoods as intervention compounds and continued using existing shared sanitation infrastructure. Detailed descriptions of the inclusion criteria for intervention and control compounds are described elsewhere.^{20,24}

A latrine entrance is an ideal soil sampling location to determine the effectiveness of onsite sanitation interventions because it is a standardized location near the fecal waste in the containment chamber.^{15,16,53} Soils in low-income Maputo are characterized as coarse to fine sand

or silty sand.⁵⁴ While the fate and transport of pathogens through soils is dependent on the individual pathogen and environmental conditions⁵⁵, the high porosity of Maputo's sandy soils combined with a high water table in the study area⁴⁴ offers potential for pathogen movement.⁵⁶ This high risk of fecal contamination suggests we could plausibly observe a reduction in enteric pathogens in soil at latrine entrances if the intervention infrastructure performed better than controls at safely containing fecal wastes.⁵⁷ Our study aim was to assess if the intervention reduced the detection of ≥ 1 pathogen, the total number of pathogens, or any individual pathogen in latrine entrance soils from MapSan intervention compounds compared to controls.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample Collection

We prospectively collected latrine entrance soil samples – defined as a location one-meter away from the latrine entrance in the direction of entry or the nearest point not covered by cement – from 49 intervention and 51 control compounds at baseline (pre-intervention) and from the same compounds 24-months following the intervention, for a total of 200 samples (Text S2). We defined this sample location *a priori* as one that could be standardized across all compounds in the study. Using a spade and ruler, we scooped a 10 cm x 10 cm x 1 cm volume of soil into a Whirl-Pak[®] bag (Nasco, Fort Atkinson, WI). The spade and ruler were sterilized between uses with 10% bleach and 70% ethanol. At the time of sampling, enumerators recorded whether the soil was visibly wet and estimated the daily sun exposure (full sun, partially shaded, full shade).⁴⁴ Samples were stored on ice for transport to the Ministry of Health in Maputo, Mozambique, frozen at -20°C for approximately six months, aliquoted into 2 ml cryovials while working on dry ice, and then stored at -80°C. During storage at -20°C, some samples (n = 21)

were unable to be evaluated because the permanent marker labeling on some Whirl-Pak[®] bags wore off and some bags burst open. All aliquoted samples (n = 179) were shipped from the Mozambican Ministry of Health in Maputo, Mozambique to Atlanta, GA, USA on dry ice (-80°C) with temperature monitoring for molecular analysis. We obtained compound observation data and socioeconomic characteristics from the MapSan baseline and 24-month survey datasets, which were collected concurrent to soil samples.^{24,58}

Sample Processing

At Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, GA, USA, we incubated 250 mg of each soil sample at 105°C for 1 hour to determine moisture content^{13,59}, then discarded the dry soil. We then extracted total nucleic acids from a separate 1-gram (calculated for dry weight) portion of each sample, and spiked samples with MS2 (Luminex Corporation, Austin, TX) as an extraction control. Following the manufacturer's protocol, we extracted RNA using the RNeasy PowerSoil Total RNA Kit and DNA using the RNeasy PowerSoil DNA Elution Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). On each day of extraction (approximately every 5-15 samples), we included one negative extraction control (sterile deionized water). We tested sample extracts for matrix inhibition using the Applied Biosystems Exogenous Internal Positive Control Assay⁶⁰ (Applied Biosystems, Waltham, Massachusetts) before downstream molecular analysis (Text S3).

We assayed extracted nucleic acids from all samples using a custom TaqMan Array Card (TAC) (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) that tested for 20 enteric pathogens in duplicate wells following Liu *et al.* 2013⁶¹, including ten bacteria (*Campylobacter jejuni/coli*, *Clostridium difficile* [*tcdA* and *tcdB* gene], Enteroaggregative *E. coli* [EAEC, *aaiC* and *aatA* gene], *Shigella*/Enteroinvasive *E. coli* [EIEC, *ipaH* gene], Enteropathogenic *E. coli* [EPEC, *bfpA* and

eae gene], Enterotoxigenic *E. coli* [ETEC, heat-labile and heat-stable enterotoxin gene], Shiga-toxin producing *E. coli* [STEC, *stx1* and *stx2*], *Salmonella* spp., *Vibrio cholerae*, and *Yersinia* spp.), five viruses (adenovirus 40/41, astrovirus, norovirus [GI and GII], rotavirus A, and sapovirus [I, II, IV, and V]), three protozoa (*Cryptosporidium parvum*, *Entamoeba histolytica*, and *Giardia duodenalis*) and two soil-transmitted helminths (*Ascaris lumbricoides*, *Trichuris trichiura*) (Text S4, Table S1, Table S2).⁶² We combined and then added 25 μ L of RNA eluant, 25 μ L of DNA eluant, and 50 μ L of mastermix into each TAC port. We included a positive and negative control on each TAC. The positive control was a plasmid that included all assay gene sequences and the negative control was either extract from a negative extraction control or sterile water.⁶³ The thermocycling conditions were as follows: 45°C for 10 minutes and 94°C for 10 minutes, followed by 45 cycles of 94°C for 30 seconds and 60°C for 1 minute, with a ramp rate of 1°C/second between each step. We visually compared exponential curves and multicomponent plots with the positive control plots to validate positive amplification¹²; positive amplification in one or both duplicate wells below a quantification cycle (Cq) of 40 was called as a positive for a target (Text S4).^{62,64}

Data analysis

We analyzed data in R version 4.0.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). We used a difference-in-difference (DID)⁶⁵ approach to assess the impact of the intervention – our exposure variable – on our outcomes compared to the control group. Our outcomes included the detection (i.e., binary presence/absence) of ≥ 1 of the enteric pathogens measured, the total number of pathogens detected out of 20, and a separate analysis for each pathogen individually. We used generalized estimating equations (GEE)⁶⁶ to fit unadjusted and adjusted Poisson regression models with robust standard errors, with an exchangeable correlation structure. We

accounted for clustering between compounds across the two study phases because the intervention was implemented at the compound level.⁶⁷

To generate adjusted estimates, we selected nine covariates from the MapSan baseline and 24-month datasets based on their biological plausibility to impact the transport⁵⁷ or persistence⁶⁸ of pathogens in the domestic environment and previously reported associations in the literature^{36,44} (Table S3). We used the same nine covariates to adjust all DID models: compound population (a 10-person increase in compound population), wealth (one-quartile increase in wealth index⁶⁹), soil moisture (assessed visually at the time of sampling), sun exposure status (estimated at the time of sampling; full sun, partially shaded, shaded⁴⁴), the mean-centered average air temperature in Fahrenheit for the day of and day preceding sample collection (i.e., two-day average), a binary variable for the presence of cats, a binary variable for the presence of dogs, a binary variable for the presence of chickens or ducks, and a binary variable for the presence of visible animal or human feces in the compound (Table S4).

To estimate the intervention's effect, we used the interaction of dummy variables representing treatment status (intervention vs. control) and trial phase (baseline or 24-month). Consequently, we present the effect estimates from our DID analysis as ratio measures (ratio of prevalence ratios, PR) instead of absolute differences. We fit separate GEE models to measure the association between intervention status and the detection of ≥ 1 pathogen and the total number of pathogens detected among the 20 targets we identified *a priori*. Likewise, we fit DID models to estimate the intervention's impact for each individual pathogen assessed, but we excluded any pathogen not detected in at least 5% of control and intervention samples during both phases.

Ethics

The study protocol was approved by the Comit  Nacional de Bio tica para a Sa de (CNBS), Minist rio da Sa de (333/CNBS/14), the Research Ethics Committee of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (reference # 8345), and the Institutional Review Board of the Georgia Institute of Technology (protocol # H15160). The overall trial was pre-registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02362932), but we did not pre-register this environmental analysis.

RESULTS (723 words)

Matched samples

We analyzed latrine entrance soils collected at baseline from 48 control compounds and 43 intervention compounds, and soils collected at the 24-month phase from 45 control and 43 intervention compounds (Table S4). We did not analyze twelve intervention samples and nine control samples because they were either lost or damaged during storage. This resulted in some samples collected at either phase not having a matched sample from the same compound from the earlier or later phase. Among the 93 control samples analyzed, 42 compounds had samples from both phases (n=84), six baseline samples did not have a matched 24-month phase sample, and three 24-month samples did not have a matched baseline sample. Among the 86 intervention samples analyzed, 41 compounds had samples from both phases (n=82), two baseline samples did not have a matched 24-month phase sample, and two 24-month samples did not have a matched baseline sample. There was a mean of 788 days between the collection of matched control samples (sd = 36, min = 733, max = 860) and a mean of 789 days between matched intervention samples (sd = 56, min = 731, max = 953). Control and intervention samples were collected approximately during the same period of the year (Figure S1).

Compound characteristics

Control and intervention compounds had similar wealth indices at baseline (mean= 0.47 [sd=0.09] and mean=0.46 [sd=0.09], respectively, $p=0.49$) but control compounds had higher wealth indices at the 24-month phase (mean=0.46 [sd=0.12] and mean=0.40 [sd=0.09], respectively, $p=0.05$) (Table 1). The number of residents in the intervention compounds was greater than control compounds at baseline (mean=19 [sd=7.8] and mean=14 [sd=6.4], respectively, $p=0.004$) and at the 24-month phase (mean=16 [sd=7.9] and mean=13 [sd=7.0], respectively, $p=0.02$) (Table 1).

Reported or observed animal ownership was high across trial arms during both phases (Table 1). Most compounds had at least one animal at baseline (62% [56/91]) including cats (50% [24/48] control, 53% [23/43] intervention), chickens or ducks (13% [6/48] control, 16% [7/43] intervention), and dogs (6.3% [3/48] control, 9.3% [4/43] intervention). Three-quarters of compounds had at least one animal 24-months post intervention (76% [67/88]): cats were most common (71% [32/45] control, 70% intervention [30/43]), followed by dogs (20% [9/45] control, 23% [10/43] intervention), and chickens or ducks (8.9% [4/45] control, 19% [8/43] intervention).

At baseline seven compounds had no useable sanitation infrastructure (6.3% [3/48] control, 9.3% [4/43] intervention) and three compounds had pour-flush sanitation (4.2% [2/48] control, 2.3% [1/43] intervention) (Table 1). Control compounds more often had pit latrines with slabs (56%, [27/48]) than without slabs (33%, [16/48]), compared to intervention compounds, which more often had pit latrines without slabs (56%, [24/43]) than with slabs (33%, [14/43]) ($p=0.09$). At the 24-month phase, most control compounds had a pit latrine (with slab 40%, [18/45]; without slab 31%, [14/45]), but some (29%, [13/45]) had independently upgraded their pit latrines to

pour-flush toilets. All intervention compounds (100%, [43/43]) still had the intervention sanitation infrastructure at the 24-month phase.

