It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- 1 Independent and combined effects of nutrition and sanitation interventions on enteric
- pathogen carriage and child growth in rural Cambodia: a factorial cluster-randomised
   controlled trial
- 4 controlle
- 5 Amanda Lai<sup>1,2</sup>, Irene Velez<sup>3</sup>, Ramya Ambikapathi<sup>4</sup>, Krisna Seng<sup>3</sup>, Karen Levy<sup>5</sup>, Erin
- 6 Kowalsky<sup>1,2</sup>, David Holcomb<sup>1</sup>, Konstantinos T. Konstantinidis<sup>2</sup>, Oliver Cumming<sup>6</sup>, Joe Brown<sup>1\*</sup>
- 7
- 8 <sup>1</sup> Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Global Public
- 9 Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA
- <sup>10</sup> <sup>2</sup> School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta,
- 11 Georgia, USA
- <sup>3</sup>MSI, A Tetra Tech Company, Arlington, Virginia, USA
- <sup>4</sup> Department of Public Health, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, University of Washington,
- 15 Seattle, Washington, USA
- <sup>6</sup> Department of Disease Control, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of
- 17 Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

18

19 \* Corresponding author: Joe Brown, joebrown@unc.edu

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

### 20 Summary

- 21 Background
- 22 Childhood exposure to enteric pathogens associated with poor sanitation contributes to
- 23 undernutrition, associated with adverse effects later in life. This trial assessed the independent
- and combined effects of nutrition and sanitation interventions on child growth outcomes and
- 25 enteric pathogen infection in rural Cambodia, where the prevalence of childhood stunting
- 26 remains high.
- 27 Methods
- 28 We conducted a factorial cluster-randomised controlled trial of 4,015 households with 4,124
- 29 children (1-28 months of age at endline) across three rural provinces in Cambodia. Fifty-five
- 30 communes (clusters) were randomly assigned to a control arm or one of three treatments: a
- 31 nutrition-only arm, a sanitation-only arm, and a combined nutrition and sanitation arm receiving
- 32 both treatments. The primary outcome was length-for-age Z-score (LAZ); other outcomes
- 33 included weight-for-age Z-score (WAZ), weight-for-length Z-score (WLZ), stunting, wasting,
- 34 underweight, and caregiver-reported diarrhoea. We assayed stool specimens from a subset of all
- 35 children (n = 1,620) for 27 enteric pathogens (14 bacteria, 6 viruses, 3 protozoa, and 4 soil-
- 36 transmitted helminths) and estimated effects of interventions on enteric pathogen detection and
- 37 density. Analysis was by intention-to-treat. The trial was pre-registered with ISRCTN Registry
- 38 (<u>ISRCTN77820875</u>).
- 39 Findings
- 40 Self-reported adherence was high for the nutrition intervention but uptake was low for sanitation.
- 41 Compared with a mean LAZ of -1.04 (SD 1.2) in the control arm, children in the nutrition-only
- 42 arm (LAZ +0.08, 95% CI -0.01-0.18) and combined nutrition and sanitation arm (LAZ +0.10,
- 43 95% CI 0.01-0.20) experienced greater linear growth; there were no measurable differences in
- 44 LAZ in the sanitation-only arm (LAZ -0.05, 95% CI -0.16-0.05). We found no effect of any
- 45 intervention (delivered independently or combined) on either enteric pathogen frequency or
- 46 pathogen load in stool. Compared with a mean WAZ of -1.05 (SD 1.1) in the control arm,
- 47 children in the nutrition-only arm (WAZ +0.10, 95% CI 0.00-0.19) and combined intervention
- 48 arm (WAZ  $\pm 0.11$ , 95% CI 0.03-0.20) were heavier for their age; there was no difference in WAZ
- 49 in the sanitation-only arm. There were no differences between arms in prevalence of stunting,
- 50 wasting, underweight status, one-week period prevalence of diarrhoea, pathogen prevalence, or
- 51 pathogen density in stool.
- 52 Interpretation
- 53 Improvements in child growth in nutrition and combined nutrition and sanitation arms are
- 54 consistent with previous efficacy trials of combined nutrition and sanitation interventions. We
- 55 found no evidence that the sanitation intervention alone improved child growth or reduced
- 56 enteric pathogen detection, having achieved only modest changes in access and use.
- 57 Funding
- 58 United States Agency for International Development (USAID), contracts AID-OAA-M-13-
- 59 00017 and AID-OAA-TO-16-00016. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility
- 60 of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States
- 61 Government.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# 62 Introduction

63 Childhood undernutrition is associated with higher susceptibility to infectious disease, reduced

64 cognitive function, and various adverse outcomes later in life<sup>1</sup>. Growth faltering is an effect of

65 chronic undernutrition and tends to manifest in a child's first two years<sup>2</sup>. Many studies have

- 66 focused on improving infant and child nutrition to achieve better growth outcomes<sup>3,4</sup>. However,
- 67 nutrition interventions alone have not been successful in eliminating stunting, suggesting that
- 68 broader interventions addressing other important factors are needed alongside exclusive
- 69 breastfeeding and improved nutritional intake<sup>5</sup>.
- 70

71 Reducing early childhood exposure to enteric pathogens through safe water, sanitation, and

72 hygiene (WASH) may complement other interventions by reducing diarrhoeal diseases and

raise not environmental enteric dysfunction (EED)<sup>6</sup>—both of which can impact early childhood growth

<sup>74</sup> and development<sup>7</sup>. Observational studies have found strong associations between child growth

75 faltering and poor access to sanitation<sup>8</sup>. However, recent randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in

76 Zimbabwe<sup>9</sup>, Bangladesh<sup>3</sup>, and Kenya<sup>4</sup> that delivered standalone household-level sanitation

77 interventions (not coupled with other nutrition or hygiene interventions) were not found to

- 78 improve child growth.
- 79

80 The community-led total sanitation (CLTS) framework is an approach to ending open defecation

81 (OD) through behavioural change and collective action rather than through the provision of

82 hardware and materials. CLTS and other rural promotion-based interventions shift the focus

83 from individual and household sanitation practices to a community-level concern over OD by

84 triggering collective behaviour change through powerful emotional drivers such as shame and

85 disgust, as well as positive motivators such as improved health, dignity, and pride. Observational

86 studies in Cambodia<sup>10</sup> and Ecuador<sup>11</sup> found higher community-level sanitation coverage to be

87 associated with reduced prevalence of stunting. Despite this, recent RCTs employing promotion-

88 based interventions have found mixed effects on child growth. One trial was found to be

89 successful in improving child growth in Mali<sup>12</sup>, but this effect was not observed in other trials

90 elsewhere<sup>13,14</sup>.

91

92 This study contributes to a growing body of literature on the impact of combined nutrition and

93 sanitation interventions on early child growth, caregiver-reported diarrhoea, and detection and

94 quantification of enteric pathogens in stool as a proxy for enteric infection. While diarrhoea has

95 been widely used as a primary outcome measure in WASH studies<sup>3,4,12,15</sup>, recent studies have

96 used stool-based detection of enteric pathogens<sup>15</sup> and anthropometry measurements<sup>3,4,9</sup> as

97 primary outcomes that are more objectively measurable and may also broadly indicate health

98 status by capturing cumulative effects of exposures via EED<sup>6</sup>. We used a factorial cluster-

99 randomised controlled trial (cRCT) to assess the independent and combined effects of nutrition

and sanitation interventions delivered in the context of a large-scale, USAID-funded rural

101 nutrition and sanitation/hygiene program in Cambodia. We hypothesised that children receiving

102 both sanitation and nutrition interventions would have increased linear growth compared with

103 children from control areas lacking these interventions. We further hypothesised that combined

104 nutrition and sanitation interventions would lead to synergistic improvements in linear growth

105 beyond what was realised in either standalone intervention arm. The hypothesised pathway for

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- 106 these effects, consistent with secondary outcome measures, was reduced enteric pathogen
- 107 frequency and enteric pathogen load in stools (Figure 1).

# 108 Methods

#### 109 Study design and participants

- 110 We implemented a two-by-two factorial cRCT in rural communes in three provinces in
- 111 Cambodia: Battambang, Pursat, and Siem Reap. The communes targeted by the program were
- selected based on two criteria: communes where at least 30% of the population was living below
- 113 the poverty line according to the 2011 Cambodia Ministry of Planning's Commune Database;
- and communes where latrine subsidies were not then in place. This study is reported per the
- 115 Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) guideline (see Supplementary Material
- 116 for CONSORT checklist).
- 117

#### 118 Randomisation and masking

- 119 In 2015, prior to the start of project activities, we randomly assigned communes to one of three
- 120 treatment arms (nutrition only, sanitation/hygiene only, combined nutrition and
- 121 sanitation/hygiene) or control arm using a random number generator with reproducible seed in
- 122 Stata 13 (Stata, College Station, TX). Randomisation was conducted at the commune level to
- 123 limit the risk of contamination between study arms and all villages within each commune
- 124 received the assigned intervention. Following randomisation, three communes were dropped
- 125 from the trial due to objections from the local governments of overlap with other current
- 126 programming. This resulted in 55 communes with treatment arms of different sizes: 11
- 127 communes in nutrition-only arm; 13 in sanitation-only arm; 12 in combined-intervention arm;
- 128 and 19 in control arm (Figure 2). The trial enrolled primary caregivers with a child who was born
- 129 after intervention implementation began (up to 28 months prior) and who had lived in the
- 130 commune during the child's entire life, resulting in a participant population of children 1-28
- 131 months old. Neither participants nor field staff were masked to treatment status due to the nature
- 132 of the interventions, but data collection teams were blinded to the arm assignment and number of
- 133 treatment arms.
- 134

