1

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

Authors: Drew Capone[1], David Berendes[2], Oliver Cumming[3], David Holcomb[4], Jackie Knee[3], Konstantinos T. Konstantinidis[5], Karen Levy[6], Rassul Nalá[7], Benjamin B. Risk[8], Jill Stewart[1], 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

2

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.

3

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 defecation[19], 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 incidental[34] and direct[35] 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.

4

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-analysis[43] 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

5

or silty sand.[54] While the fate and transport of pathogens through soils is dependent on the individual pathogen and environmental conditions[55], the high porosity of Maputo's sandy soils combined with a high water table in the study area[44] 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 Assay[60] (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*. 2013[61], 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

7

eae gene], Enterotoxigenic *E. coli* [ETEC, heat-labile and heat-stabile 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 µL of RNA eluant, 25 µL of DNA eluant, and 50 µL 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 amplification[12]; 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

8

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 transport[57] or persistence[68] 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 index[69]), soil moisture (assessed visually at the time of sampling), sun exposure status (estimated at the time of sampling; full sun, partially shaded, shaded[44]), 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 Comité Nacional de Bioética para a Saúde (CNBS), Ministério da Saúde (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

10

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

11

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**

| Characteristic | Level | Metric | Baseline | | | | 24-Month Phase | | | |
| | | | Control | | Intervention | | Control | | Intervention | |
			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

13

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**
24 **phase.**

Pathogen				
	Baseline Detection	24-month Detection	Unadjusted BL-24M DID estimate[‡]	Adjusted BL-24M DID estimate[‡]
Ascaris lumbricoides				
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)		
Enteroaggregative *E. coli*				
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)		
Giardia duodenalis				
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)		

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

control	0.15 (7/48)	0.04 (2/45)	NA	
intervention	0.09 (4/43)	0.09 (4/43)		
Yersinia spp.				
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)		
Entamoeba histolytica				
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)		
Vibrio cholerae				
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

17

27

28

DISCUSSION

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

Most of the other pathogens we frequently detected in soils were measured in child stools via multiplex end-point PCR as part of the MapSan trial, with the exception of EAEC, EPEC, and astrovirus. At baseline, *Shigella*/EIEC (44%) and *Trichuris trichiura* (37%) – generally thought to be transmitted human-to-human – were the second and third most common pathogens detected in child stool[24,50], following *Giardia* (51%) which can be zoonotic[70]. Given the high prevalence of anthroponotic enteric pathogens in stools and the lack of a zoonotic reservoir for *Shigella*/EIEC and *Trichuris trichiura*[71,72], the trial may have had greater power to observe an effect on *Shigella*/EIEC and *Trichuris trichiura* compared with other pathogens. For children born into study compounds before the 24-month visit, the intervention reduced the detection of *Shigella*/EIEC in children's stools by 51% and *Trichuris trichiura* by 76%.[58] Results from soils in this study differ from trial findings in stools: while we observed a 41% reduction in *Shigella*/EIEC detection, we identified no difference with respect to detection of *Trichuris trichiura*. This absence of impact on *Trichuris trichiura* in soils may have been due to limited

18

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

19

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 baseline[15] 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 $1\text{-}\log_{10}$ 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

20

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 lining[32] 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 table[31], 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]

22

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.

23

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 costs[91], and water usage

167   requirements[92] 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)

24

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

25

References

(1) Wagner, E.; Lanoix, J. Excreta Disposal for Rural Areas and Small Communities. *Monogr Ser World Heal. Organ.* **1958**, *39*, 1–182.

(2) Luby, S. P.; Rahman, M.; Arnold, B. F.; Unicomb, L.; Ashraf, S.; Winch, P. J.; Stewart, C. P.; Begum, F.; Hussain, F.; Benjamin-Chung, J.; Leontsini, E.; Naser, A. M.; Parvez, S. M.; Hubbard, A. E.; Lin, A.; Nizame, F. A.; Jannat, K.; Ercumen, A.; Ram, P. K.; Das, K. K.; Abedin, J.; Clasen, T. F.; Dewey, K. G.; Fernald, L. C.; Null, C.; Ahmed, T.; Colford, J. M. Effects of Water Quality, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutritional Interventions on Diarrhoea and Child Growth in Rural Bangladesh: A Cluster Randomised Controlled Trial. *Lancet Glob. Heal.* **2018**, *6* (3), e302–e315. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30490-4.

(3) Null, C.; Stewart, C. P.; Pickering, A. J.; Dentz, H. N.; Arnold, B. F.; Arnold, C. D.; Benjamin-Chung, J.; Clasen, T.; Dewey, K. G.; Fernald, L. C. H.; Hubbard, A. E.; Kariger, P.; Lin, A.; Luby, S. P.; Mertens, A.; Njenga, S. M.; Nyambane, G.; Ram, P. K.; Colford, J. M. Effects of Water Quality, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutritional Interventions on Diarrhoea and Child Growth in Rural Kenya: A Cluster-Randomised Controlled Trial. *Lancet Glob. Heal.* **2018**, *6* (3), e316–e329. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30005-6.

(4) Humphrey, J. H.; Mbuya, M. N. N.; Ntozini, R.; Moulton, L. H.; Stoltzfus, R. J.; Tavengwa, N. V; Mutasa, K.; Majo, F.; Mutasa, B.; Mangwadu, G.; Chasokela, C. M.; Chigumira, A.; Chasekwa, B.; Smith, L. E.; Tielsch, J. M.; Jones, A. D.; Manges, A. R.; Maluccio, J. A.; 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.;

27

245   Kaswa, T.; Kayeruza, P.; Lunga, J.; Magogo, N.; Manyeruke, D.; Mazani, P.; Mhuriyengwe,

246   F.; Mlambo, F.; Moyo, S.; Mpofu, 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.; Macheka, 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.;

28

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

269   Matunhu, M.; Mavhoro, 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.; Chinhamo, 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.;

30

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.

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.

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.

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.;

31

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

32

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.

33

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.

34

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.

35

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. *Environmnetal 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.

36

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.

37

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.; Nhiwatiwa, 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.; Dreibelbis, R.; Holcomb, D. A.;

38

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-

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

39

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.

40

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 Sanitaiton 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*

41

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

42

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.

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,

43

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.

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.

44

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.

45

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.

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   Jeamwattanalert, 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

46

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-

667   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