1 **Table 1. Characteristics of MapSan trial compounds and households selected for soil sampling**

			Baseline				24-Month Phase			
			Control		Intervention		Control		Intervention	
Characteristic	Level	Metric	N	Summary	N	Summary	N	Summary	N	Summary
Wealth index (0-1)	household	mean (sd)	48	0.47 (0.09)	43	0.46 (0.09)	45	0.44 (0.12)	43	0.40 (0.09)
Compound population	compound	mean (sd)	48	14 (6.4)	43	19 (7.8)	45	13 (7.0)	43	16 (7.9)
Any animal(s) present	compound	n (%)	48	28 (58%)	43	28 (65%)	45	32 (71%)	43	35 (81%)
Cat(s) present	compound	n (%)	48	24 (50%)	43	23 (53%)	45	32 (71%)	43	30 (70%)
Chicken(s) or duck(s) present	compound	n (%)	48	6 (13%)	43	7 (16%)	45	4 (8.9%)	43	8 (19%)
Dog(s) present	compound	n (%)	48	3 (6.3%)	43	4 (9.3%)	45	9 (20%)	43	10 (23%)
Other animal(s) present	compound	n (%)	48	1 (2.1%)	43	2 (4.7%)	45	1 (2.2%)	43	0 (0%)
Visible feces	compound	n (%)	48	22 (46%)	43	22 (51%)	45	4 (8.9%)	43	4 (9.3%)
Visibly wet soil	sample	n (%)	48	37 (77%)	43	34 (79%)	45	37 (82%)	43	34 (79%)
Partially shaded soil	sample	n (%)	48	24 (50%)	43	13 (30%)	45	30 (67%)	43	28 (65%)
Fully shaded soil	sample	n (%)	48	14 (29%)	43	20 (47%)	45	10 (22%)	43	9 (21%)
Temperature (°F)	date	mean (sd)	48	72 (4.5)	43	70 (4.3)	45	72 (4.7)	43	73 (5.3)
No useable sanitation infrastructure	compound	n (%)	48	3 (6.3%)	43	4 (9.3%)	45	0 (0%)	43	0 (0%)
Pit latrine with slab	compound	n (%)	48	27 (56%)	43	14 (14%)	45	18 (40%)	43	0 (0%)
Pit latrine without slab	compound	n (%)	48	16 (33%)	43	24 (56%)	45	14 (31%)	43	0 (0%)
Pour-flush toilet (non-intervention)	compound	n (%)	48	2 (4.2%)	43	1 (2.2%)	45	13 (29%)	43	0 (0%)
Intervention infrastructure	compound	n (%)	48	0 (0%)	43	0 (0%)	45	0 (0%)	43	43 (100%)

2 Note: Wealth index created using the 2013 Simple Poverty Scorecard© for Mozambique

3 *Laboratory Controls*

4 We did not observe inhibition in any sample (Text S3). We observed positive amplification for
5 all assays using our positive controls (n = 32). We did not observe positive amplification for any
6 assay in our extraction controls (n=16), nor any template controls (n=16) below a Cq of 40.

7 *All Pathogens*

8 We detected at least one pathogen in 91% (163/179) of latrine entrance soils, two or more
9 pathogens in 75% (134/179), and a mean of 3.4 out of 20 measured targets (IQR=3.5). The four
10 most frequently detected pathogens were *Ascaris lumbricoides* (62%, [111/179]), EAEC (46%,
11 [82/179]), *Giardia duodenalis* (36%, [64/179]), and astrovirus (26%, [47/179]). We found
12 evidence that the intervention reduced the detection of ≥ 1 pathogen in latrine entrance soils by
13 15% (aPR = 0.85, 95% CI [0.70, 1.0]) and the total number of pathogens by 35% (aPR = 0.65,
14 95% CI [0.44, 0.95]) (Table 2). The mean Cq values of detected pathogens were similar across
15 trial arms and phases (Table S5).

16 There was a consistent trend among all individual pathogens except for astrovirus: the adjusted
17 point estimates for nine of the ten most frequently detected had point estimates below 1.0 (Table
18 3). The confidence intervals around the adjusted DID estimates of effect were also below 1.0 for
19 three pathogen targets: *Ascaris lumbricoides* (aPR = 0.62, 95% CI [0.39, 0.98]), EAEC (aPR=0.51,
20 95% CI [0.27, 0.94]), and EPEC (aPR = 0.20 95% CI [0.05, 0.82]).

21 **Table 2. Detection of pathogens at baseline and 24-month**

Detection				
	Baseline Detection	24-month Detection	Unadjusted BL-24M DID estimate	Adjusted BL-24M DID estimate
≥1 pathogen				
control	0.88 (42/48)	0.96 (43/45)	0.82 (0.68, 1.0) p = 0.05	0.85 (0.70, 1.0) p = 0.11
intervention	0.95 (41/43)	0.86 (37/43)		
Total pathogen detects (out of 20)	Mean (IQR)	Mean (IQR)		
control	3.5 (4)	3.9 (3)	0.66 (0.44, 0.97) p = 0.03	0.65 (0.44, 0.95) p = 0.03
intervention	3.6 (3)	2.6 (3)		

22 Note: DID: difference-in-difference. BL: baseline. 24M: 24-month. IQR: Inter-quartile range

23 **Table 3. Detection of individual pathogens at baseline and 24-month. Sorted by detection in control soils at the 24-month phase.**
24

Pathogen				
	Baseline Detection	24-month Detection	Unadjusted BL-24M DID estimate [‡]	Adjusted BL-24M DID estimate [‡]
<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>				
control	0.65 (31/48)	0.76 (34/45)	0.64 (0.40, 1.0) p = 0.06	0.62 (0.39, 0.98) p = 0.04
intervention	0.63 (27/43)	0.44 (19/43)		
Enterogaagregative <i>E. coli</i>				
control	0.42 (20/48)	0.53 (24/45)	0.57 (0.30, 1.1) p = 0.08	0.51 (0.27, 0.94) p = 0.03
intervention	0.51 (22/43)	0.37 (16/43)		
<i>Giardia duodenalis</i>				
control	0.42 (20/48)	0.38 (17/45)	0.76 (0.34, 1.7) p = 0.50	0.85 (0.37, 1.9) p = 0.69
intervention	0.37 (16/43)	0.26 (11/43)		

<i>Shigella/Enteroinvasive E. coli</i>				
control	0.33 (16/48)	0.33 (15/45)	0.58 (0.17, 1.9) p = 0.37	0.59 (0.18, 1.9) p = 0.38
intervention	0.16 (7/43)	0.09 (4/43)		
<i>Enterotoxigenic E. coli</i>				
control	0.25 (12/48)	0.33 (15/45)	0.45 (0.17, 1.2) p = 0.10	0.44 (0.17, 1.1) p = 0.09
intervention	0.35 (15/43)	0.21 (9/43)		
adenovirus 40/41				
control	0.23 (11/48)	0.33 (15/45)	0.34 (0.08, 1.5) p = 0.19	0.32 (0.07, 1.5) p = 0.14
intervention	0.14 (6/43)	0.07 (3/43)		
astrovirus				
control	0.23 (11/48)	0.27 (12/45)	1.3 (0.51, 3.1) p = 0.62	1.6 (0.60, 4.0) p = 0.36
intervention	0.23 (10/43)	0.33 (14/43)		
<i>Enteropathogenic E. coli</i>				
control	0.15 (7/48)	0.24 (11/45)	0.20 (0.05, 0.88) p = 0.02	0.20 (0.05, 0.82) p = 0.03
intervention	0.21 (9/43)	0.07 (3/43)		
<i>Trichuris trichiura</i>				
control	0.31 (15/48)	0.18 (8/45)	1.0 (0.33, 3.2) p = 0.96	0.95 (0.32, 2.9) p = 0.93
intervention	0.28 (12/43)	0.16 (7/43)		
<i>Clostridium difficile</i>				
control	0.13 (6/48)	0.16 (7/45)	0.68 (0.17, 2.8) p = 0.59	0.70 (0.16, 3.0) p = 0.62
intervention	0.16 (7/43)	0.14 (6/43)		
<i>Cryptosporidium parvum</i>				
control	0.02 (1/48)	0.09 (4/45)	NA	
intervention	0.11 (5/43)	0.07 (3/43)		
<i>Salmonella spp.</i>				
control	0.02 (1/48)	0.09 (4/45)	NA	
intervention	0.05 (2/43)	0.05 (2/43)		
Shiga-toxin producing <i>E. coli</i>				
control	0.02 (1/48)	0.07 (3/45)	NA	
intervention	0 (0/43)	0.02 (1/43)		
<i>Campylobacter jejuni/coli</i>				

	control	0.15 (7/48)	0.04 (2/45)	NA	
	intervention	0.09 (4/43)	0.09 (4/43)		
<i>Yersinia spp.</i>					
	control	0.02 (1/48)	0.04 (2/45)	NA	
	intervention	0.05 (2/43)	0.05 (2/43)		
norovirus GI/GII					
	control	0.06 (3/48)	0.02 (1/45)	NA	
	intervention	0.07 (3/43)	0.02 (1/43)		
rotavirus A					
	control	0.08 (4/48)	0 (0/45)	NA	
	intervention	0.14 (6/43)	0.09 (4/43)		
<i>Entamoeba histolytica</i>					
	control	0.02 (1/48)	0 (0/45)	NA	
	intervention	0.02 (1/43)	0.02 (1/43)		
sapovirus I/II/IV/V					
	control	0 (0/48)	0 (0/45)	NA	
	intervention	0 (0/43)	0 (0/43)		
<i>Vibrio cholerae</i>					
	control	0 (0/48)	0 (0/45)	NA	
	intervention	0 (0/43)	0 (0/43)		

25 Note: DID: difference-in-difference.

26 †We did not calculate DID estimates for pathogens with <5% detection

27

28

29 DISCUSSION

30 We found evidence that the onsite shared urban sanitation intervention evaluated in the MapSan
31 trial was somewhat protective against the detection of ≥ 1 pathogen and against the total number
32 of pathogens in latrine entrance soils. The adjusted estimates for nine of the ten most common
33 pathogens were consistently protective (DID estimates = 0.20-0.95) and pathogen-specific effect
34 estimates from adjusted models were protective for *Ascaris lumbricoides*, EAEC, and EPEC.
35 This suggests that intervention septic tanks may have better sequestered or inactivated these
36 pathogens, which are passed in stool, compared with controls.