#### 135 Procedures

- 136 The interventions were delivered in the 36 intervention communes over the course of two years,
- between 2015-2017, while the remaining 19 control communes were unexposed to the
- 138 programmes. Two international non-governmental organizations—Save the Children and SNV—
- 139 provided programmatic implementation and coordinated activities with local governments. The
- 140 nutrition interventions included complementary feeding activities and education through
- 141 community-based growth promotion sessions; caregiver groups; home visits; and conditional
- 142 cash transfers (CCTs) linked to the utilization of key health and nutrition services focusing on
- 143 first 1,000 days of life. The sanitation interventions consisted primarily of CLTS as it was
- 144 delivered here, latrine vouchers coupled with supply-side support for sanitation and hygiene
- 145 products, and social behaviours change communications (SBCC). Intervention activities and
- 146 frequency are summarized in Table 1, and additional details about the interventions are described
- 147 in the Supplementary Material.
- 148
- 149 The survey was communicated in the Khmer language to assess household and child-level risk
- 150 factors of children under 28 months of age. Enumerators completed in-home interviews with the

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- 151 primary caregiver of children in the household about basic household member information;
- breastfeeding and nutrition of children up to age 28 months; number of pregnancies and child
- 153 births of the caregiver; intervention exposure and participation; household WASH conditions and
- 154 practices; and household assets/characteristics to construct wealth scores (excluding WASH
- 155 variables). We also documented process evaluation (PE) indicators based on self-reported receipt
- 156 of, and participation in, intervention activities to assess intervention fidelty and adherence,
- respectively. We attempted to collect a stool sample from each child and randomly selected a
- 158 subset of stools for analysis by reverse-transcription quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-
- 159 qPCR) of 30 enteric pathogen genes using a custom-developed TaqMan Array Card (TAC;
- 160 ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, VA), as described in the Supplementary Material.
- 161

#### 162 Outcomes

- 163 The primary outcome was length-for-age Z-score (LAZ). For children 1-24 months in age, we
- 164 measured recumbent length; for children 24-28 months in age, we measured standing height.
- 165 Herein, "length" will be inclusive of both recumbent length and standing height. Secondary
- 166 outcomes included weight-for-age Z-score (WAZ); weight-for-length Z-score (WLZ); proportion
- 167 of children stunted (LAZ<-2), underweight (WAZ<-2), and wasted (WLZ<-2); caregiver
- 168 reported diarrhoea; all-cause mortality; and enteric pathogen detection and quantification in
- 169 stool. Child length and weight were measured by trained paired enumerators following
- 170 guidelines from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)<sup>16</sup>. Final
- 171 measurements took place in August 2019, 28 months after the end of the roll-out period. Data
- 172 collection was completed by KHANA Centre for Population Health Research, with oversight and
- 173 support from Management Systems International (MSI). Data collection details, measurement
- 174 protocols, and PE indicators are further described in Supplementary Material.
- 175
- 176 We assessed enteric pathogens as the prevalence of individual gene targets, the number of co-
- 177 detected pathogens, and enteric pathogen-associated gene copies per gram of stool based on PCR
- 178 quantification cycle (Cq) and standard curves. *E.coli* pathotypes were defined as: EAEC (*aaiC*,
- 179 or *aatA*, or both), atypical EPEC (*eae* without *bfpA*, *stx1*, and *stx2*), typical EPEC (*bfpA*), ETEC
- 180 (STh, STp, or LT), and STEC (eae without bfpA and with stx1, stx2, or both). Details on nucleic
- acid extraction and molecular assaying are described in Supplementary Material.
- 182

## 183 Statistical analysis

- 184 We performed an intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis for all outcomes using generalised estimating
- 185 equations (GEE) with robust standard errors to account for clustering at the village level. We did
- 186 not consider pre-intervention covariate balance<sup>17</sup> but present secondary analyses adjusted for pre-
- 187 specified pre-intervention covariates in the Supplementary Material. Outcomes in each treatment
- arm were compared to the control arm and between standalone treatment arms and the combined
- 189 treatment arm. We used linear regression to estimate mean differences in LAZ, WAZ, WLZ, and
- 190 log<sub>10</sub>-transformed pathogen gene target densities and used log-linear Poisson regression to
- 191 estimate the prevalence ratio (PR) between arms for nutritional status (stunting, wasting, and
- 192 underweight), diarrhoea, and overall mortality. Enteric pathogen gene outcomes were
- 193 dichotomised, with positive detections defined by a  $Cq < 35^{18}$ , and Poisson regression was used
- 194 to estimate PRs for individual pathogens detected in stool. We further estimated the incidence
- 195 rate ratio (IRR) of co-detected pathogens (total and in subgroups by bacteria, viruses, protozoa,
- and STHs) using negative binomial regression. We did not adjust for multiple comparisons for

- 197 growth, diarrhoea, or mortality outcomes<sup>3,19</sup>, but we did apply the Benjamini-Hochberg
- 198 procedure to control the false discovery rate within analyses of multiple enteric pathogen
- 199 outcomes<sup>20</sup>. Details on power calculations are included in Supplementary Material.
- 200
- 201 Ethics
- 202 The study received approval from the National Ethics Committee for Health Research in the
- 203 Cambodian Ministry of Health, Georgia Institute of Technology, and New England Institutional
- 204 Review Board. Prior to any data collection, the trial was explained to participants in the Khmer
- 205 language. Written and verbal consent were obtained prior to administering the surveys and
- anthropometry measurements. The trial was pre-registered with ISRCTN Registry
- 207 (<u>ISRCTN77820875</u>).

# 208 Results

- 209 Among 82 presumptively eligible communes, the provincial governments in 27 declined to
- 210 participate. Ultimately, the evaluation included 55 communes randomly assigned to one of three
- 211 treatment arms (n=36 communes) or control arm (n=19 communes); the control arm was
- relatively oversized to enhance statistical efficiency of multiple hypothesis testing<sup>21</sup>. Figure 2
- shows the trial profile by intervention subgroups. 4,015 households participated in endline
- surveys; 4,005 households were included in these analyses (10 were excluded due to incomplete
- surveys), and 4,124 children had anthropometry measures taken.
- 216

217 Household and caregiver characteristics were mostly similar across treatment and control groups

- 218 (Table 2). Primary caregivers in the control group reported lower levels of primary school
- attendance compared to the treatment groups, but paternal primary school attendance was
- similar. Households in the nutrition-only and sanitation-only groups had higher wealth index
- scores compared to households in the combined intervention and control groups. The control
- group had a higher prevalence of improved water source as their main source of drinking water
- compared to the treatment groups.
- 224
- 225 Nutrition intervention fidelity was high, with households in the nutrition-only and combined-
- 226 intervention arms reporting significantly higher participation in these activities compared to the
- sanitation-only and control groups (Table 3). Approximately 60% of households in the nutrition-
- 228 only and combined-intervention arms reported participating in at least four of the eight nutrition
- intervention activities, compared to 4% in the sanitation-only and control arms. Conversely,
- sanitation intervention fidelity was very low, with only 6% of households in the sanitation-only
- and control arms reporting participation in any CLTS activity, compared to 14% of households
- in the nutrition-only arm and 25% in the combined-intervention arm.
- 233
- 234 More households in the control arm (70%) had an improved water source as their main source of
- 235 drinking water, an indicator of nutrition intervention adherence, compared to other arms
- 236 (approximately 60% in other arms; Table 4). The combined intervention arm had greater access
- to improved sanitation facilities (61%) compared to the nutrition-only (55%), sanitation-only
- 238 (51%), and control (52%) arms. OD (self-reported) was practiced less in the combined
- intervention arm (7%) compared to the nutrition-only (14%), sanitation-only (16%), and control
- 240 (16%) arms. Notably, the sanitation-only arm experienced a significantly larger increase in
- sanitation coverage (+25 percentage points [pp]) compared to all other arms (+14pp in nutrition-

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- only arm, +19pp in combined and control arms), though sanitation gains across all arms were
- 243 evident in the intervention period, reflecting a strong secular trend of sanitation expansion that
- has been widely documented in rural Cambodia<sup>8,10,22,23</sup>. Additional intervention adherence
- 245 indicators related to environmental hygiene are reported in the Supplementary Material.
- 246

#### 247 Primary and secondary outcomes

- 248 Mean LAZ in the control arm was -1.04 (SD 1.20). Compared with control, children in the
- nutrition-only arm were longer by a mean of 0.08 LAZ (95% CI -0.01, 0.18), and children in the
- combined-intervention arm were longer by 0.10 LAZ (95% CI 0.01, 0.20), although these
- 251 differences were not observed in the adjusted analyses (
- 252

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- 253 Table 5, Figure 3, Supplementary Material). Children in the nutrition-only arm and combined-
- intervention arm were heavier than children in the control arm by a mean of 0.10 WAZ (95% CI
- 255 0.00, 0.19) and 0.11 (95% CI 0.03, 0.20), respectively. These differences were slightly attenuated
- in the adjusted analyses (

258 Table 5, Supplementary Material). No differences were observed between the control arm and

- 259 intervention arms in terms of WLZ. Children in the combined intervention arm were also longer
- 260 and heavier, on average, than children in the sanitation-only arm by 0.16 LAZ (95% CI 0.04,
- 261 0.27) and 0.10 WAZ (95% CI 0.01, 0.20), respectively. LAZ and WAZ were similar between
- 262 children in the nutrition-only and combined intervention arms.
- 263
- 264 Compared with the control arm, none of the intervention arms differed in the prevalence of
- 265 children who experienced stunting, wasting, diarrhoea (7-day recall), or mortality (Table 6).
- 266 However, the combined intervention reduced underweight prevalence by 18% (PR 0.82, 95% CI
- 267 0.68, 0.99) relative to the control arm. Although the combined intervention did not significantly
- 268 impact stunting prevalence compared with the control arm or the nutrition-only arm, the 269
- sanitation-only arm was associated with a 20% increase (PR 1.2, 95% CI 1.0, 1.5) in the
- 270 prevalence of both stunting and underweight status when compared to the combined
- 271 intervention. All associations with stunting and underweight were attenuated in adjusted analyses
- 272 (Supplementary Material).
- 273