37 Most of the other pathogens we frequently detected in soils were measured in child stools via
38 multiplex end-point PCR as part of the MapSan trial, with the exception of EAEC, EPEC, and
39 astrovirus. At baseline, *Shigella*/EIEC (44%) and *Trichuris trichiura* (37%) – generally thought
40 to be transmitted human-to-human – were the second and third most common pathogens detected
41 in child stool^{24,50}, following *Giardia* (51%) which can be zoonotic⁷⁰. Given the high prevalence
42 of anthroponotic enteric pathogens in stools and the lack of a zoonotic reservoir for
43 *Shigella*/EIEC and *Trichuris trichiura*^{71,72}, the trial may have had greater power to observe an
44 effect on *Shigella*/EIEC and *Trichuris trichiura* compared with other pathogens. For children
45 born into study compounds before the 24-month visit, the intervention reduced the detection of
46 *Shigella*/EIEC in children's stools by 51% and *Trichuris trichiura* by 76%.⁵⁸ Results from soils
47 in this study differ from trial findings in stools: while we observed a 41% reduction in
48 *Shigella*/EIEC detection, we identified no difference with respect to detection of *Trichuris*
49 *trichiura*. This absence of impact on *Trichuris trichiura* in soils may have been due to limited

50 power from infrequent detection; we did observe a reduction in the other STH assessed, *Ascaris*
51 *lumbricoides*, which was the most frequently detected individual pathogen in soils. The MapSan
52 trial found the sanitation intervention reduced the detection of *Ascaris lumbricoides* by 32%
53 among children born into study compounds before the 24-month visit, but the confidence interval
54 included the null.⁵⁸ Overall, the protective trend we observed in soils, therefore, is consistent
55 with the enteric infection data for children born into trial compounds. This may suggest that the
56 intervention reduced the transport of pathogens to latrine entrance soils, and subsequently
57 contributed to a reduction in children's exposures, but our small sample size and the resulting
58 uncertainty of point estimates suggest results should be interpreted with caution.

59 Compared to other recent large-scale, rigorous trials of onsite sanitation improvements in rural
60 Bangladesh (pour flush to double-pit latrine)², rural Kenya (single unlined pit latrine with plastic
61 slab and hole-lid)³, and rural Zimbabwe (ventilated improved pit latrine)⁴, we evaluated a more
62 sophisticated intervention that included site-specific engineered septic tanks and subsurface
63 discharge of aqueous effluent to a soakaway pit^{24,73}, and it is the only recent controlled health
64 impact trial of onsite sanitation to take place in an urban setting. In the early 2000s, Barreto *et al.*
65 observed health benefits from household sewerage connections in urban Brazil in an
66 uncontrolled trial^{74,75}. However, the scope, complexity, and cost of that intervention make it an
67 imperfect point of comparison.

68 The WASH Benefits Trial (WASH-B) evaluated the impact of single and combined water,
69 sanitation, and handwashing intervention arms in rural Bangladesh and Kenya. In Bangladesh, a
70 molecular analysis of household entrance soils, hand rinses, and stored water from the sanitation
71 arm found no significant reductions in enteric pathogens (EAEC, EPEC, STEC, *Shigella*/EIEC,
72 ETEC, norovirus, *Cryptosporidium* spp., *Giardia duodenalis*) or microbial source tracking

73 markers (HumM2, BacCow).³⁸ The combined WASH arm and individual water treatment arm
74 observed a reduction in *E. coli* prevalence and concentration in stored drinking water; the
75 individual water treatment and handwashing arms reduced *E. coli* prevalence and concentration
76 in food. WASH-B trial arms in Bangladesh did not observe reductions in *E. coli* in courtyard
77 soil, ambient waters, child hands, or sentinel objects.^{76,77} Likewise, WASH-B Kenya found the
78 individual water treatment arm and combined WASH arm reduced culturable *E. coli* in stored
79 drinking water, but not along other transmission pathways.¹⁸ The Sanitation, Hygiene, Infant
80 Nutrition Efficacy Project (SHINE) trial in rural Zimbabwe has not yet published the results
81 from a sub-study on environmental fecal contamination. In separate analyses of environmental
82 samples collected during MapSan baseline¹⁵ and the 24-month phase^{13,21,44} we found widespread
83 fecal contamination in soils and other environmental compartments. At the 12-month MapSan
84 trial phase Holcomb *et al.* 2021 found the intervention reduced *E. coli* gene densities by more
85 than 1- \log_{10} in latrine entrance soils, but observed no reduction in culturable *E. coli* or human
86 microbial source tracking markers.⁷⁸ Our study is the first controlled evaluation of an urban
87 onsite sanitation intervention to show a decrease in the detection of enteric pathogens, via
88 molecular methods, in soils from the domestic living environment.

89 The intervention may have reduced the presence of enteric pathogens in soils compared with
90 controls because the intervention may have better sequestered or treated fecal material than
91 control latrines. In high-income countries, properly designed, constructed, and maintained septic
92 tank systems have been demonstrated to be efficient and economic alternatives to public sewage
93 disposal systems.⁷⁹ Although some pathogen die-off will occur in pit latrines, the primary
94 purpose of pit latrines is to sequester human feces and reduce exposures, and they are not
95 designed to achieve a specific level of pathogen reduction.⁸⁰ Design features of the intervention

96 septic tanks may have resulted in better treatment of fecal wastes than control systems.
97 Intervention septic tanks contained inlet and outlet pipes configured to maximize detention time,
98 baffles to direct incoming waste downward, t-pipes to ensure sequestration of solids and
99 floatable materials, and a sealed containment chamber to promote anaerobic treatment of stored
100 solids and non-settleable materials. In addition, the intervention septic tank systems represented
101 an upgrade to a more permanent sanitation infrastructure. The construction included masonry
102 block walls, a concrete floor, masonry block lined septic tank, masonry block lined soakaway pit,
103 tin roof, and a water seal squat pan.^{20,24,53,73} These features may have acted as a physical barrier
104 that prevented the contamination of soils by enteric pathogens. At the 24-month phase, most
105 control compounds used a pit latrine with or without a slab, and therefore lacked similar physical
106 barriers such as a water seal. In addition, the control compounds that did upgrade to pour flush
107 sanitation may not have used the same rigorous design criteria as intervention septic tanks.⁵⁰
108 The extent to which bacterial and viral pathogens may be transported from fecal sludges through
109 the surrounding soil depends on pit characteristics including presence of lining³² and the
110 hydrological and soil conditions.³¹ Protozoan cysts and helminth ova are unlikely to be
111 transported out of the pit and into surrounding soil because of their relatively large size.⁸⁰⁻⁸²
112 Lateral movement of viral pathogens from unlined or partially lined pit latrines to groundwater
113 has been demonstrated at distances up to 50 meters.^{31,83} This movement is often exacerbated by a
114 high water table³¹, which is present in the study neighborhoods.⁵³ While we were unable to
115 assess the lining of control latrines, it is unlikely control linings – if present – matched the
116 construction quality of intervention linings.
117 Pit latrines in low-income Maputo are often covered when full and rebuilt, or the fecal sludge is
118 emptied and buried or dumped nearby.²⁰ The intervention included programming to encourage

119 hygienic pit emptying and provided equipment and training to local organizations to offer
120 hygienic emptying services.⁷³ During the 24-month phase, intervention compounds emptied their
121 sanitation systems less frequently and were more likely to have their onsite systems emptied
122 hygienically than control compounds.²⁰ Less frequent emptying would have beneficial for two
123 reasons. First, longer residence times would likely have resulted in greater pathogen die-off.⁸⁰
124 Second, less frequent emptying would have created fewer opportunities for environmental fecal
125 contamination to occur and hygienic emptying may have reduced the quantity of fecal sludge
126 that contaminated soils during emptying. In addition, intervention systems contained a drain for
127 bathing, which may have prevented fecally contaminated graywater from flowing into nearby
128 soils, and the concrete floors were likely easier to clean than control systems with dirt floors.⁵⁶

129 Although our findings suggest that some pathogens appeared to be reduced by the latrine
130 improvements, it is likely that the potential for exposure remains high in this setting.¹³ While we
131 detected some individual pathogens, such as *Ascaris lumbricoides*, EAEC, *Shigella*/EIEC and
132 EPEC, in intervention soils less frequently compared to controls during the 24-month phase, we
133 also detected one or more enteric pathogens in 86% of intervention latrine entrance soils two
134 years post-intervention. Fecal waste from children unable to use the latrines was not addressed
135 by the intervention.^{28,84} At the 24-month follow-up, 29% (289/980) of children reported
136 defecating into a latrine, 29% (281/980) defecated into a child potty which was emptied into a
137 latrine, 20% (192/980) used disposable diapers that were disposed with solid waste, 7.3%
138 defecated on the ground (72/980), and 2.7% (26/980) defecated into diapers that were washed
139 and reused (Table S6). In addition, the intervention did not address animal feces. While we
140 adjusted for animals in our DID estimates, many animals are not penned in this setting and may
141 defecate outside of their respective compounds, which was not accounted for in our analysis.³⁰

142 Live chickens are also commonly purchased and stored in the compound for consumption.⁸⁵ We
143 may not have adequately captured this intermittent chicken ownership in our cross-sectional
144 surveys.

145 The similar reduction in pathogen detection in soils and child stools may be informative about
146 exposures. At two years post-intervention in the MapSan cohort, children born into study
147 compounds were 1-24 months old, while children born previously and enrolled at baseline were
148 25-73 months old.⁵⁸ Considering the consistent reduction in the detection of pathogens observed
149 in soils and stools from children 1-24 months old, the dominant exposure pathways for these
150 younger children may be inside the compound or soil ingestion may have represented a more
151 important transmission pathway for these children.⁸⁶ Older children are more mobile than
152 younger children, and their potential exposures outside of study compounds may explain why the
153 intervention did not reduce the prevalence of pathogen carriage among them.

154 Our study had several limitations, including a relatively small sample size that was not intended
155 to observe small reductions in pathogen detection. Nevertheless, in high burden settings,
156 sanitation interventions may need to achieve a large reduction in environmental fecal
157 contamination both within households and in the larger community to reduce exposure risks and
158 yield improved health outcomes.⁸⁷ Further, intervention compounds had lower wealth indices
159 and higher compound populations 24-months post intervention compared to control. This may
160 suggest we underestimated changes due to sanitation improvements, but we adjusted for these in
161 our regression analyses and did not observe substantial differences between unadjusted and
162 adjusted point estimates that would indicate confounding. In addition, we assessed gene targets
163 via molecular assays – which may not be 100% sensitive or specific^{61,88,89} – and not pathogen
164 viability or infectivity.

165 There is substantial evidence that city-wide upgrades to sewerage infrastructure improve health
166 outcomes.^{74,75,90} However, the high capital and maintenance costs⁹¹, and water usage
167 requirements⁹² of such improvements suggest they are currently impractical for many LMICs.
168 Until sewerage becomes widely feasible in high-burden settings, onsite sanitation systems
169 remain necessary to achieve safely managed sanitation in many urban areas. The results of this
170 study – and other rigorous environmental impact evaluations of onsite sanitation
171 interventions^{18,38,77} – suggest that fecal contamination is transported into the environment
172 through multiple complex pathways that may vary among settings.⁹³ In urban Maputo – and
173 similar settings with poor sanitation infrastructure, widespread environmental fecal
174 contamination, and a high burden of enteric infection – other, more transformative interventions
175 interrupting multiple transmission pathways may need to accompany improvements to onsite
176 sanitation infrastructure. These improvements likely require an integrated and incremental
177 approach that might include legal protections (e.g. land tenure)⁹⁴, contact control interventions
178 (e.g. hardscape cleanable flooring)^{13,95,96}, public infrastructure (e.g. drainage, and improvements
179 in quality, quantity, and access to water)⁹⁷, and public services (e.g. education, hygienic fecal
180 sludge and solid waste management)^{20,98,99}. Such improvements may reduce the transport of
181 enteric pathogens into the environment through site-specific pathways and subsequently reduce
182 children’s infection risks.

183 **Supplemental Information**

- 184 1. Text S1. Detailed description of the sanitation intervention
- 185 2. Text S2. Compound enrollment at baseline
- 186 3. Text S3. Test for Matrix Inhibition
- 187 4. Text S4. Custom TaqMan Array Card (TAC)

- 188 5. Table S1. Assays used on the custom TAC
- 189 6. Table S2. Interpretation of gene targets on the TAC
- 190 7. Table S3. Description of variables and their respective sources
- 191 8. Table S4. Soils samples matched at baseline and 24-month trial periods
- 192 9. Figure S1. Histogram of dates that latrine entrance soils were collected
- 193 10. Table S5. Mean Cq Values
- 194 11. Table S6. Child feces disposal at 24-month phase

195 **Notes**

196 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent
197 the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

198

199

200 **References**

- 201 (1) Wagner, E.; Lanoix, J. Excreta Disposal for Rural Areas and Small Communities. *Monogr*
202 *Ser World Heal. Organ.* **1958**, *39*, 1–182.
- 203 (2) Luby, S. P.; Rahman, M.; Arnold, B. F.; Unicomb, L.; Ashraf, S.; Winch, P. J.; Stewart, C.
204 P.; Begum, F.; Hussain, F.; Benjamin-Chung, J.; Leontsini, E.; Naser, A. M.; Parvez, S. M.;
205 Hubbard, A. E.; Lin, A.; Nizame, F. A.; Jannat, K.; Ercumen, A.; Ram, P. K.; Das, K. K.;
206 Abedin, J.; Clasen, T. F.; Dewey, K. G.; Fernald, L. C.; Null, C.; Ahmed, T.; Colford, J. M.
207 Effects of Water Quality, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutritional Interventions on
208 Diarrhoea and Child Growth in Rural Bangladesh: A Cluster Randomised Controlled Trial.
209 *Lancet Glob. Heal.* **2018**, *6* (3), e302–e315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214->
210 [109X\(17\)30490-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30490-4).
- 211 (3) Null, C.; Stewart, C. P.; Pickering, A. J.; Dentz, H. N.; Arnold, B. F.; Arnold, C. D.;
212 Benjamin-Chung, J.; Clasen, T.; Dewey, K. G.; Fernald, L. C. H.; Hubbard, A. E.; Kariger,
213 P.; Lin, A.; Luby, S. P.; Mertens, A.; Njenga, S. M.; Nyambane, G.; Ram, P. K.; Colford, J.
214 M. Effects of Water Quality, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutritional Interventions on
215 Diarrhoea and Child Growth in Rural Kenya: A Cluster-Randomised Controlled Trial.
216 *Lancet Glob. Heal.* **2018**, *6* (3), e316–e329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214->
217 [109X\(18\)30005-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30005-6).
- 218 (4) Humphrey, J. H.; Mbuya, M. N. N.; Ntozini, R.; Moulton, L. H.; Stoltzfus, R. J.; Tavengwa,
219 N. V.; Mutasa, K.; Majo, F.; Mutasa, B.; Mangwadu, G.; Chasokela, C. M.; Chigumira, A.;
220 Chasekwa, B.; Smith, L. E.; Tielsch, J. M.; Jones, A. D.; Manges, A. R.; Maluccio, J. A.;
221 Prendergast, A. J.; Humphrey, J. H.; Jones, A. D.; Manges, A.; Mangwadu, G.; Maluccio,

222 J. A.; Mbuya, M. N. N.; Moulton, L. H.; Ntozini, R.; Prendergast, A. J.; Stoltzfus, R. J.;
223 Tielsch, J. M.; Chasokela, C.; Chigumira, A.; Heylar, W.; Hwena, P.; Kembo, G.; Majo, F.
224 D.; Mutasa, B.; Mutasa, K.; Rambanepasi, P.; Sauramba, V.; Tavengwa, N. V; Van Der
225 Keilen, F.; Zambezi, C.; Chidhanguro, D.; Chigodora, D.; Chipanga, J. F.; Gerema, G.;
226 Magara, T.; Mandava, M.; Mavhudzi, T.; Mazhanga, C.; Muzaradope, G.; Mwapaura, M.
227 T.; Phiri, S.; Tengende, A.; Banda, C.; Chasekwa, B.; Chidamba, L.; Chidawanyika, T.;
228 Chikwindi, E.; Chingaona, L. K.; Chiorera, C. K.; Dandadzi, A.; Govha, M.; Gumbo, H.;
229 Gwanzura, K. T.; Kasaru, S.; Makasi, R.; Matsika, A. M.; Maunze, D.; Mazarura, E.;
230 Mpofu, E.; Mushonga, J.; Mushore, T. E.; Muzira, T.; Nembaware, N.; Nkiwane, S.;
231 Nyamwino, P.; Rukobo, S. D.; Runodamoto, T.; Seremwe, S.; Simango, P.; Tome, J.;
232 Tsenesa, B.; Amadu, U.; Bangira, B.; Chiveza, D.; Hove, P.; Jombe, H. A.; Kujenga, D.;
233 Madhuyu, L.; Makoni, P. M.; Maramba, N.; Maregere, B.; Marumani, E.; Masakadze, E.;
234 Mazula, P.; Munyanyi, C.; Musanhu, G.; Mushanawani, R. C.; Mutsando, S.; Nazare, F.;
235 Nyarambi, M.; Nzuda, W.; Sigauke, T.; Solomon, M.; Tavengwa, T.; Biri, F.; Chafanza,
236 M.; Chaitezvi, C.; Chauke, T.; Chidzomba, C.; Dadirai, T.; Fundira, C.; Gambiza, A. C.;
237 Godzongere, T.; Kuona, M.; Mafuratidze, T.; Mapurisa, I.; Mashedze, T.; Moyo, N.;
238 Musariri, C.; Mushambadope, M.; Mutsonziwa, T. R.; Muzondo, A.; Mwareka, R.;
239 Nyamupfukudza, J.; Saidi, B.; Sakuhwehwe, T.; Sikalima, G.; Tembe, J.; Chekera, T. E.;
240 Chihombe, O.; Chikombingo, M.; Chirinda, T.; Chivizhe, A.; Hove, R.; Kufa, R.;
241 Machikopa, T. F.; Mandaza, W.; Mandongwe, L.; Manhiyo, F.; Manyaga, E.; Mapuranga,
242 P.; Matimba, F. S.; Matonhodze, P.; Mhuri, S.; Mike, J.; Ncube, B.; Nderecha, W. T. S.;
243 Noah, M.; Nyamadzawo, C.; Penda, J.; Saidi, A.; Shonhayi, S.; Simon, C.; Tichagwa, M.;
244 Chamakono, R.; Chauke, A.; Gatsi, A. F.; Hwena, B.; Jawi, H.; Kaisa, B.; Kamutanho, S.;

245 Kaswa, T.; Kayeruza, P.; Lunga, J.; Magogo, N.; Manyeruke, D.; Mazani, P.; Mhuriyengwe,
246 F.; Mlambo, F.; Moyo, S.; Mpofo, T.; Mugava, M.; Mukungwa, Y.; Muroyiwa, F.;
247 Mushonga, E.; Nyekete, S.; Rinashe, T.; Sibanda, K.; Chemhuru, M.; Chikunya, J.;
248 Chikwavaire, V. F.; Chikwiriro, C.; Chimusoro, A.; Chinyama, J.; Gwinji, G.; Hoko-
249 Sibanda, N.; Kandawasvika, R.; Madzimure, T.; Maponga, B.; Mapuranga, A.; Marembo,
250 J.; Matsunge, L.; Maunga, S.; Muchekeza, M.; Muti, M.; Nyamana, M.; Azhuda, E.;
251 Bhoroma, U.; Biriyadi, A.; Chafota, E.; Chakwizira, A.; Chamhamiwa, A.; Champion, T.;
252 Chazuza, S.; Chikwira, B.; Chingozho, C.; Chitabwa, A.; Dhurumba, A.; Furidzirai, A.;
253 Gandanga, A.; Gukuta, C.; Macheche, B.; Marihwi, B.; Masike, B.; Mutangandura, E.;
254 Mutodza, B.; Mutsindikwa, A.; Mwale, A.; Ndhlovu, R.; Nduna, N.; Nyamandi, C.; Ruvata,
255 E.; Sithole, B.; Urayai, R.; Vengesa, B.; Zorounye, M.; Bamule, M.; Bande, M.; Chahuruva,
256 K.; Chidumba, L.; Chigove, Z.; Chiguri, K.; Chikuni, S.; Chikwanda, R.; Chimbi, T.;
257 Chingozho, M.; Chinhamo, O.; Chinokuramba, R.; Chinyoka, C.; Chipenzi, X.; Chipute,
258 R.; Chiribhani, G.; Chitsinga, M.; Chiwanga, C.; Chiza, A.; Chombe, F.; Denhere, M.;
259 Dhamba, E.; Dhamba, M.; Dube, J.; Dzimbanhete, F.; Dzingai, G.; Fusira, S.; Gonese, M.;
260 Gota, J.; Gumure, K.; Gwaidza, P.; Gwangwava, M.; Gwara, W.; Gwauya, M.; Gwiba, M.;
261 Hamauswa, J.; Hlasera, S.; Hlukani, E.; Hotera, J.; Jakwa, L.; Jangara, G.; Janyure, M.; Jari,
262 C.; Juru, D.; Kapuma, T.; Konzai, P.; Mabhodha, M.; Maburutse, S.; Macheke, C.;
263 Machigaya, T.; Machingauta, F.; Machokoto, E.; Madhumba, E.; Madziise, L.; Madziva,
264 C.; Madzivire, M.; Mafukise, M.; Maganga, M.; Maganga, S.; Mageja, E.; Mahanya, M.;
265 Mahaso, E.; Mahleka, S.; Makanhiwa, P.; Makarudze, M.; Makeche, C.; Makopa, N.;
266 Makumbe, R.; Mandire, M.; Mandiyanike, E.; Mangena, E.; Mangiro, F.; Mangwadu, A.;
267 Mangwengwe, T.; Manhidza, J.; Manhovo, F.; Manono, I.; Mapako, S.; Mapfumo, E.;