#### 274 Enteric pathogen results

- 275 We assessed enteric pathogen-associated gene targets in 1,620 randomly selected stools that 276 demonstrated acceptible amplification (of 4,114 stools total, see Supplementary Material): 305
- 277 from the nutrition arm, 333 from the sanitation arm, 438 from the combined-intervention arm,
- 278 and 544 from the control arm. We detected at least one bacterial gene in 87% of all samples, at
- 279 least one viral gene in 49% of samples, at least one protozoan gene in 20% of samples, and at
- 280 least one STH gene in 2% of samples. Enteroaggregative E. coli (EAEC), enteric pathogenic E.
- 281 coli (EPEC), enterovirus, Campylobacter spp., and enterotoxigenic E. coli (ETEC) were the most
- 282 prevalent pathogens (Table 7). We detected a mean 2.2 bacterial genes (out of 9), 0.59 viral
- 283 genes (out of 6), 0.21 protozoan genes (out of 4), and 0.03 STH genes (out of 4) in each sample.
- 284 We found no differences in the rate of bacterial, viral, protozoan, or STH gene co-detection 285
- between the control arm and any treatment arm or between the combined arm and the standalone 286 intervention arms (Table 8). Prevalence increased with age for many pathogens (aEPEC, ETEC,
- 287 Shigella/EIEC (ipah), STEC, adenovirus, Giardia), while prevalence peaked for children 9-17
- 288 months for other pathogens (*Campylobacter* spp., *C.diff*, EAEC, *Salmonella* spp.; Supplementary 289 Material).
- 290
- 291 Examining prevalence of specific targets compared to the control arm, the nutrition-only arm
- 292 demonstrated increased prevalence of any bacterial gene (PR 1.06, 95% CI 1.01, 1.11),
- 293 adenovirus (PR 1.88, 95% CI 1.41, 2.51) and heat-labile/heat-stable ETEC (PR 2.00, 95% CI
- 294 1.19, 3.36) and reduced prevalence of EIEC/Shigella spp. (PR 0.60, 95% CI 0.39, 0.94). Children
- 295 in the sanitation-only arm had less EPEC (PR 0.88, 95% CI 0.78, 1.00) compared to control. In
- 296 the combined-intervention arm, atypical-EPEC prevalence decreased (PR 0.85, 95% CI 0.73,
- 0.98) while the prevalence increased for heat-stable ETEC (PR 1.42, 95% CI 1.01, 2.00), heat-297
- 298 labile/heat-stable ETEC (PR 1.74, 95% CI 1.06, 2.86), and any viral gene (PR 1.16, 95% CI 299
- 1.02, 1.31). We found similar mixed effects when comparing pathogen gene prevalence in 300 individual treatment arms compared to the combined arm; there was slightly lower combined
- 301 prevalence of any bacterial target (PR 0.96, 95% CI 0.91, 1.02) and enterovirus (PR 0.82, 95%
- 302 CI 0.67, 1.00) in the sanitation-only arm, and we found higher prevalence of adenovirus (PR
- 303 1.42, 95% CI 1.07, 1.87) in the nutrition-only arm (Table 9).
- 9

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

304

305 Generally, differences in mean gene quantities were consistent with prevalence differences

306 (Table 9;

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- Table 10). We detected lower concentrations of pathogen-associated genes in the nutrition-only
- 308 and sanitation-only arms compared with the control arm; children in the nutrition-only arm
- 309 carried lower quantities of STEC (-1.46 log<sub>10</sub>-copies, 95% CI -2.97, 0.06) and *Giardia* (-1.73
- 310 log<sub>10</sub>-copies, 95% CI -3.02, -0.44), and children in the sanitation-only arm carried lower
- 311 quantities of EPEC (-0.54 log<sub>10</sub>-copies, 95% CI -1.17, 0.09) and STEC (-1.71 log<sub>10</sub>-copies, 95%
- 312 CI -3.07, -0.34). There was no measurable difference in mean gene quantities between the
- 313 combined and control arm. There was no significant difference in quantity of pathogen genes
- between treatment arms after adjusting for multiple comparisons<sup>20</sup>.

### 315 Discussion

- 316 We found a modest effect on growth from the nutrition-only intervention and a greater effect in
- 317 the combined intervention arm that was likely attributable to the nutrition intervention alone. By
- 318 contrast, the sanitation intervention alone was not associated with growth improvements, relative
- 319 to control conditions, and demonstrated significantly poorer growth than the combined
- 320 intervention arm. The similar impacts on linear growth between the nutrition-only and combined
- 321 intervention arms were consistent with the observed linear growth improvements being
- 322 attributable primarily to the nutrition intervention alone, further suggesting that the addition of
- 323 this sanitation intervention to the nutrition intervention did not produce synergistic effects.
- 324 Intermediate outcomes of meal frequency and dietary diversity were similar between arms, so the
- 325 observed effects may have been attributable to other elements of the nutrition or combined
- 326 intervention not captured by these measures. We observed no meaningful differences between
- 327 arms with respect to secondary outcome measures of WAZ, WLZ, stunting, wasting,
- 328 underweight status, diarrhoea, mortality, pathogen prevalence, pathogen co-detection rate, or
- 329 pathogen gene copy quantity. Although molecular detection of a specific pathogen in stool does
- 330 not necessarily signal active enteric infection, potential for disease, or direct effects on the
- individual, it does unambiguously indicate prior exposure to that pathogen. Our specific
- pathogen targets were selected *a priori* based on a range of globally observed enteric pathogens
- and may not fully capture the relevant enteric pathogens in rural Cambodia; however, the
- 334 consistently high pathogen prevalence across all treatment arms suggests the suite of 335 interventions assessed in this trial did not prevent environmental exposure to enteric pathogen
- interventions assessed in this trial did not prevent environmental exposure to enteric pathogens.
- 337 Our findings are consistent with results from several recent randomised factorial WASH and
- 338 nutrition efficacy trials reporting protective effects of combined/integrated interventions and null
- effects of WASH alone on child growth outcomes<sup>3,4,9</sup>. A small number of experimental trials<sup>24</sup>
- 340 and many observational studies<sup>8,10</sup> have reported increases in child growth and reductions in
- 341 stunting prevalence with improvements in sanitation coverage and commensurate reductions in
- 342 OD; among the latter, unmeasured confounding is a likely explanation for observed effects<sup>24</sup>.
- 343
- While gains in the proportion of the population self-reporting access to sanitation were highest in the sanitation only arm (+25 pp), these were only modestly higher than the gains for the control
- 345 the sanitation only arm (+25 pp), these were only modestly higher than the gains for the control 346 (+19 pp) and nutrition arms (+14 pp); furthermore, sanitation coverage gains for the combined
- (+19 pp) and nutrition arms (+14 pp), furthermore, samuation coverage gams for the combined intervention matched the control arm at +19 pp. Comparable secular trends of increasing
- sanitation coverage in Cambodia have been documented previously: the percentage of children
- 349 younger than five years of age with access to an improved sanitation facility increased from 5%
- in 2000 to 17% in 2005, 29% in 2010, and 54% in 2014, the most recent nationally
- 351 representative DHS survey<sup>8,23</sup>. Correspondingly swift improvements have been documented

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

specifically in rural areas, where access to any sanitation facility increased from 30% in 2010 to
 44% in 2014 and improved sanitation coverage rose from 27% to 43%<sup>8,23</sup>. The rapid pace of
 WASH development in rural Cambodia makes it challenging to measure the impact of specific

354 wASH development in fural Cambodia makes it channeliging to measure the impact of specific 355 programs. However, the lack of differences in other sanitation intervention adherence indicators

- 355 programs. However, the fack of differences in other samation intervention adherence indicators 356 suggests low overall uptake of the sanitation intervention and only modest increases in sanitation
- coverage attributable to the intervention, which were likely insufficient to reduce community
- 358 exposure and transmission. Zoonotic transmission from domestic animals, for instance, was not
- addressed by this or many other WASH trials, as indicated by nearly 80% of households across
- all treatment arms lacking access to an area free of animals for children to safely  $play^{25}$ .
- 361

The frequency and intensity of contact from program promoters was much greater in the nutrition intervention than the sanitation intervention. Recipients of the nutrition intervention participated in monthly activities, whereas the sanitation intervention consisted of one triggering

- 365 session with infrequent follow-up visits. The lower contact frequency may explain the
- 366 discrepancy in intervention adherence. Both arms receiving the nutrition programming reported
- 367 higher levels of participation in the key intervention activities—including sanitation intervention
- 368 activities—suggesting higher adherence to the nutrition intervention than the sanitation 369 intervention. Self-reported CLTS participation rates were equally low in both the sanitation-only
- intervention. Self-reported CLTS participation rates were equally low in both the sanitation-only
   and control arms at 6%, while 14% of nutrition-only recipients and 25% of combined
- intervention recipients reported CLTS participation. The comparatively elevated CLTS
- 372 participation in the nutrition-only arm may reflect biases embedded in the self-reporting process;
- 373 given the 28+ months that had elapsed since the initial CLTS triggering session and the
- infrequency of CLTS follow-up visits, households that only received the sanitation intervention
- 375 may have been less likely to recall programming of any kind than households that participated in
- the more frequent and intense nutrition intervention activities. Furthermore, the "Growth
- Together" SBCC campaign, which promoted 13 core health, nutrition, sanitation, and hygiene practices, was fully incorporated into all intervention activities across the three intervention
- 378 practices, was fully incorporated into an intervention activities across the three intervention 379 arms, meaning households receiving the higher intensity nutrition programming also encountered
- the associated SBCC sanitation messaging much more frequently than households in the
- solution associated SDCC samilation messaging inden more nequently than not senoted in the sanitation-only arm. The SBCC campaign was also promoted nationally on television, such that
- households in the control arms may have been nearly as exposed to its content as sanitation-only
- 383 households, while the nutrition-only and combined intervention arms received substantial in-
- 384 person promotion of the SBCC campaign messaging.
- 385

386 Due to the nature of the interventions and resource considerations, all trial outcomes were 387 assessed during a single survey round conducted 28 months after initiating the intervention 388 programming, which introduced some limitations. Growth and pathogen outcomes were assessed 389 in children from one to 28 months of age, meaning that older children received the treatments for 390 a longer duration but were initially exposed to less mature intervention conditions than the 391 younger children born later. The timing of outcome ascertainment also precluded detecting 392 effects that may only be realized later in childhood, such as potentially rapid catch-up growth 393 after 24 months of age that may reverse earlier growth faltering<sup>26</sup>. While a focus on the first 394 1,000 days is justified<sup>2</sup>, investigation of growth and growth-promoting factors after this window 395 may provide additional insight on improved WASH practices and their role in supporting long-396 term development and health.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