268 Mapfumo, T.; Mapuka, J.; Masama, D.; Masenge, G.; Mashasha, M.; Mashivire, V.;

269 Matunhu, M.; Mavhoru, P.; Mawuka, G.; Mazango, I.; Mazhata, N.; Mazuva, D.; Mazuva,

270 M.; Mbinda, F.; Mborera, J.; Mfiri, U.; Mhandu, F.; Mhike, C.; Mhike, T.; Mhuka, A.;

271 Midzi, J.; Moyo, S.; Mpundu, M.; Msekiwa, N.; Msindo, D.; Mtisi, C.; Muchemwa, G.;

272 Mujere, N.; Mukaro, E.; Muketiwa, K.; Mungoi, S.; Munzava, E.; Muoki, R.; Mupura, H.;

273 Murerwa, E.; Murisi, C.; Muroyiwa, L.; Muruvi, M.; Musemwa, N.; Mushure, C.; Mutero,

274 J.; Mutero, P.; Mutumbu, P.; Mutya, C.; Muzanango, L.; Muzembi, M.; Muzungunye, D.;

275 Mwazha, V.; Ncube, T.; Ndava, T.; Ndlovu, N.; Nehowa, P.; Ngara, D.; Nguruve, L.; Nhigo,

276 P.; Nkiwane, S.; Nyanyai, L.; Nzombe, J.; Office, E.; Paul, B.; Pavari, S.; Ranganai, S.;

277 Ratisai, S.; Rugara, M.; Rusere, P.; Sakala, J.; Sango, P.; Shava, S.; Shekede, M.; Shizha,

278 C.; Sibanda, T.; Tapambwa, N.; Tembo, J.; Tinago, N.; Tinago, V.; Toindepi, T.; Tovigepi,

279 J.; Tuhwe, M.; Tumbo, K.; Zaranyika, T.; Zaru, T.; Zimidzi, K.; Zindo, M.; Zindonda, M.;

280 Zinhumwe, N.; Zishiri, L.; Ziyambi, E.; Zvinowanda, J.; Bepete, E.; Chiwira, C.; Chuma,

281 N.; Fari, A.; Gavi, S.; Gunha, V.; Hakunandava, F.; Huku, C.; Hungwe, G.; Maduke, G.;

282 Manyewe, E.; Mapfumo, T.; Marufu, I.; Mashiri, C.; Mazenge, S.; Mbinda, E.; Mhuri, A.;

283 Muguti, C.; Munemo, L.; Musindo, L.; Ngada, L.; Nyembe, D.; Taruvinga, R.; Tobaiwa,

284 E.; Banda, S.; Chaipa, J.; Chakaza, P.; Chandigere, M.; Changunduma, A.; Chibi, C.;

285 Chidyagwai, O.; Chidza, E.; Chigatse, N.; Chikoto, L.; Chingware, V.; Chinghamo, J.;

286 Chinhoro, M.; Chiripamberi, A.; Chitavati, E.; Chitiga, R.; Chivanga, N.; Chivese, T.;

287 Chizema, F.; Dera, S.; Dhliwayo, A.; Dhononga, P.; Dimingo, E.; Dziyani, M.; Fambi, T.;

288 Gambagamba, L.; Gandiyari, S.; Gomo, C.; Gore, S.; Gundani, J.; Gundani, R.; Gwarima,

289 L.; Gwaringa, C.; Gwenya, S.; Hamilton, R.; Hlabano, A.; Hofisi, E.; Hofisi, F.; Hungwe,

290 S.; Hwacha, S.; Hwara, A.; Jogwe, R.; Kanikani, A.; Kuchicha, L.; Kutsira, M.; Kuziyamisa,

291 K.; Kuziyamisa, M.; Kwangware, B.; Lozani, P.; Mabuto, J.; Mabuto, V.; Mabvurwa, L.;
292 Machacha, R.; Machaya, C.; Madembo, R.; Madya, S.; Madzingira, S.; Mafa, L.; Mafuta,
293 F.; Mafuta, J.; Mahara, A.; Mahonye, S.; Maisva, A.; Makara, A.; Makover, M.;
294 Mambongo, E.; Mambure, M.; Mandizvidza, E.; Mangena, G.; Manjengwa, E.; Manomano,
295 J.; Mapfumo, M.; Mapfurire, A.; Maphosa, L.; Mapundo, J.; Mare, D.; Marecha, F.;
296 Marecha, S.; Mashiri, C.; Masiya, M.; Masuku, T.; Masvimbo, P.; Matambo, S.; Matarise,
297 G.; Matinanga, L.; Matizanadzo, J.; Maunganidze, M.; Mawere, B.; Mawire, C.; Mazvanya,
298 Y.; Mbasera, M.; Mbono, M.; Mhakayakora, C.; Mhlanga, N.; Mhosva, B.; Moyo, N.;
299 Moyo, O.; Moyo, R.; Mpakami, C.; Mpedzisi, R.; Mpofu, E.; Mpofu, E.; Mtetwa, M.;
300 Muchakachi, J.; Mudadada, T.; Mudzingwa, K.; Mugwira, M.; Mukarati, T.; Munana, A.;
301 Munazo, J.; Munyeki, O.; Mupfeka, P.; Murangandi, G.; Muranganwa, M.; Murenjekwa,
302 J.; Muringo, N.; Mushaninga, T.; Mutaja, F.; Mutanha, D.; Mutemeri, P.; Mutero, B.;
303 Muteya, E.; Muvembi, S.; Muzenda, T.; Mwenjota, A.; Ncube, S.; Ndabambi, T.; Ndava,
304 N.; Ndlovu, E.; Nene, E.; Ngazimbi, E.; Ngwalati, A.; Nyama, T.; Nzembe, A.;
305 Pabwaungana, E.; Phiri, S.; Pukuta, R.; Rambanapasi, M.; Rera, T.; Samanga, V.;
306 Shirichena, S.; Shoko, C.; Shonhe, M.; Shuro, C.; Sibanda, J.; Sibangani, E.; Sibangani, N.;
307 Sibindi, N.; Sitotombe, M.; Siwawa, P.; Tagwirei, M.; Taruvinga, P.; Tavagwisa, A.; Tete,
308 E.; Tete, Y.; Thandiwe, E.; Tibugari, A.; Timothy, S.; Tongogara, R.; Tshuma, L.; Tsikira,
309 M.; Tumba, C.; Watinaye, R.; Zhiradzango, E.; Zimunya, E.; Zinengwa, L.; Ziupfu, M.;
310 Ziyambe, J.; Church, J. A.; Desai, A.; Fundira, D.; Gough, E.; Kambarami, R. A.; Matare,
311 C. R.; Malaba, T. R.; Mupfudze, T.; Ngure, F.; Smith, L. E.; Curtis, V.; Dickin, K. L.;
312 Habicht, J.-P.; Masimirembwa, C.; Morgan, P.; Pelto, G. H.; Sheffner-Rogers, C.;
313 Thelingwani, R.; Turner, P.; Zungu, L.; Makadzange, T.; Mujuru, H. A.; Nyachowe, C.;

- 314 Chakadai, R.; Chanyau, G.; Makamure, M. G.; Chiwariro, H.; Mtetwa, T.; Chikunya, J.;
- 315 Maguwu, L.; Nyadundu, S.; Moyo, T.; Chayima, B.; Mvindi, L.; Rwenhamo, P.;
- 316 Muzvarwandoga, S.; Chimukangara, R.; Njovo, H.; Makoni, T. Independent and Combined
- 317 Effects of Improved Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene, and Improved Complementary
- 318 Feeding, on Child Stunting and Anaemia in Rural Zimbabwe: A Cluster-Randomised Trial.
- 319 *Lancet Glob. Heal.* **2019**, *7* (1), e132–e147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214->
- 320 [109X\(18\)30374-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30374-7).
- 321 (5) Clasen, T.; Boisson, S.; Routray, P.; Torondel, B.; Bell, M.; Cumming, O.; Ensink, J.;
- 322 Freeman, M.; Jenkins, M.; Odagiri, M.; Ray, S.; Sinha, A.; Suar, M.; Schmidt, W. P.
- 323 Effectiveness of a Rural Sanitation Programme on Diarrhoea, Soil-Transmitted Helminth
- 324 Infection, and Child Malnutrition in Odisha, India: A Cluster-Randomised Trial. *Lancet*
- 325 *Glob. Heal.* **2014**, *2* (11), e645–e653. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(14\)70307-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(14)70307-9).
- 326 (6) Patil, S. R.; Arnold, B. F.; Salvatore, A. L.; Briceno, B.; Ganguly, S.; Colford, J. M.; Gertler,
- 327 P. J. The Effect of India’s Total Sanitation Campaign on Defecation Behaviors and Child
- 328 Health in Rural Madhya Pradesh: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. *PLoS Med.* **2014**,
- 329 *11* (8), e1001709. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001709>.
- 330 (7) Pickering, A. J.; Djebbari, H.; Lopez, C.; Coulibaly, M.; Alzua, M. L. Effect of a
- 331 Community-Led Sanitation Intervention on Child Diarrhoea and Child Growth in Rural
- 332 Mali: A Cluster-Randomised Controlled Trial. *Lancet. Glob. Heal.* **2015**, *3* (11), e701-11.
- 333 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(15\)00144-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(15)00144-8).
- 334 (8) Goddard, F. G. B.; Ban, R.; Barr, D. B.; Brown, J.; Cannon, J.; Colford, J. M.; Eisenberg,
- 335 J. N. S.; Ercumen, A.; Petach, H.; Freeman, M. C.; Levy, K.; Luby, S. P.; Moe, C.;

- 336 Pickering, A. J.; Sarnat, J. A.; Stewart, J.; Thomas, E.; Taniuchi, M.; Clasen, T. Measuring
337 Environmental Exposure to Enteric Pathogens in Low-Income Settings: Review and
338 Recommendations of an Interdisciplinary Working Group. *Environmental Science and*
339 *Technology*. American Chemical Society October 6, 2020, pp 11673–11691.
340 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02421>.
- 341 (9) Mattioli, M. C. M.; Davis, J.; Boehm, A. B. Hand-to-Mouth Contacts Result in Greater
342 Ingestion of Feces than Dietary Water Consumption in Tanzania: A Quantitative Fecal
343 Exposure Assessment Model. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, *49* (3), 1912–1920.
344 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es505555f>.
- 345 (10) Katukiza, A. Y.; Ronteltap, M.; van der Steen, P.; Foppen, J. W. A.; Lens, P. N. L.
346 Quantification of Microbial Risks to Human Health Caused by Waterborne Viruses and
347 Bacteria in an Urban Slum. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2014**, *116* (2), 447–463.
348 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.12368>.
- 349 (11) Cairncross, S.; Blumenthal, U.; Kolsky, P.; Moraes, L.; Tayeh, A. The Public and Domestic
350 Domains in the Transmission of Disease. *Trop. Med. Int. Heal.* **1996**, *1* (1), 27–34.
351 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3156.1996.d01-9.x>.
- 352 (12) Baker, K. K.; Senesac, R.; Sewell, D.; Sen Gupta, A.; Cumming, O.; Mumma, J. Fecal
353 Fingerprints of Enteric Pathogen Contamination in Public Environments of Kisumu, Kenya
354 Associated with Human Sanitation Conditions and Domestic Animals. *Environ. Sci.*
355 *Technol.* **2018**, *acs.est.8b01528*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b01528>.
- 356 (13) Capone, D.; Bivins, A.; Knee, J.; Cumming, O.; Nalá, R.; Brown, J. Quantitative Microbial

- 357 Risk Assessment of Pediatric Infections Attributable to Ingestion of Fecally Contaminated
358 Domestic Soils in Low-Income Urban Maputo, Mozambique. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**,
359 55 (3), 1941–1952. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c06972>.
- 360 (14) Steinbaum, L.; Njenga, S. M.; Kihara, J.; Boehm, A. B.; Davis, J.; Null, C.; Pickering, A. J.
361 Soil-Transmitted Helminth Eggs Are Present in Soil at Multiple Locations within
362 Households in Rural Kenya. *PLoS One* **2016**, 11 (6), e0157780.
363 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0157780>.
- 364 (15) Holcomb, D. A.; Knee, J.; Sumner, T.; Adriano, Z.; de Bruijn, E.; Nalá, R.; Cumming, O.;
365 Brown, J.; Stewart, J. R. Human Fecal Contamination of Water, Soil, and Surfaces in
366 Households Sharing Poor-Quality Sanitation Facilities in Maputo, Mozambique. *Int. J. Hyg.*
367 *Environ. Health* **2020**, 226, 113496. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2020.113496>.
- 368 (16) Pickering, A. J.; Julian, T. R.; Marks, S. J.; Mattioli, M. C.; Boehm, A. B.; Schwab, K. J.;
369 Davis, J. Fecal Contamination and Diarrheal Pathogens on Surfaces and in Soils among
370 Tanzanian Households with and without Improved Sanitation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012**,
371 46 (11), 5736–5743. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es300022c>.
- 372 (17) Ercumen, A.; Pickering, A. J.; Kwong, L. H.; Mertens, A.; Arnold, B. F.; Benjamin-Chung,
373 J.; Hubbard, A. E.; Alam, M.; Sen, D.; Islam, S.; Rahman, M. Z.; Kullmann, C.; Chase, C.;
374 Ahmed, R.; Parvez, S. M.; Unicomb, L.; Rahman, M.; Ram, P. K.; Clasen, T.; Luby, S. P.;
375 Colford, J. M. Do Sanitation Improvements Reduce Fecal Contamination of Water, Hands,
376 Food, Soil, and Flies? Evidence from a Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural
377 Bangladesh. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2018**, 52 (21), 12089–12097.
378 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b02988>.

- 379 (18) Pickering, A. J.; Swarthout, J.; Mureithi, M.; Mboya, J.; Arnold, B. F.; Wolfe, M.; Dentz,
380 H. N.; Lin, A.; Arnold, C. D.; Rao, G.; Stewart, C. P.; Ram, P. K.; Clasen, T.; Colford, J.
381 M.; Null, C. Can Individual and Integrated Water, Sanitation, and Handwashing
382 Interventions Reduce Fecal Contamination in the Household Environment? Evidence from
383 the WASH Benefits Cluster-Randomized Trial in Rural Kenya. *bioRxiv* **2019**, 731992.
384 <https://doi.org/10.1101/731992>.
- 385 (19) World Health Organization. *Guidelines on Sanitation and Health*; Geneva, 2018.
- 386 (20) Capone, D.; Buxton, H.; Cumming, O.; Dreibelbis, R.; Knee, J.; Nalá, R.; Ross, I.; Brown,
387 J. Impact of an Intervention to Improve Pit Latrine Emptying Practices in Low Income
388 Urban Neighborhoods of Maputo, Mozambique. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **2020**, 226.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2020.113480>.
- 390 (21) Capone, D.; Berendes, D.; Cumming, O.; Knee, J.; Nalá, R.; Risk, B. B.; Stauber, C.; Zhu,
391 K.; Brown, J. Analysis of Fecal Sludges Reveals Common Enteric Pathogens in Urban
392 Maputo, Mozambique. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2020**.
393 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00610>.
- 394 (22) Alexander, K. A.; Godrej, A. Greywater Disposal Practices in Northern Botswana--The
395 Silent Spring? *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2015**, 12 (11), 14529–14540.
396 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph121114529>.
- 397 (23) Carden, K.; Armitage, N.; Sichone, O.; Winter, K. The Use and Disposal of Greywater in
398 the Non-Sewered Areas of South Africa: Part 2 – Greywater Management Options. *Water*
399 *SA* **2010**, 33 (4). <https://doi.org/10.4314/wsa.v33i4.52936>.

- 400 (24) Knee, J.; Sumner, T.; Adriano, Z.; Berendes, D.; de Bruijn, E.; Schmidt, W.-P.; Nalá, R.;
401 Cumming, O.; Brown, J. Risk Factors for Childhood Enteric Infection in Urban Maputo,
402 Mozambique: A Cross-Sectional Study. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **2018**, *12* (11), e0006956.
403 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006956>.
- 404 (25) Miller-Petrie, M. K.; Voigt, L.; McLennan, L.; Cairncross, S.; Jenkins, M. W. Infant and
405 Young Child Feces Management and Enabling Products for Their Hygienic Collection,
406 Transport, and Disposal in Cambodia. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **2016**, *94* (2), 456–465.
407 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.15-0423>.
- 408 (26) Borges Pedro, J. P.; Oliveira, C. A. da S.; de Lima, S. C. R. B.; von Sperling, M. A Review
409 of Sanitation Technologies for Flood-Prone Areas. *J. Water, Sanit. Hyg. Dev.* **2020**, *10* (3),
410 397–412. <https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2020.019>.
- 411 (27) Levy, K.; Woster, A. P.; Goldstein, R. S.; Carlton, E. J. Untangling the Impacts of Climate
412 Change on Waterborne Diseases: A Systematic Review of Relationships between Diarrheal
413 Diseases and Temperature, Rainfall, Flooding, and Drought. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**,
414 *50* (10), 4905–4922. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b06186>.
- 415 (28) Penakalapati, G.; Swarthout, J.; Delahoy, M. J.; McAliley, L.; Wodnik, B.; Levy, K.;
416 Freeman, M. C. Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A Systematic Review and
417 Proposed Research Priorities. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2017**, *51* (20), 11537–11552.
418 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b02811>.
- 419 (29) Berendes, D. M.; Yang, P. J.; Lai, A.; Hu, D.; Brown, J. Estimation of Global Recoverable
420 Human and Animal Faecal Biomass. *Nat. Sustain.* **2018**, *1* (11), 679–685.

- 421 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0167-0>.
- 422 (30) Delahoy, M. J.; Wodnik, B.; McAliley, L.; Penakalapati, G.; Swarthout, J.; Freeman, M. C.;
423 Levy, K. Pathogens Transmitted in Animal Feces in Low- and Middle-Income Countries.
424 *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* **2018**, *221* (4), 661–676.
425 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2018.03.005>.
- 426 (31) Graham, J. P.; Polizzotto, M. L. Pit Latrines and Their Impacts on Groundwater Quality: A
427 Systematic Review. *Environmetal Heal. Perspect.* **2013**, *5* (121), 521–530.
428 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1206028>.
- 429 (32) Nichols, D. S.; Prettyman, D.; Gross, M. Movement of Bacteria and Nutrients from Pit
430 Latrines in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. *Water. Air. Soil Pollut.* **1983**, *20*
431 (2), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00279627>.
- 432 (33) Chaúque, B. J. M.; Chicumbe, C. M.; Cossa, V. C.; Rott, M. B. Spatial Arrangement of
433 Well and Latrine and Their Influence on Water Quality in Clayey Soil – a Study in Low-
434 Income Peri-Urban Neighborhoods in Lichinga, Mozambique. *J. Water, Sanit. Hyg. Dev.*
435 **2021**. <https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2021.137>.
- 436 (34) Wang, Y.; Moe, C. L.; Null, C.; Raj, S. J.; Baker, K. K.; Robb, K. A.; Yakubu, H.; Ampofo,
437 J. A.; Wellington, N.; Freeman, M. C.; Armah, G.; Reese, H. E.; Peprah, D.; Teunis, P. F.
438 M. Multipathway Quantitative Assessment of Exposure to Fecal Contamination for Young
439 Children in Low-Income Urban Environments in Accra, Ghana: The Sanipath Analytical
440 Approach. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **2017**, *97* (4), 1009–1019.
441 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.16-0408>.

- 442 (35) Kwong, L. H.; Ercumen, A.; Pickering, A. J.; Unicomb, L.; Davis, J.; Leckie, J. O.; Luby,
443 S. P. Soil Ingestion among Young Children in Rural Bangladesh. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ.*
444 *Epidemiol.* **2021**, *31* (1), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-019-0177-7>.
- 445 (36) Ercumen, A.; Pickering, A. J.; Kwong, L. H.; Arnold, B. F.; Parvez, S. M.; Alam, M.; Sen,
446 D.; Islam, S.; Kullmann, C.; Chase, C.; Ahmed, R.; Unicomb, L.; Luby, S. P.; Colford, J.
447 M. Animal Feces Contribute to Domestic Fecal Contamination: Evidence from E. Coli
448 Measured in Water, Hands, Food, Flies, and Soil in Bangladesh. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
449 **2017**, *51* (15), 8725–8734. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b01710>.
- 450 (37) Berendes, D. M.; Kirby, A. E.; Clennon, J. A.; Agbemabiese, C.; Ampofo, J. A.; Armah, G.
451 E.; Baker, K. K.; Liu, P.; Reese, H. E.; Robb, K. A.; Wellington, N.; Yakubu, H.; Moe, C.
452 L. Urban Sanitation Coverage and Environmental Fecal Contamination: Links between the
453 Household and Public Environments of Accra, Ghana. *PLoS One* **2018**, *13* (7), e0199304.
454 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199304>.
- 455 (38) Fuhrmeister, E. R.; Ercumen, A.; Pickering, A. J.; Jeanis, K. M.; Crider, Y.; Ahmed, M.;
456 Brown, S.; Alam, M.; Sen, D.; Islam, S.; Kabir, H.; Islam, M.; Rahman, M.; Kwong, L. H.;
457 Arnold, B. F.; Luby, S. P.; Colford, J. M.; Nelson, K. L. Effect of Sanitation Improvements
458 on Pathogens and Microbial Source Tracking Markers in the Rural Bangladeshi Household
459 Environment. *Cite This Environ. Sci. Technol* **2020**, *54*, 4316–4326.
460 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b04835>.
- 461 (39) Bauza, V.; Madadi, V.; Ocharo, R.; Nguyen, T. H.; Guest, J. S. Enteric Pathogens from
462 Water, Hands, Surface, Soil, Drainage Ditch, and Stream Exposure Points in a Low-Income
463 Neighborhood of Nairobi, Kenya. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *709*, 135344.