398 While molecular detection of a specific pathogen in stool unambiguously indicates prior 399 exposure to that pathogen, our data do not necessarily indicate active enteric infection, potential 400 for disease, or direct effects on the individual. We were limited by the suite of pathogen targets 401 selected on our custom TAC assay; we selected these targets a priori based on a range of 402 globally observed enteric pathogens, but we cannot know whether these were the most important 403 enteric pathogens in rural Cambodia. There is also evidence that the *invA* gene, which was 404 selected for Salmonella spp. detection, is not specific to Salmonella enterica and suggest the 405 consideration of other genes, such as ttrA/C, for reliable detection of S. enterica<sup>27</sup>. 406 It is highly plausible that this sanitation intervention simply failed to sufficiently reduce 407 environmental exposure to enteric pathogens. For example, only 22% of households in our 408 survey were observed to have a child play environment free of animals, with little difference 409 between treatment and control arms; this is a transmission pathway that our trial and many other 410 WASH trials have not addressed<sup>25</sup>. The trial design is predicated on the theory that gains in 411 sanitation coverage may lead to improved growth outcomes in children via reductions in the 412 transmission of enteric infection and disease, though links between sanitation coverage and 413 specific outcomes are poorly understood in high-burden settings. The change in community

414 coverage in this trial was limited and likely insufficient to reduce community exposure and 415 transmission.

416

417 There are a few key observations from this study that should be considered in future

418 interventions and effectiveness trials of comparable interventions. Increased frequency, duration,

419 and intensity of CLTS programming could have resulted in greater uptake of sanitation in target

420 communes. Despite the sanitation coverage gains observed in the sanitation-only arm, much of

421 which may have been as a result of the sanitation intervention, we are unable to attribute

422 beneficial effects—i.e., measurable differences in prespecified outcomes—to the sanitation

423 intervention due to the high sanitation gains also observed in the control arm. There may have

424 been other benefits of sanitation gains that were not measured, including in safety and broader

425 measures of well-being<sup>28</sup>. Future trials may also include additional objective outcome measures,

426 including intermediate measures of environmental contamination that are on the causal pathway

- 427 between interventions and exposures.
- 428

429 Our work is consistent with a growing body of research reporting high prevalence of enteric

430 pathogen exposure in early childhood, which may lead to long-term effects on health<sup>15,18,29,30</sup>.

431 Reducing these exposures in high-burden settings requires transformative interventions that have

432 the potential to dramatically reduce direct and indirect contact with all faeces, including animal

433 faeces<sup>24</sup>, across multiple pathways.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# 435 Other Information

- 436 Trial Registry
- 437 The trial is registered with ISRCTN Registry (<u>ISRCTN77820875</u>).
- 438 Protocol
- 439 The National Ethics Committee for Health Research in the Cambodian Ministry of Health
- 440 reviewed and approved the protocols (NECHR #110) prior to the start of data collection. The
- study also received approvals from the Institutional Review Board at Georgia Institute of
- 442 Technology (Ref: H19286) and from New England IRB (IRB#: 120190186).
- 443 Funding
- 444 This study was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
- 445 under contract number OAA-M-13-00017. The contents of this publication are the sole
- 446 responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United
- 447 States Government.

#### 448 Acknowledgements

- 449 We thank the staff and participants of the study for their important contributions. We also
- 450 acknowledge contributions by Caroline Akerley, Farran Bush, Isabelle du Plessis, and Juliann
- 451 Pham.

| runor controations                   |                                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Conceptualisation                    | IV, OC, JB                         |
| Data Curation                        | IV, KS, AL                         |
| Formal Analysis                      | AL, RA, IV                         |
| Funding Acquisition                  | IV, JB                             |
| Investigation                        | AL, KS, IV, JB                     |
| Methodology                          | AL, IV, OC, JB                     |
| Project Administration               | IV, KS, JB                         |
| Resources                            | IV, JB                             |
| Software                             | N/A                                |
| Supervision                          | IV, KS, OC, JB                     |
| Validation                           | N/A                                |
| Visualisation                        | N/A                                |
| Writing – Original Draft Preparation | AL                                 |
| Writing – Review & Editing           | AL, IV, RA, EK, DH, KS, OC, JB, KL |

### 452 Author contributions

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



462 Figure 2: Trial profile

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



464
465 Figure 3: Unadjusted intervention effects on LAZ. Estimates are mean differences (point)
466 with 95% CIs (line)

## 468 Figure 4: Impact of interventions on unadjusted prevalence ratio of individual pathogens.

469 Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals were determined using log-linear Poisson

#### 470 models with generalized estimating equations.



It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# 473 Table 1: Summary of intervention activities

|          | Intervention activity  | Frequency  |
|----------|--|--|
| Nutritio | n-only   |  |
|          | Community dialogues led by village chief and VHSG to support children's growth   | Quarterly  |
|          | Caregiver group sessions led by local women trained by staff to promote 13 key stunting prevention behaviours  | Monthly  |
|          | GMP sessions led by VHSGs to monitor growth and refer<br>children who were sick or not growing well to health<br>centers   | Monthly  |
|          | Home visits to pregnant women, caregivers of children 9-<br>11 months old, and caregivers of children not growing<br>well to promote childcare and feeding, home hygiene, and<br>handwashing | Monthly  |
|          | Village fair help twice per year to offer hands-on learning<br>experiences (health/nutrition, WASH and agricultural<br>using games, latrine marketing and sales                              | Twice per year   |
|          | CCT (cash for antenatal and postnatal care visits and<br>adherence to handwashing stations), vouchers for water<br>filters and food baskets  | Up to six payments over first 1,000 days of child life |
| Sanitati | on-only  |  |
|          | CLTS triggering session  | Once   |
|          | Door-to-door visits to provide information about sanitation/latrines   | At least five times per village                        |
|          | Latrine vouchers to subsidise poor households in villages<br>that reached 75% sanitation coverage to achieve sufficient<br>open defecation free (ODF) coverage                               | Once, as needed  |
|          | Promoted supply-side support by connecting small- and<br>medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) with communes after<br>triggering event   | Continuously   |
| Combin   | ed   |  |
|          | All activities described in NUTR and SAN groups above  | See above  |
| Control  |  | •  |
|          | None   | N/A  |

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

|  | Nut   | trition-only  | Sani  | tation-only  | C     | ombined       |       | Control        |
|--|-------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------|---------------|-------|----------------|
|  | Mean  | 95% CI        | Mean  | 95% CI       | Mean  | 95% CI        | Mean  | 95% CI         |
| Buddhist   | 0.98  | (0.97, 0.99)  | 0.97  | (0.96, 0.98) | 0.96  | (0.95, 0.97)  | 0.99  | (0.98, 0.99)   |
| Married or living together                         | 0.95  | (0.93, 0.96)  | 0.94  | (0.92, 0.95) | 0.94  | (0.92, 0.95)  | 0.95  | (0.94, 0.96)   |
| Maternal age (years)                               | 32.0  | (31.2, 32.7)  | 31.1  | (30.4, 31.9) | 31.9  | (31.2, 32.5)  | 31.0  | (30.5, 31.5)   |
| Primary caregiver has attended primary school      | 0.87  | (0.85, 0.89)  | 0.87  | (0.84, 0.89) | 0.88  | (0.85, 0.89)  | 0.81  | (0.79, 0.83)   |
| Spouse has attended<br>primary school              | 0.90  | (0.88, 0.92)  | 0.86  | (0.83, 0.88) | 0.87  | (0.85, 0.89)  | 0.87  | (0.85, 0.89)   |
| Household size                                     | 5.63  | (5.48, 5.78)  | 5.54  | (5.40, 5.69) | 5.36  | (5.24, 5.47)  | 5.52  | (5.42, 5.62)   |
| Number of children in HH                           | 2.61  | (2.52, 2.70)  | 2.61  | (2.51, 2.70) | 2.43  | (2.36, 2.50)  | 2.43  | (2.37, 2.49)   |
| Has electricity                                    | 0.73  | (0.70, 0.76)  | 0.74  | (0.71, 0.77) | 0.76  | (0.73, 0.78)  | 0.75  | (0.72, 0.77)   |
| Owns a mobile phone                                | 0.93  | (0.92, 0.95)  | 0.90  | (0.88, 0.92) | 0.87  | (0.85, 0.89)  | 0.90  | (0.89, 0.92)   |
| Has a finished floor [1]                           | 0.92  | (0.90, 0.94)  | 0.93  | (0.91, 0.95) | 0.96  | (0.94, 0.97)  | 0.96  | (0.95, 0.97)   |
| Wealth index score,<br>excluding WASH<br>variables | 0.06  | (-0.06, 0.19) | 0.19  | (0.05, 0.33) | -0.02 | (-0.14, 0.09) | -0.12 | (-0.21, -0.03) |
| Improved drinking water source [2]                 | 0.59  | (0.56, 0.62)  | 0.56  | (0.52, 0.59) | 0.61  | (0.58, 0.64)  | 0.70  | (0.68, 0.72)   |
| Has water source on site                           | 0.68  | (0.64, 0.71)  | 0.58  | (0.55, 0.61) | 0.60  | (0.57, 0.63)  | 0.65  | (0.62, 0.67)   |
| Water source is <5 min,<br>roundtrip               | 0.20  | (0.16, 0.25)  | 0.23  | (0.19, 0.28) | 0.24  | (0.19, 0.29)  | 0.34  | (0.29, 0.39)   |
| Reported minutes to fetch<br>water, roundtrip      | 12.42 | (10.6, 14.2)  | 14.14 | (12.5, 15.8) | 14.50 | (13.1, 15.9)  | 13.56 | (12.3, 14.8)   |

#### Table 2: Household and caregiver characteristics 476

[1] Finished floor defined as floor made of wood plans, palm/bamboo, parquet or polished wood, vinyl or asphalt strips, ceramic

477 478 479 tiles, cement tiles, or cement. Floor materials were classified by enumerator observation. [2] Improved sources of drinking water include: piped water into dwelling/yard/plot, public tap or standpipe, tube well or borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, 480 bottled water, and rainwater.