- 464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135344>.
- 465 (40) Pickering, A. J.; Ercumen, A.; Arnold, B. F.; Kwong, L. H.; Parvez, S. M.; Alam, M.; Sen,
466 D.; Islam, S.; Kullmann, C.; Chase, C.; Ahmed, R.; Unicomb, L.; Colford, J. M.; Luby, S.
467 P. Fecal Indicator Bacteria along Multiple Environmental Transmission Pathways (Water,
468 Hands, Food, Soil, Flies) and Subsequent Child Diarrhea in Rural Bangladesh. *Environ. Sci.*
469 *Technol.* **2018**, 52 (14), 7928–7936. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b00928>.
- 470 (41) Ngure, F. M.; Humphrey, J. H.; Mbuya, M. N. N.; Majo, F.; Mutasa, K.; Govha, M.;
471 Mazarura, E.; Chasekwa, B.; Prendergast, A. J.; Curtis, V.; Boor, K. J.; Stoltzfus, R. J.
472 Formative Research on Hygiene Behaviors and Geophagy among Infants and Young
473 Children and Implications of Exposure to Fecal Bacteria. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **2013**, 89
474 (4), 709–716. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.12-0568>.
- 475 (42) Navab-Daneshmand, T.; Friedrich, M. N. D.; Gächter, M.; Montealegre, M. C.; Mlambo,
476 L. S.; Nihwatiwa, T.; Mosler, H. J.; Julian, T. R. Escherichia Coli Contamination across
477 Multiple Environmental Compartments (Soil, Hands, Drinking Water, and Handwashing
478 Water) in Urban Harare: Correlations and Risk Factors. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **2018**, 98
479 (3), 803–813. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.17-0521>.
- 480 (43) Sclar, G. D.; Penakalapati, G.; Amato, H. K.; Garn, J. V.; Alexander, K.; Freeman, M. C.;
481 Boisson, S.; Medlicott, K. O.; Clasen, T. Assessing the Impact of Sanitation on Indicators
482 of Fecal Exposure along Principal Transmission Pathways: A Systematic Review. *Int. J.*
483 *Hyg. Environ. Health* **2016**, 219 (8), 709–723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2016.09.021>.
- 484 (44) Capone, D.; Adriano, Z.; Berendes, D.; Cumming, O.; Dreifelbis, R.; Holcomb, D. A.;

- 485 Knee, J.; Ross, I.; Brown, J. A Localized Sanitation Status Index as a Proxy for Fecal
486 Contamination in Urban Maputo, Mozambique. *PLoS One* **2019**, *14* (10).
487 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224333>.
- 488 (45) Montealegre, M. C.; Roy, S.; Böni, F.; Hossain, M. I.; Navab-Daneshmand, T.; Caduff, L.;
489 Faruque, A. S. G.; Islam, M. A.; Julian, T. R. Risk Factors for Detection, Survival, and
490 Growth of Antibiotic-Resistant and Pathogenic Escherichia Coli in Household Soils in
491 Rural Bangladesh. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2018**. [https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01978-](https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01978-18)
492 18.
- 493 (46) Odagiri, M.; Schriewer, A.; Daniels, M. E.; Wuertz, S.; Smith, W. A.; Clasen, T.; Schmidt,
494 W. P.; Jin, Y.; Torondel, B.; Misra, P. R.; Panigrahi, P.; Jenkins, M. W. Human Fecal and
495 Pathogen Exposure Pathways in Rural Indian Villages and the Effect of Increased Latrine
496 Coverage. *Water Res.* **2016**, *100*, 232–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2016.05.015>.
- 497 (47) Ishii, S.; Ksoll, W. B.; Hicks, R. E.; Sadowsky, M. J. Presence and Growth of Naturalized
498 Escherichia Coli in Temperate Soils from Lake Superior Watersheds. *Appl. Environ.*
499 *Microbiol.* **2006**, *72* (1), 612–621. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.72.1.612>.
- 500 (48) Byappanahalli, M. N.; Yan, T.; Hamilton, M. J.; Ishii, S.; Fujioka, R. S.; Whitman, R. L.;
501 Sadowsky, M. J. The Population Structure of Escherichia Coli Isolated from Subtropical
502 and Temperate Soils. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2012**, *417–418*, 273–279.
503 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.12.041>.
- 504 (49) Nowicki, S.; DeLaurent, Z. R.; de Villiers, E. P.; Githinji, G.; Charles, K. J. The Utility of
505 Escherichia Coli as a Contamination Indicator for Rural Drinking Water: Evidence from

- 506 Whole Genome Sequencing. *PLoS One* **2021**, *16* (1), e0245910.
507 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245910>.
- 508 (50) Knee, J.; Sumner, T.; Adriano, Z.; Anderson, C.; Capone, D.; Eng, B.; Casmo, V.; Holcomb,
509 D.; Macdougall, A.; Molotkova, E.; Monteiro Braga, J.; Russo, C.; Peter Schmidt, W.;
510 Stewart, J.; Zambrana, W.; Zuin, V.; Nalá, R.; Cumming, O.; Brown, J. Effects of an Urban
511 Sanitation Intervention on Childhood Enteric Infection and Diarrhoea in Mozambique.
512 *medRxiv* **2020**. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.20.20178608>.
- 513 (51) Brown, J.; Cumming, O.; Bartram, J.; Cairncross, S.; Ensink, J.; Holcomb, D.; Knee, J.;
514 Kolsky, P.; Liang, K.; Liang, S.; Nala, R.; Norman, G.; Rheingans, R.; Stewart, J.; Zavale,
515 O.; Zuin, V.; Schmidt, W.-P. A Controlled, before-and-after Trial of an Urban Sanitation
516 Intervention to Reduce Enteric Infections in Children: Research Protocol for the Maputo
517 Sanitation (MapSan) Study, Mozambique. *BMJ Open* **2015**, *5* (6), e008215–e008215.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008215>.
- 519 (52) Augusto, G.; Nalá, R.; Casmo, V.; Sabonete, A.; Mapaco, L.; Monteiro, J. Geographic
520 Distribution and Prevalence of Schistosomiasis and Soil-Transmitted Helminths among
521 Schoolchildren in Mozambique. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **2009**, *81* (5), 799–803.
522 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2009.08-0344>.
- 523 (53) Capone, D.; Adriano, Z.; Berendes, D.; Cumming, O.; Dreibelbis, R.; Holcomb, D. A.;
524 Knee, J.; Ross, I.; Brown, J. A Localized Sanitation Status Index as a Proxy for Fecal
525 Contamination in Urban Maputo, Mozambique. *PLoS One* **2019**, *14* (10), e0224333.
526 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224333>.

- 527 (54) Vicente, E. M.; Jermy, C. A.; Schreiner, H. D. Urban Geology of Maputo, Mocambique. In
528 *10th Congress of the International Association for Engineering Geology and the*
529 *Environment*; London Geological Society: London, 2006.
- 530 (55) Bition, G.; Harvey, R. W. Transport of Pathogens through Soils and Aquifers. *Environ.*
531 *Microbiol.* **1992**, 103–124.
- 532 (56) Abu-Ashour, J.; Joy, D. M.; Lee, H.; Whiteley, H. R.; Zelin, S. Transport of
533 Microorganisms through Soil. *Water, Air, Soil Pollut.* **1994**, 75 (1–2), 141–158.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01100406>.
- 535 (57) Williams, A. R.; Overbo, A. *Unsafe Return of Human Excreta to the Environment: A*
536 *Literature Review*; 2015.
- 537 (58) Knee, J. S. Quantifying the Impact of an Urban Onsite Shared Sanitation Intervention on
538 Child Health in Maputo, Mozambique: The MapSan Trial, Georgia Institute of Technology,
539 2019.
- 540 (59) ASTM, D. 2216-98 *Standard Test Method for Laboratory Determination of Water*
541 *(Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass*; 1998.
- 542 (60) Aoyagi, K.; Livak, K. J. Methods Using Exogenous, Internal Controls and Analogue Blocks
543 during Nucleic Acid Amplification. US5952202A, March 26, 1998.
- 544 (61) Liu, J.; Gratz, J.; Amour, C.; Kibiki, G.; Becker, S.; Janaki, L.; Verweij, J. J.; Taniuchi, M.;
545 Sobuz, S. U.; Haque, R.; Haverstick, D. M.; Houpt, E. R. A Laboratory-Developed Taqman
546 Array Card for Simultaneous Detection of 19 Enteropathogens. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2013**, 51

- 547 (2), 472–480. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02658-12>.
- 548 (62) Capone, D.; Berendes, D.; Cumming, O.; Knee, J.; Nalá, R.; Risk, B. B.; Stauber, C.; Zhu,
549 K.; Brown, J. Analysis of Fecal Sludges Reveals Common Enteric Pathogens in Urban
550 Maputo, Mozambique. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2020**, *acs.estlett.0c00610*.
551 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00610>.
- 552 (63) Kodani, M.; Winchell, J. M. Engineered Combined-Positive-Control Template for Real-
553 Time Reverse Transcription-PCR in Multiple-Pathogen-Detection Assays. *J. Clin.*
554 *Microbiol.* **2012**, *50* (3), 1057–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.05987-11>.
- 555 (64) Capone, D.; Chigwechokha, P.; de los Reyes, F. L.; Holm, R. H.; Risk, B. B.; Tilley, E.;
556 Brown, J. Impact of Sampling Depth on Pathogen Detection in Pit Latrines. *PLoS Negl.*
557 *Trop. Dis.* **2021**, *15* (3), e0009176. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0009176>.
- 558 (65) Wing, C.; Simon, K.; Bello-Gomez, R. A. Designing Difference in Difference Studies: Best
559 Practices for Public Health Policy Research. *Annu. Rev. Public Health* **2018**, *39* (1), 453–
560 469. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-013507>.
- 561 (66) Halekoh, U.; Højsgaard, S.; Yan, J. The R Package Geepack for Generalized Estimating
562 Equations. *J. Stat. Softw.* **2006**, *15* (2), 1–11.
- 563 (67) Bottomley, C.; Kirby, M. J.; Lindsay, S. W.; Alexander, N. Can the Buck Always Be Passed
564 to the Highest Level of Clustering? *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* **2016**, *16*, 29.
565 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-016-0127-1>.
- 566 (68) Rose, J.; Jiménez-Cisneros, B.; Murphy, H. Persistence of Pathogens in Sewage and Other

- 567 Water Types. In *Global Water Pathogen Project*; Michigan State University, 2019.
568 <https://doi.org/10.14321/waterpathogens.51>.
- 569 (69) Schreiner, M. *Simple Poverty Scorecard* ® *Poverty-Assessment Tool Mozambique*; 2013.
- 570 (70) Yaoyu, F.; Xiao, L. Zoonotic Potential and Molecular Epidemiology of Giardia Species and
571 Giardiasis. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **2011**, *24* (1), 110–140.
572 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00033-10>.
- 573 (71) Izurieta, R.; Reina-Ortiz, M.; Ochoa-Capello, T. Trichuris Trichiura. In *Global Water*
574 *Pathogen Project*; Michigan State University, 2019.
575 <https://doi.org/10.14321/waterpathogens.43>.
- 576 (72) Kotloff, K. L.; Riddle, M. S.; Platts-Mills, J. A.; Pavlinac, P.; Zaidi, A. K. M. Shigellosis.
577 *Lancet* **2018**, *391* (10122), 801–812. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)33296-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)33296-8).
- 578 (73) Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor. *An Integrated Approach to Peri-Urban Sanitation*
579 *and Hygiene in Maputo: Working with City Authorities to Improve Services and Practices*;
580 Maputo, 2018.
- 581 (74) Barreto, M. L.; Genser, B.; Strina, A.; Teixeira, M. G.; Assis, A. M. O.; Rego, R. F.; Teles,
582 C. A.; Prado, M. S.; Matos, S. M. A.; Alcântara-Neves, N. M.; Cairncross, S. Impact of a
583 Citywide Sanitation Program in Northeast Brazil on Intestinal Parasites Infection in Young
584 Children. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2010**, *118* (11), 1637–1642.
585 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1002058>.
- 586 (75) Barreto, M. L.; Genser, B.; Strina, A.; Teixeira, M. G.; Assis, A. M. O.; Rego, R. F.; Teles,