481

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

| 483 | Table 3: | Intervention | fidelity | indicators |
|-----|----------|--------------|----------|------------|
|-----|----------|--------------|----------|------------|

|  | Nut | rition-o | only | San | itation- | only | Co    | ombine | d   | Control |     |     |
|--|-----|----------|------|-----|----------|------|-------|--------|-----|---------|-----|-----|
| Nutrition  | Ν   | n        | %    | Ν   | n        | %    | N     | n      | %   | Ν       | n   | %   |
| Participated in any "First<br>1,000 Days" type activity [1]  | 817 | 615      | 75%  | 792 | 145      | 18%  | 1,055 | 813    | 77% | 1,460   | 383 | 26% |
| Participated in any GMP  | 817 | 641      | 78%  | 792 | 181      | 23%  | 1,055 | 935    | 89% | 1,460   | 482 | 33% |
| Received home visit VHSG   | 817 | 518      | 63%  | 792 | 227      | 29%  | 1,055 | 661    | 63% | 1,460   | 490 | 34% |
| Enrolled in any CCT program for health and nutrition [2]   | 817 | 224      | 27%  | 792 | 19       | 2%   | 1,055 | 228    | 22% | 1,460   | 31  | 2%  |
| Received any voucher for food basket [3]   | 817 | 440      | 54%  | 792 | 1        | 0%   | 1,055 | 554    | 53% | 1,460   | 6   | 0%  |
| Received any voucher for<br>water filter [3]   | 817 | 41       | 5%   | 792 | 40       | 5%   | 1,055 | 149    | 14% | 1,460   | 100 | 7%  |
| Aware of <i>Grow Together</i><br>campaign [4]  | 817 | 353      | 43%  | 792 | 93       | 12%  | 1,055 | 471    | 45% | 1,460   | 149 | 10% |
| Participation in nutrition<br>intervention activities: none<br>(0 of 8)  | 817 | 65       | 8%   | 792 | 404      | 51%  | 1,055 | 44     | 4%  | 1,460   | 585 | 40% |
| Participation in nutrition<br>intervention activities: low<br>(1-3 of 8)   | 817 | 262      | 32%  | 792 | 359      | 45%  | 1,055 | 367    | 35% | 1,460   | 809 | 55% |
| Participation in nutrition<br>intervention activities: med<br>(4-6 of 8)   | 817 | 387      | 47%  | 792 | 29       | 4%   | 1,055 | 501    | 47% | 1,460   | 65  | 4%  |
| Participation in nutrition<br>intervention activities: high<br>(7-8 of 8)  | 817 | 103      | 13%  | 792 | 0        | 0%   | 1,055 | 143    | 14% | 1,460   | 1   | 0%  |
| Sanitation   |     |          |      |     |          |      |       |        |     |         |     |     |
| Any CLTS participation [5]   | 817 | 115      | 14%  | 792 | 46       | 6%   | 1,055 | 261    | 25% | 1,460   | 81  | 6%  |
| Received any voucher to build latrine [6]  | 817 | 66       | 8%   | 792 | 51       | 6%   | 1,055 | 123    | 12% | 1,460   | 84  | 6%  |
| build latrine [6] [1] "First 1,000 Days" activities were administered in nutrition-only and combined arms and include: community dialogues, caregiver group education sessions, and village fairs. [2] CCT program ended in Jan 2019 and the Government of Cambodia started a new CCT program in July 2019 across study area. CCT program administered in nutrition-only and combined arms only. [3] Vouchers for water filter and food baskets were targeted subsidies distributed to CCT participants in nutrition-only and combined arms. [4] <i>Grow Together</i> campaign was part of the nutrition programming (nutrition-only and combined arms). However, three TV spote were seen across all four arms. [5] In sanitation-only and combined arms, the Ministry of Burgl |     |          |      |     |          |      |       |        |     |         |     |     |

Development confirmed that the project was the only CLTS campaign active in those areas. [6] Latrine vouchers were targeted subsidies given to households in villages that reached 75% sanitation coverage in sanitation-only and combined arms.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

### 486 **Table 4: Intervention adherence indicators (28-months after intervention)**

|  | Nu  | Nutrition-only |               | Sar | Sanitation-only |               | C     | ombined      | 1             | Control |              |            |
|--|-----|----------------|---------------|-----|-----------------|---------------|-------|--------------|---------------|---------|--------------|------------|
| Nutrition  | N   | n or<br>mean   | %<br>or<br>SD | N   | n or<br>mean    | %<br>or<br>SD | Ν     | n or<br>mean | %<br>or<br>SD | N       | n or<br>mean | % or<br>SD |
| Visited health facility for at<br>least four antenatal care<br>check-ups | 697 | 632            | 91%           | 712 | 646             | 91%           | 910   | 819          | 90%           | 1,257   | 1116         | 89%        |
| Brought child for monthly<br>GMP at community or<br>health center        | 817 | 641            | 78%           | 792 | 181             | 23%           | 1,055 | 935          | 89%           | 1,460   | 482          | 33%        |
| Breastfeeding exclusively<br>for children <6 months                      | 171 | 109            | 64%           | 161 | 110             | 68%           | 205   | 140          | 68%           | 272     | 182          | 67%        |
| Ever breastfed (all children)  | 817 | 797            | 98%           | 792 | 765             | 97%           | 1,048 | 1021         | 97%           | 1,457   | 1420         | 97%        |
| Solid and semi-solid foods<br>eaten for children >6<br>months            | 646 | 609            | 94%           | 631 | 611             | 97%           | 843   | 792          | 94%           | 1,185   | 1134         | 96%        |
| Dietary diversity score (0-7)  | 817 | 2.24           | 1.61          | 792 | 2.19            | 1.58          | 1,048 | 2.20         | 1.62          | 1,457   | 2.33         | 1.59       |
| Achieved minimum dietary diversity                                       | 817 | 202            | 25%           | 792 | 177             | 22%           | 1,048 | 247          | 24%           | 1,457   | 350          | 24%        |
| Achieved minimum meal frequency  | 817 | 537            | 66%           | 792 | 518             | 65%           | 1,048 | 680          | 65%           | 1,457   | 977          | 67%        |
| Achieved minimum<br>acceptable diet                                      | 817 | 170            | 21%           | 792 | 159             | 20%           | 1,048 | 205          | 20%           | 1,457   | 310          | 21%        |
| Treated drinking water   | 817 | 548            | 67%           | 792 | 471             | 59%           | 1,055 | 765          | 73%           | 1,460   | 1,037        | 71%        |
| Treated drinking water with filter                                       | 817 | 151            | 18%           | 792 | 160             | 20%           | 1,055 | 302          | 29%           | 1,460   | 548          | 40%        |
| Sanitation   |     |                |               |     |                 |               |       |              |               |         |              |            |
| Had improved sanitation facility [1]                                     | 816 | 452            | 55%           | 791 | 400             | 51%           | 1,054 | 638          | 61%           | 1,459   | 759          | 52%        |
| Open defecation (OD)   | 817 | 112            | 14%           | 792 | 126             | 16%           | 1,055 | 73           | 7%            | 1,460   | 231          | 16%        |
| Used shared toilet   | 817 | 252            | 31%           | 791 | 264             | 33%           | 1,054 | 343          | 33%           | 1,459   | 468          | 32%        |
| Caregiver reported adults in<br>HH openly defecating                     | 697 | 92             | 13%           | 658 | 116             | 18%           | 973   | 118          | 12%           | 1,208   | 213          | 18%        |
| Time to get to toilet, one<br>way (minutes)                              | 171 | 4.22           | 4.11          | 166 | 3.92            | 3.83          | 219   | 4.74         | 8.17          | 291     | 5.05         | 8.27       |
| Reported latrine built as a result of CLTS activity                      | 115 | 51             | 44%           | 46  | 15              | 33%           | 261   | 91           | 35%           | 81      | 28           | 35%        |
| Reported latrine built using latrine voucher                             | 50  | 10             | 20%           | 15  | 4               | 27%           | 91    | 37           | 41%           | 28      | 12           | 43%        |
| Main reason for not<br>constructing latrine: lack of<br>funds            | 20  | 17             | 85%           | 18  | 14              | 78%           | 60    | 55           | 92%           | 14      | 14           | 100%       |
| Main reason for<br>construction latrine: privacy                         | 51  | 7              | 14%           | 15  | 6               | 40%           | 91    | 6            | 7%            | 28      | 7            | 25%        |
| Main reason for<br>construction latrine:<br>security                     | 51  | 10             | 20%           | 15  | 2               | 13%           | 91    | 20           | 22%           | 28      | 4            | 14%        |
| Main reason for<br>construction latrine:<br>hygiene                      | 51  | 17             | 33%           | 15  | 5               | 33%           | 91    | 43           | 47%           | 28      | 10           | 36%        |
| Main reason for<br>construction latrine: OD is<br>harmful                | 51  | 5              | 10%           | 15  | 1               | 7%            | 91    | 9            | 10%           | 28      | 5            | 18%        |

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

| Child stools properly disposed of [2]                                | 817 | 581 | 71% | 792 | 515 | 65% | 1,055 | 781 | 74% | 1,460 | 993 | 68% |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| Community-level open<br>defecation before<br>intervention            | 817 | 28% | 27% | 792 | 41% | 33% | 1,055 | 28% | 28% | 1,460 | 32% | 31% |
| Community-level open defecation after intervention                   | 817 | 14% | 21% | 792 | 16% | 21% | 1,055 | 9%  | 17% | 1,460 | 13% | 20% |
| Environmental hygiene  |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |     |     |       |     |     |
| Child stools left in the open  | 817 | 147 | 18% | 792 | 170 | 21% | 1,055 | 160 | 15% | 1,460 | 315 | 22% |
| Child play environment<br>observed to be free of<br>animals          | 817 | 182 | 22% | 792 | 187 | 24% | 1,055 | 261 | 25% | 1,460 | 294 | 20% |
| Child play environment<br>observed to be free of<br>garbage/HH waste | 817 | 298 | 36% | 792 | 290 | 37% | 1,055 | 419 | 40% | 1,460 | 567 | 39% |
| Child play environment<br>observed to be free of sharp<br>objects    | 817 | 449 | 55% | 792 | 427 | 54% | 1,055 | 639 | 61% | 1,460 | 818 | 56% |
| Child play environment<br>observed to be free of<br>faeces           | 817 | 313 | 38% | 792 | 304 | 38% | 1,055 | 448 | 42% | 1,460 | 555 | 38% |

[1] Improved sanitation facilities include: flush/pour flush toilet to a piped sewer system, septic tank or pit latrine, a ventilated improved pit latrine, a pit latrine with slab, and a composting toilet. [2] Proper disposal of children faeces consist of putting or rinsing stool into a sanitation facility or burying it; improper disposal of children faeces includes putting or rinsing stool into a drain or ditch, throwing it into garbage or leaving it in the open.