- 587 C. A.; Prado, M. S.; Matos, S. M.; Santos, D. N.; dos Santos, L. A.; Cairncross, S. Effect of
588 City-Wide Sanitation Programme on Reduction in Rate of Childhood Diarrhoea in
589 Northeast Brazil: Assessment by Two Cohort Studies. *Lancet* **2007**, *370* (9599), 1622–
590 1628. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(07\)61638-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61638-9).
- 591 (76) Ercumen, A.; Mertens, A.; Arnold, B. F.; Benjamin-chung, J.; Alan, E.; Ahmed, M. A.;
592 Kabir, M. H.; Khalil, M. R.; Rahman, S.; Parvez, S. M.; Unicomb, L.; Ram, P.; Clasen, T.
593 F.; Luby, S. P.; Colford, J. M. Characterization of Natural and Affected Environments
594 Effects of Single and Combined Water , Sanitation and Handwashing Interventions on Fecal
595 Contamination in the Domestic Environment : A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in
596 Rural Bangladesh. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2018**. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b05153>.
- 597 (77) Ercumen, A.; Pickering, A.; Kwong, L. H.; Mertens, A.; Arnold, B. F.; Benjamin-, J.;
598 Hubbard, A. E.; Alam, M.; Sen, D.; Islam, S.; Rahman, M.; Kullmann, C.; Chase, C.;
599 Ahmed, R.; Parvez, S. M.; Unicomb, L.; Rahman, M.; Ram, P.; Clasen, T. F.; Luby, S. P.;
600 Colford, J. M. Characterization of Natural and Affected Environments Do Sanitation
601 Improvements Reduce Fecal Contamination of Water , Hands , Food , Soil and Flies ?
602 Evidence from a Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural Bangladesh. *Environ. Sci.*
603 *Technol.* **2018**. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b02988>.
- 604 (78) Holcomb, D. A.; Knee, J.; Capone, D.; Sumner, T.; Adriano, Z.; Nalá, R.; Cumming, O.;
605 Brown, J.; Stewart, J. R. Bayesian Analysis of Source Tracking Markers to Estimate the
606 Effects of an Urban Sanitation Intervention on Human Fecal Contamination in
607 Mozambique. *bioRxiv* **2021**, 2021.02.19.432000.
608 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.19.432000>.

- 609 (79) Canter, L.; Knox, R. C. *Evaluation of Septic Tank System Effects on Ground Water Quality*;
610 Norman, OK, 1984.
- 611 (80) Orner, K.; Naughton, C.; Stenstrom, T.-A. Pit Toilets (Latrines). In *Water and Sanitation
612 for the 21st Century: Health and Microbiological Aspects of Excreta and Wastewater
613 Management (Global Water Pathogen Project)*; Mihelcic, J. R., Verbyla, M. E., Eds.;
614 Michigan State University: Lansing, MI, 2018.
615 <https://doi.org/10.14321/waterpathogens.56>.
- 616 (81) Asaolu, S. O.; Ofoezie, I. E. *Ascaris Spp.* In *Global Water Pathogen Project*; Robertson,
617 L., Ed.; Michigan State University, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.14321/waterpathogens.41>.
- 618 (82) Boarato-David, É.; Guimarães, S.; Cacciò, S. *Giardia Duodenalis*. In *Global Water
619 Pathogen Project*; Fayer, R., Jakubowski, W., Eds.; Michigan State University, 2019.
620 <https://doi.org/10.14321/waterpathogens.35>.
- 621 (83) Verheyen, J.; Timmen-Wego, M.; Laudien, R.; Boussaad, I.; Sen, S.; Koc, A.; Uesbeck, A.;
622 Mazou, F.; Pfister, H. Detection of Adenoviruses and Rotaviruses in Drinking Water
623 Sources Used in Rural Areas of Benin, West Africa. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2009**, 75 (9),
624 2798–2801. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01807-08>.
- 625 (84) Ritter, R. L.; Peprah, D.; Null, C.; Moe, C. L.; Armah, G.; Ampofo, J.; Wellington, N.;
626 Yakubu, H.; Robb, K.; Kirby, A. E.; Wang, Y.; Roguski, K.; Reese, H.; Agbemabiese, C.
627 A.; Asantewa, Lady; Adomako, B.; Freeman, M. C.; Baker, K. K. Within-Compound
628 Versus Public Latrine Access and Child Feces Disposal Practices in Low-Income
629 Neighborhoods of Accra, Ghana. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg* **2018**, 98 (5), 1250–1259.

- 630 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.17-0654>.
- 631 (85) Lamar, F.; Freeman, M. C.; Levy, K. Conceptualizing Chickflows in Maputo, Mozambique:
632 High Risk Behaviors and Pathways for Childhood Exposure to Chicken Feces. In *American*
633 *Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 2019*; American Journal of Tropical Medicine
634 and Hygiene: Mclean, VA, 2019; p 573.
- 635 (86) Kwong, L. H.; Ercumen, A.; Pickering, A. J.; Arsenault, J. E.; Islam, M.; Parvez, S. M.;
636 Unicomb, L.; Rahman, M.; Davis, J.; Luby, S. P. Ingestion of Fecal Bacteria along Multiple
637 Pathways by Young Children in Rural Bangladesh Participating in a Cluster-Randomized
638 Trial of Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Interventions (WASH Benefits). *Environ. Sci.*
639 *Technol.* **2020**, *54* (21), 13828–13838. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02606>.
- 640 (87) Arnold, B. F.; Null, C.; Luby, S. P.; Colford, J. M. Implications of WASH Benefits Trials
641 for Water and Sanitation – Authors’ Reply. *Lancet Glob. Heal.* **2018**, *6* (6), e616–e617.
642 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(18\)30229-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30229-8).
- 643 (88) Liu, J.; Gratz, J.; Amour, C.; Nshama, R.; Walongo, T.; Maro, A.; Mduma, E.; Platts-Mills,
644 J.; Boisen, N.; Nataro, J.; Haverstick, D. M.; Kabir, F.; Lertsethtakarn, P.; Silapong, S.;
645 Jeanwattanalert, P.; Bodhidatta, L.; Mason, C.; Begum, S.; Haque, R.; Praharaj, I.; Kang,
646 G.; Houpt, E. R. Optimization of Quantitative PCR Methods for Enteropathogen Detection.
647 *PLoS One* **2016**, *11* (6), e0158199. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158199>.
- 648 (89) Lappan, R.; Henry, R.; Chown, S. L.; Luby, S. P.; Higginson, E. E.; Bata, L.; Jirapanjawat,
649 T.; Schang, C.; Openshaw, J. J.; O’Toole, J.; Lin, A.; Tela, A.; Turagabeci, A.; Wong, T.
650 H. F.; French, M. A.; Brown, R. R.; Leder, K.; Greening, C.; McCarthy, D. TaqMan Array

- 651 Cards Enable Monitoring of Diverse Enteric Pathogens across Environmental and Host
652 Reservoirs. *bioRxiv* **2020**, 2020.10.27.356642. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.27.356642>.
- 653 (90) Cutler, D.; Miller, G. *The Role of Public Health Improvements in Health Advances: The*
654 *20th Century United States*; Cambridge, MA, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w10511>.
- 655 (91) Dodane, P. H.; Mbéguéré, M.; Sow, O.; Strande, L. Capital and Operating Costs of Full-
656 Scale Fecal Sludge Management and Wastewater Treatment Systems in Dakar, Senegal.
657 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012**, *46* (7), 3705–3711. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es2045234>.
- 658 (92) Mafuta, C.; Formo, R. K.; Nellemann, C.; Li, F. *Green Hills, Blue Cities: An Ecosystems*
659 *Approach to Water Resources Management for African Cities*; United Nations Environment
660 Programme, GRID-Arendal, 2011.
- 661 (93) Cumming, O.; Arnold, B. F.; Ban, R.; Clasen, T.; Esteves Mills, J.; Freeman, M. C.; Gordon,
662 B.; Guiteras, R.; Howard, G.; Hunter, P. R.; Johnston, R. B.; Pickering, A. J.; Prendergast,
663 A. J.; Prüss-Ustün, A.; Rosenboom, J. W.; Spears, D.; Sundberg, S.; Wolf, J.; Null, C.;
664 Luby, S. P.; Humphrey, J. H.; Colford, J. M. The Implications of Three Major New Trials
665 for the Effect of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene on Childhood Diarrhea and Stunting: A
666 Consensus Statement. *BMC Med.* **2019**, *17* (1), 173. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1410-x)
667 [1410-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1410-x).
- 668 (94) Un-Habitat. *The Challenge of Slums - Global Report on Human Settlements*; 2003.
669 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/meq.2004.15.3.337.3>.
- 670 (95) Ngure, F. M.; Reid, B. M.; Humphrey, J. H.; Mbuya, M. N.; Pelto, G.; Stoltzfus, R. J. Water,
671 Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH), Environmental Enteropathy, Nutrition, and Early Child

672 Development: Making the Links. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **2014**, *1308* (1), 118–128.
673 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12330>.

674 (96) Cattaneo, M. D.; Galiani, S.; Gertler, P. J.; Martinez, S.; Titiunik, R. Housing, Health, and
675 Happiness. *Am. Econ. J. Econ. Policy* **2009**, *1* (1), 75–105.
676 <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.1.1.75>.

677 (97) Kolsky, P. Performance-Based Evaluation of Surface Water Drainage for Low Income
678 Communities: A Case Study in Indore, Madhya Pradesh, London School of Hygiene and
679 Tropical Medicine, 1999. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.1136.6721>.

680 (98) Voth-Gaeddert, L. E.; Divelbiss, D. W.; Oerther, D. B. Utilizing Structural Equation
681 Modeling to Correlate Biosand Filter Performance and Occurrence of Diarrhea in the
682 Village of Enseado Do Aritapera in Para, Brazil. *Water Supply* **2015**, *15* (1), 164–172.
683 <https://doi.org/10.2166/ws.2014.101>.

684 (99) Peal, A.; Evans, B.; Blackett, I.; Hawkins, P.; Heymans, C. Fecal Sludge Management: A
685 Comparative Analysis of 12 Cities. *J. Water, Sanit. Hyg. Dev.* **2014**, *4* (4), 563.
686 <https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2014.026>.

687

688