487

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

#### 489 Table 5: Effects of interventions on length and weight (Primary outcome (LAZ) and

# 490 secondary outcomes (WAZ, WLZ)), comparing intervention arms to control and single 491 intervention arms to combined intervention

|                 |      |       |      | Unadjusted mean difference (95% CI) |                                       |  |  |  |
|-----------------|------|-------|------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                 | Ν    | Mean  | SD   | Compared to control arm             | Compared to combined intervention arm |  |  |  |
| LAZ             |      |       |      |                                     |                                       |  |  |  |
| Nutrition-only  | 798  | -0.95 | 1.16 | 0.08 (-0.01, 0.18)                  | -0.02 (-0.12, 0.09)                   |  |  |  |
| Sanitation-only | 777  | -1.09 | 1.23 | -0.05 (-0.16, 0.05)                 | -0.16 (-0.27, -0.04)                  |  |  |  |
| Combined        | 1037 | -0.94 | 1.16 | 0.10 (0.01, 0.20)                   |                                       |  |  |  |
| Control         | 1443 | -1.04 | 1.20 |                                     |                                       |  |  |  |
| WAZ             |      |       |      |                                     |                                       |  |  |  |
| Nutrition-only  | 815  | -0.95 | 1.29 | 0.10 (0.00, 0.19)                   | -0.02 (-0.12, 0.08)                   |  |  |  |
| Sanitation-only | 792  | -1.04 | 1.13 | 0.01 (-0.07, 0.09)                  | -0.10 (-0.20, -0.01)                  |  |  |  |
| Combined        | 1044 | -0.94 | 1.11 | 0.11 (0.03, 0.20)                   |                                       |  |  |  |
| Control         | 1452 | -1.05 | 1.10 |                                     |                                       |  |  |  |
| WLZ             |      |       |      |                                     |                                       |  |  |  |
| Nutrition-only  | 814  | -0.60 | 1.04 | 0.06 (-0.03, 0.15)                  | -0.02 (-0.12, 0.08)                   |  |  |  |
| Sanitation-only | 790  | -0.59 | 0.98 | 0.06 (-0.02, 0.14)                  | -0.02 (-0.11, 0.07)                   |  |  |  |
| Combined        | 1043 | -0.58 | 1.03 | 0.08 (0.00, 0.16)                   |                                       |  |  |  |
| Control         | 1452 | -0.65 | 0.98 |                                     |                                       |  |  |  |

492 493

494

# Table 6: Effects of intervention on child health outcomes, comparing intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined intervention.

|                      |       |      | Compared to control arm | Compared to combined-intervention arm |                   |  |  |  |
|----------------------|-------|------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
|                      | Ν     | Mean | SD                      | PR (95% CI)                           | PR (95% CI)       |  |  |  |
| Stunted              |       |      |                         |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| Nutrition-only       | 801   | 0.15 | 0.36                    | 0.84 (0.69, 1.03)                     | 0.93 (0.74, 1.15) |  |  |  |
| Sanitation-only      | 782   | 0.21 | 0.40                    | 1.12 (0.94, 1.33)                     | 1.23 (1.02, 1.49) |  |  |  |
| Combined             | 1046  | 0.17 | 0.37                    | 0.91 (0.76, 1.09)                     |                   |  |  |  |
| Control              | 1449  | 0.18 | 0.39                    |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| Wasted               |       |      |                         |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| Nutrition-only       | 815   | 0.07 | 0.26                    | 0.87 (0.65, 1.17)                     | 1.12 (0.80, 1.57) |  |  |  |
| Sanitation-only      | 790   | 0.07 | 0.26                    | 0.84 (0.62, 1.14)                     | 1.08 (0.76, 1.53) |  |  |  |
| Combined             | 1052  | 0.07 | 0.25                    | 0.78 (0.58, 1.04)                     |                   |  |  |  |
| Control              | 1457  | 0.08 | 0.28                    |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| Underweight          |       |      |                         |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| Nutrition-only       | 816   | 0.15 | 0.35                    | 0.85 (0.71, 1.03)                     | 1.04 (0.84, 1.29) |  |  |  |
| Sanitation-only      | 792   | 0.17 | 0.38                    | 1.00 (0.85, 1.19)                     | 1.22 (1.00, 1.49) |  |  |  |
| Combined             | 1053  | 0.14 | 0.35                    | 0.82 (0.68, 0.99)                     |                   |  |  |  |
| Control              | 1457  | 0.17 | 0.38                    |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| Diarrhoea (7-day red | call) |      |                         |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| Nutrition-only       | 788   | 0.19 | 0.39                    | 0.89 (0.74, 1.06)                     | 0.95 (0.78, 1.14) |  |  |  |
| Sanitation-only      | 752   | 0.21 | 0.41                    | 0.99 (0.84, 1.17)                     | 1.05 (0.88, 1.25) |  |  |  |
| Combined             | 1018  | 0.20 | 0.40                    | 0.94 (0.80, 1.11)                     |                   |  |  |  |
| Control              | 1411  | 0.21 | 0.41                    |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| All-cause mortality  |       |      |                         |                                       |                   |  |  |  |
| Nutrition-only       | 1574  | 0.03 | 0.16                    | 1.55 (0.71, 3.39)                     | 1.61 (0.68, 3.82) |  |  |  |
| Sanitation-only      | 1636  | 0.03 | 0.16                    | 1.09 (0.50, 2.40)                     | 1.13 (0.48, 2.68) |  |  |  |
| Combined             | 1932  | 0.03 | 0.16                    | 0.96 (0.44, 2.10)                     |                   |  |  |  |
| Control              | 2688  | 0.03 | 0.16                    |                                       |                   |  |  |  |

497

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# 499 Table 7: Enteric pathogen gene prevalence among treatment arms

|                                  |   | Nutrition-                                    | Sanitation-  |              |              |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                  | All samples                                   | only  | only         | Combined     | Control      |
|                                  | (N=1620)                                      | (N=305)                                       | (N=333)      | (N=438)      | (N=544)      |
| Bacteria                         |   |   | ( )          |              |              |
| <i>Campylobacter</i> spp.        | 551 (34%)                                     | 104 (34%)                                     | 114 (34%)    | 162 (37%)    | 171 (31%)    |
| Clostridium difficile            | 139 (9%)                                      | 33 (11%)                                      | 25 (8%)      | 41 (9%)      | 40 (7%)      |
| EAEC                             | 1029 (64%)                                    | 204 (67%)                                     | 207 (62%)    | 281 (64%)    | 337 (62%)    |
| EPEC                             | 899 (55%)                                     | 172 (56%)                                     | 173 (52%)    | 234 (53%)    | 320 (59%)    |
| aEPEC                            | 703 (43%)                                     | 139 (46%)                                     | 137 (41%)    | 173 (39%)    | 254 (47%)    |
| tEPEC                            | 109 (7%)                                      | 15 (5%)                                       | 17 (5%)      | 32 (7%)      | 45 (8%)      |
| ETEC                             | 422 (26%)                                     | 86 (28%)                                      | 79 (24%)     | 114 (26%)    | 143 (26%)    |
| ETEC-LT                          | 342 (21%)                                     | 75 (25%)                                      | 68 (20%)     | 86 (20%)     | 113 (21%)    |
| ETEC-ST                          | 194 (12%)                                     | 39 (13%)                                      | 37 (11%)     | 63 (14%)     | 55 (10%)     |
| ETEC-LT/ST                       | 114 (7%)                                      | 28 (9%)                                       | 26 (8%)      | 35 (8%)      | 25 (5%)      |
| Salmonella spp.                  | 134 (8%)                                      | 28 (9%)                                       | 19 (6%)      | 39 (9%)      | 48 (9%)      |
| Shigella spp.                    | 186 (11%)                                     | 24 (8%)                                       | 39 (12%)     | 52 (12%)     | 71 (13%)     |
| STEC                             | 132 (8%)                                      | 27 (9%)                                       | 22 (7%)      | 45 (10%)     | 38 (7%)      |
| Vibrio cholerae                  | 10 (1%)                                       | 1 (0%)  | 6 (2%)       | 1 (0%)       | 2 (0%)       |
| At least 1 bacterium detected    | 1410 (87%)                                    | 276 (90%)                                     | 282 (85%)    | 386 (88%)    | 466 (86%)    |
|                                  | , <i>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </i> | , <i>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </i> | , , ,        |              | 2.51         |
|                                  | 2.48  | 2.46  | 2.43         | 2.51         | (2.40,       |
| Mean number of bacteria detected | (2.42, 2.55)                                  | (2.32, 2.60)                                  | (2.28, 2.57) | (2.39, 2.63) | 2.62)        |
| Viruses                          |   |   |              |              |              |
| Adenovirus                       | 287 (18%)                                     | 77 (25%)                                      | 59 (18%)     | 78 (18%)     | 73 (13%)     |
| Astrovirus                       | 7 (0%)  | 2 (1%)  | 1 (0%)       | 3 (1%)       | 1 (0%)       |
| Enterovirus                      | 558 (34%)                                     | 97 (32%)                                      | 105 (32%)    | 169 (39%)    | 187 (34%)    |
| Norovirus                        | 54 (3%)                                       | 8 (3%)  | 9 (3%)       | 20 (5%)      | 17 (3%)      |
| Rotavirus                        | 17 (1%)                                       | 2 (1%)  | 2 (1%)       | 6 (1%)       | 7 (1%)       |
| Sapovirus                        | 24 (1%)                                       | 4 (1%)  | 5 (2%)       | 9 (2%)       | 6 (1%)       |
| At least 1 virus detected        | 788 (49%)                                     | 152 (50%)                                     | 157 (47%)    | 231 (53%)    | 248 (46%)    |
|                                  | 1.20  |   |              |              | 1.17         |
|                                  | (1.17,  | 1.25  | 1.15         | 1.23         | (1.12,       |
| Mean number of viruses detected  | 1.23)   | (1.17, 1.33)                                  | (1.09, 1.21) | (1.17, 1.30) | 1.23)        |
| Protozoa                         |   |   |              |              |              |
| Cryptosporidium                  | 17 (1%)                                       | 4 (1%)  | 1 (0%)       | 6 (1%)       | 6 (1%)       |
| Entamoeba                        | 13 (1%)                                       | 1 (0%)  | 1 (0%)       | 8 (2%)       | 3 (1%)       |
| Giardia                          | 306 (19%)                                     | 52 (17%)                                      | 68 (20%)     | 84 (19%)     | 102 (19%)    |
| At least 1 protozoan detected    | 328 (20%)                                     | 56 (18%)                                      | 69 (21%)     | 93 (21%)     | 110 (20%)    |
|                                  | 1.02  |   |              |              | 1.01         |
|                                  | (1.01,  | 1.02  | 1.01         | 1.05         | (0.99,       |
| Mean number of protozoa detected | 1.04)   | (0.98, 1.05)                                  | (0.99, 1.04) | (1.01, 1.10) | 1.03)        |
| STH                              | 2 (00()                                       | 0 (00)  | 0 (00)       | 2 (10/)      | 0.(00.()     |
| Ascaris lumbricoides             | 3 (0%)  | 0(0%)   | 0 (0%)       | 3 (1%)       | 0 (0%)       |
| Trichuris trichiura              | 3 (0%)  | 1 (0%)  | 1 (0%)       |              | 1 (0%)       |
| Ancylostoma duodenale            | 17 (1%)                                       |   | 4 (1%)       | 4 (1%)       | 9 (2%)       |
| Necator americanus               | 20 (1%)                                       | <u> </u>                                      | 6 (2%)       | <u> </u>     | 6(1%)        |
| At least 1                       | 37 (2%)                                       | 4 (1%)  | 10 (3%)      | 9 (2%)       | 14 (3%)      |
|                                  | 1 1 4   | 1.00  | 1 10         | 1.33         | 1.14         |
| Mean number of STU detected      | 1.10  | 1.00  | 1.10         | (1.00, 1.67) | (0.93, 1.24) |
| wieall number of STH detected    | (1.04, 1.29)                                  | (1.00, 1.00)                                  | (0.90, 1.30) | 1.07)        | 1.34)        |

## 502 Table 8: Unadjusted incidence rate ratios of co-detected bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and

#### 503 STHs, comparing intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined 504 intervention.

|             |      | C              | ompared to control ar | Compared to  | Compared to combined arm |                 |  |  |
|-------------|------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
|             | Ν    | Nutrition-only | Sanitation-only       | Combined     | Nutrition-only           | Sanitation-only |  |  |
| Bacteria 10 | 1620 | 1.04           | 0.96                  | 1.03         | 0.01                     | -0.07           |  |  |
|             | 1020 | (0.95, 1.13)   | (0.87, 1.05)          | (0.95, 1.12) | (-0.08, 0.10)            | (-0.17, 0.02)   |  |  |
| x 7.        | 1620 | 1.16           | 1.02                  | 1.22         | -0.04                    | -0.18           |  |  |
| viruses     | 1020 | (0.99, 1.37)   | (0.86, 1.19)          | (1.05, 1.41) | (-0.21, 0.12)            | (-0.34, -0.02)  |  |  |
| D (         | 1(20 | 0.92           | 1.03                  | 1.10         | -0.18                    | -0.06           |  |  |
| Protozoa    | 1620 | (0.68, 1.23)   | (0.79, 1.35)          | (0.85, 1.41) | (-0.48, 0.12)            | (0.66, -0.34)   |  |  |

505

- 506 Table 9: Unadjusted prevalence ratios (PR) of detected bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and
- 507 STHs, comparing intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined
- 508 intervention.

|                      | Co                      | ompared to control arm  |                       | Compared to             | combined arm          |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|                      | Nutrition-only          | Sanitation-only         | Combined              | Nutrition-only          | Sanitation-only       |
| Any bacterium        | 1.06 (1.00, 1.11)       | 0.99 (0.93, 1.05)       | 1.03 (0.98, 1.08)     | 1.03 (0.98, 1.08)       | 0.96 (0.91, 1.02)     |
| Camploybacter spp.   | 1.08 (0.89, 1.32)       | 1.09 (0.90, 1.32)       | 1.18 (0.99, 1.40)     | 0.92 (0.76, 1.12)       | 0.93 (0.76, 1.12)     |
| C.diff               | 1.47 (0.95, 2.28)       | 1.02 (0.63, 1.65)       | 1.27 (0.84, 1.93)     | 1.16 (0.75, 1.78)       | 0.80 (0.50, 1.29)     |
| EAEC                 | 1.08 (0.97, 1.20)       | 1.00 (0.90, 1.12)       | 1.04 (0.94, 1.14)     | 1.04 (0.94, 1.16)       | 0.97 (0.87, 1.08)     |
| EPEC                 | 0.96 (0.85, 1.08)       | 0.88 (0.78, 1.00)       | 0.91 (0.81, 1.02)     | 1.06 (0.93, 1.20)       | 0.97 (0.85, 1.11)     |
| aEPEC                | 0.98 (0.84, 1.14)       | 0.88 (0.75, 1.03)       | 0.85 (0.73, 0.98)     | 1.15 (0.97, 1.37)       | 1.04 (0.88, 1.24)     |
| tEPEC                | 0.59 (0.34, 1.05)       | 0.62 (0.36, 1.06)       | 0.88 (0.57, 1.37)     | 0.67 (0.37, 1.22)       | 0.70 (0.39, 1.24)     |
| ETEC                 | 1.07 (0.85, 1.35)       | 0.90 (0.71, 1.15)       | 0.99 (0.80, 1.22)     | 1.08 (0.85, 1.38)       | 0.91 (0.71, 1.17)     |
| ETEC-LT              | 1.18 (0.92, 1.53)       | 0.98 (0.75, 1.29)       | 0.95 (0.74, 1.21)     | 1.25 (0.95, 1.65)       | 1.04 (0.78, 1.38)     |
| ETEC-ST              | 1.26 (0.86, 1.86)       | 1.10 (0.74, 1.63)       | 1.42 (1.01, 2.00)     | 0.89 (0.61, 1.29)       | 0.77 (0.53, 1.13)     |
| ETEC-LT/ST           | 2.00 (1.19, 3.36)       | 1.70 (1.00, 2.89)       | 1.74 (1.06, 2.86)     | 1.15 (0.71, 1.85)       | 0.98 (0.60, 1.59)     |
| Salmonella spp.      | 1.04 (0.67, 1.62)       | 0.65 (0.39, 1.08)       | 1.01 (0.67, 1.51)     | 1.03 (0.65, 1.64)       | 0.64 (0.38, 1.09)     |
| EIEC/Shigella spp.   | 0.60 (0.39, 0.94)       | 0.90 (0.62, 1.29)       | 0.91 (0.65, 1.27)     | 0.66 (0.42, 1.05)       | 0.99 (0.67, 1.46)     |
| STEC                 | 1.27 (0.79, 2.03)       | 0.95 (0.57, 1.57)       | 1.47 (0.97, 2.22)     | 0.86 (0.55, 1.36)       | 0.64 (0.39, 1.05)     |
| Any virus            | 1.09 (0.95, 1.26)       | 1.03 (0.89, 1.20)       | 1.16 (1.02, 1.31)     | 0.94 (0.82, 1.09)       | 0.89 (0.77, 1.03)     |
| Adenovirus           | 1.88 (1.41, 2.51)       | 1.32 (0.96, 1.81)       | 1.33 (0.99, 1.78)     | 1.42 (1.07, 1.87)       | 0.99 (0.73, 1.35)     |
| Enterovirus          | 0.93 (0.76, 1.13)       | 0.92 (0.75, 1.12)       | 1.12 (0.95, 1.32)     | 0.82 (0.67, 1.01)       | 0.82 (0.67, 1.00)     |
| Any protozoa         | 0.91 (0.68, 1.21)       | 1.02 (0.78, 1.34)       | 1.05 (0.82, 1.34)     | 0.86 (0.64, 1.16)       | 0.98 (0.74, 1.29)     |
| Giardia              | 0.91 (0.67, 1.23)       | 1.09 (0.83, 1.43)       | 1.02 (0.79, 1.33)     | 0.89 (0.65, 1.22)       | 1.06 (0.80, 1.42)     |
| Gene targets with <  | <5% prevalence were     | omitted from PR an      | alyses: V.cholera, as | strovirus, norovirus, 1 | rotavirus, sapovirus, |
| Cryptosporidium, Ent | amoeba, and all STHs (A | scaris, Trichuris, Ancy | lostoma, and Necator) |                         | _                     |

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# 511 Table 10: Mean difference in log<sub>10</sub>-transformed gene copy estimates, comparing

### 512 intervention arms to control and single intervention arms to combined intervention.

|   | Compared to control arm |                      |                      | Compared to combined arm |                      |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
|   | Nutrition-only          | Sanitation-only      | Combined             | Nutrition-only           | Sanitation-only      |
| Bacteria  |                         |                      |                      |                          |                      |
| CAMP  | 0.22 (-0.60 - 1.03)     | -0.40 (-1.27 - 0.48) | -0.24 (-1.00 - 0.53) | 0.45 (-0.37 - 1.28)      | -0.16 (-1.05 - 0.73) |
| CDIF  | 0.31 (-1.14 - 1.75)     | -0.37 (-1.92 - 1.19) | 0.19 (-1.16 - 1.54)  | 0.11 (-1.29 - 1.52)      | -0.56 (-2.08 - 0.96) |
| EAEC_aaic   | -0.38 (-1.35 - 0.60)    | 0.35 (-0.52 - 1.22)  | -0.28 (-1.08 - 0.52) | -0.10 (-1.11 - 0.92)     | 0.63 (-0.28 - 1.54)  |
| EAEC aata   | -0.36 (-1.26 - 0.53)    | -0.24 (-1.05 - 0.56) | 0.12 (-0.69 - 0.93)  | -0.48 (-1.43 - 0.47)     | -0.36 (-1.24 - 0.51) |
| EPEC_bfpa   | -1.08 (-3.47 - 1.31)    | -1.13 (-3.16 - 0.89) | 1.15 (-0.38 - 2.67)  | -2.23 (-4.57 - 0.11)     | -2.28 (-4.240.32)    |
| EPEC_eae  | -0.12 (-0.80 - 0.56)    | -0.54 (-1.17 - 0.09) | 0.24 (-0.33 - 0.82)  | -0.37 (-1.05 - 0.32)     | -0.78 (-1.410.15)    |
| ETEC LT   | -0.62 (-1.64 - 0.40)    | -0.47 (-1.56 - 0.61) | -0.03 (-1.06 - 1.00) | -0.59 (-1.65 - 0.47)     | -0.44 (-1.57 - 0.68) |
| ETEC_stp  | 0.13 (-1.73 - 1.98)     | 1.29 (-0.61 - 3.20)  | 0.87 (-0.97 - 2.71)  | -0.75 (-2.61 - 1.11)     | 0.42 (-1.49 - 2.33)  |
| SALM  | 1.42 (-0.04 - 2.87)     | 0.27 (-0.97 - 1.52)  | 0.80 (-0.33 - 1.93)  | 0.62 (-0.93 - 2.17)      | -0.53 (-1.89 - 0.83) |
| IPAH  | 0.22 (-1.33 - 1.77)     | -0.28 (-1.68 - 1.13) | 1.17 (0.07 - 2.26)   | -0.95 (-2.43 - 0.53)     | -1.44 (-2.770.11)    |
| STEC1   | -1.46 (-2.97 - 0.06)    | -1.71 (-3.070.34)    | -0.00 (-1.49 - 1.49) | -1.46 (-2.840.07)        | -1.70 (-2.920.49)    |
| STEC2   | -0.20 (-1.45 - 1.04)    | 0.09 (-1.20 - 1.37)  | 0.72 (-0.47 - 1.91)  | -0.92 (-2.06 - 0.22)     | -0.63 (-1.82 - 0.56) |
| Viruses   |                         |                      |                      |                          |                      |
| ADEV  | 0.50 (-0.48 - 1.49)     | 0.67 (-0.32 - 1.67)  | 0.48 (-0.42 - 1.38)  | 0.03 (-0.96 - 1.02)      | 0.20 (-0.80 - 1.20)  |
| ENTV  | -0.40 (-1.09 - 0.28)    | -0.35 (-0.97 - 0.26) | -0.26 (-0.77 - 0.24) | -0.14 (-0.84 - 0.56)     | -0.09 (-0.72 - 0.54) |
| Protozoa  |                         |                      |                      |                          |                      |
| GIAR  | -1.73 (-3.020.44)       | 0.23 (-1.16 - 1.62)  | -0.14 (-1.47 - 1.18) | -1.58 (-3.060.11)        | 0.37 (-1.19 - 1.93)  |
| Gene targets with <5% prevalence were omitted from PR analyses: V.cholera, astrovirus, norovirus, rotavirus, sapovirus, |                         |                      |                      |                          |                      |
| Cryptosporidium, Entamoeba, and all STHs (Ascaris, Trichuris, Ancylostoma, and Necator).                                |                         |                      |                      |                          |                      |

# References

- 1. Prendergast, A. J. & Humphrey, J. H. The stunting syndrome in developing countries. *Paediatr Int Child Health* **34**, 250–265 (2014).
- 2. Victora, C. G. *et al.* Maternal and child undernutrition: consequences for adult health and human capital. *The Lancet* **371**, 340–357 (2008).
- 3. Luby, S. P. *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health* **6**, e302–e315 (2018).
- 4. Null, C. *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Kenya: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health* **6**, e316–e329 (2018).
- 5. Ruel, M. T. & Alderman, H. Nutrition-sensitive interventions and programmes: how can they help to accelerate progress in improving maternal and child nutrition? *Lancet* **382**, 536–551 (2013).
- 6. Humphrey, J. H. Child undernutrition, tropical enteropathy, toilets, and handwashing. *Lancet* **374**, 1032–1035 (2009).
- 7. Guerrant, R. L., Schorling, J. B., McAuliffe, J. F. & de Souza, M. A. Diarrhea as a cause and an effect of malnutrition: diarrhea prevents catch-up growth and malnutrition increases diarrhea frequency and duration. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **47**, 28–35 (1992).
- 8. Ikeda, N., Irie, Y. & Shibuya, K. Determinants of reduced child stunting in Cambodia: analysis of pooled data from three demographic and health surveys. *Bull World Health Organ* **91**, 341–349 (2013).
- 9. Humphrey, J. H. *et al.* Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on child stunting and anaemia in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Glob Health* **7**, e132–e147 (2019).
- Vyas, S., Kov, P., Smets, S. & Spears, D. Disease externalities and net nutrition: Evidence from changes in sanitation and child height in Cambodia, 2005–2010. *Econ Hum Biol* 23, 235–245 (2016).
- Harris, M., Alzua, M. L., Osbert, N. & Pickering, A. Community-Level Sanitation Coverage More Strongly Associated with Child Growth and Household Drinking Water Quality than Access to a Private Toilet in Rural Mali. *Environ Sci Technol* 51, 7219–7227 (2017).
- 12. Pickering, A. J., Djebbari, H., Lopez, C., Coulibaly, M. & Alzua, M. L. Effect of a community-led sanitation intervention on child diarrhoea and child growth in rural Mali: A cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health* **3**, e701–e711 (2015).
- 13. Briceño, B., Coville, A., Gertler, P. & Martinez, S. Are there synergies from combining hygiene and sanitation promotion campaigns: Evidence from a large-scale cluster-randomized trial in rural Tanzania. *PLoS One* **12**, e0186228–e0186228 (2017).
- 14. Clasen, T. *et al.* Effectiveness of a rural sanitation programme on diarrhoea, soiltransmitted helminth infection, and child malnutrition in Odisha, India: a clusterrandomised trial. *Lancet Glob Health* **2**, e645–e653 (2014).
- 15. Knee, J. *et al.* Effects of an urban sanitation intervention on childhood enteric infection and diarrhea in Maputo, Mozambique: A controlled before-and-after trial. *Elife* **10**, 2020.08.20.20178608 (2021).

- Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES): Anthropometry Procedures Manual. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/2017-2018/manuals/2017 Anthropometry Procedures Manual.pdf (2017).
- 17. Mutz, D. C., Pemantle, R. & Pham, P. The Perils of Balance Testing in Experimental Design: Messy Analyses of Clean Data. *Am Stat* **73**, 32–42 (2019).
- 18. Liu, J. *et al.* Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to identify causes of diarrhoea in children: a reanalysis of the GEMS case-control study. *The Lancet* **388**, 1291–1301 (2016).
- 19. Rothman, K. J. No Adjustments Are Needed for Multiple Comparisons. *Epidemiology* **1**, (1990).
- 20. Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)* **57**, 289–300 (1995).
- 21. Marschner, I. C. Optimal design of clinical trials comparing several treatments with a control. *Pharm Stat* **6**, 23–33 (2007).
- 22. Zanello, G., Srinivasan, C. S. & Shankar, B. What Explains Cambodia's Success in Reducing Child Stunting-2000-2014? *PLoS One* **11**, e0162668 (2016).
- 23. National Institute of Statistics, Directorate General for Health, and I. I. *Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey 2014*.
- 24. Pickering, A. J. *et al.* The WASH Benefits and SHINE trials: interpretation of WASH intervention effects on linear growth and diarrhoea. *Lancet Glob Health* **7**, e1139–e1146 (2019).
- 25. Prendergast, A. J. *et al.* Putting the 'A' into WaSH: a call for integrated management of water, animals, sanitation, and hygiene. *Lancet Planet Health* **3**, e336–e337 (2019).
- Leroy, J. L., Ruel, M., Habicht, J.-P. & Frongillo, E. A. Using height-for-age differences (HAD) instead of height-for-age z-scores (HAZ) for the meaningful measurement of population-level catch-up in linear growth in children less than 5 years of age. *BMC Pediatr* 15, 145 (2015).
- Resendiz-Nava, C., Esquivel-Hernandez, Y., Alcaraz-Gonzalez, A., Castaneda-Serrano, P. & Nava, G. M. PCR Assays Based on invA Gene Amplification are not Reliable for Salmonella Detection. *Jundishapur J Microbiol* In Press, (2019).
- 28. Shiras, T. *et al.* Shared latrines in Maputo, Mozambique: exploring emotional well-being and psychosocial stress. *BMC Int Health Hum Rights* **18**, 30 (2018).
- 29. Platts-Mills, J. A. *et al.* Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to assess the aetiology, burden, and clinical characteristics of diarrhoea in children in low-resource settings: a reanalysis of the MAL-ED cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health* **6**, e1309–e1318 (2018).
- 30. Rogawski, E. T. *et al.* Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to investigate the effect of enteropathogen infections on linear growth in children in low-resource settings: longitudinal analysis of results from the MAL-ED cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health* **6**, e1319–e1328 (2018).