

1 Water, Sanitation and Cholera in sub-Saharan Africa

2 Mustafa Sikder,^{a 1} Aniruddha Deshpande,² Sonia T. Hegde,³ Espoir Bwenge Malembaka,^{3, 4}
3 Karin Gallandat,⁵ Robert C. Reiner,⁶ Justin Lessler,³ Elizabeth C. Lee,³ Andrew S. Azman^{*3}

4 ¹ Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns
5 Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

6 ² Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

7 ³ Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns
8 Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

9 ⁴ Center for Tropical Diseases and Global Health (CTDGH), Université Catholique de Bukavu
10 (UCB), Bukavu, the Democratic Republic of Congo.

11 ⁵ Environmental Health Group, Department for Disease Control, Faculty of Infectious and
12 Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

13 ⁶ Department of Health Metrics Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle,
14 WA, USA

15 Corresponding author:

16 Andrew S. Azman, azman@jhu.edu, and Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins
17 Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

18

19

^a Present affiliation: Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, Food and Drug Administration, College Park, MD, USA

20 Abstract

21 Improvements in water and sanitation should reduce cholera risk. But it is unclear which water
22 and sanitation access are associated with cholera risk. We estimated the association between
23 eight water and sanitation measures and annual cholera incidence across sub-Saharan
24 Africa (2010-2016) for data aggregated at the country and district-level. We fit random forest
25 regression and classification models to understand how well these measures combined might
26 be able to predict cholera incidence rates and identify high cholera incidence areas. Across
27 spatial scales, piped or “other improved” water access was inversely associated with cholera
28 incidence. Access to piped water, piped sanitation, and piped or “other improved” sanitation
29 were associated with decreased district-level cholera incidence. The classification model had
30 moderate skill in identifying high cholera incidence areas (cross-validated-AUC 0.81 95%CI
31 0.78–0.83) with high negative predictive values (92.5–100.0%) indicating the utility of water and
32 sanitation measures for screening out areas that are unlikely to be cholera hotspots. While
33 comprehensive cholera risk assessments must incorporate other data sources (e.g., historical
34 incidence), our results suggest that water and sanitation measures could alone be useful in
35 narrowing the geographic focus for detailed risk assessments.

36

37 Keywords

38 Water, sanitation, cholera, sub-Saharan Africa, ecological analyses

39 Synopsis

40 We quantified the relationship between high-resolution estimates of water and sanitation access
41 and cholera incidence and assessed the utility of water and sanitation measures in identifying
42 high risk geographic areas in sub-Saharan Africa.

43

44 Introduction

45 Access to safe water and sanitation are measured as part of global disease control initiatives
46 and to assess progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals. Safe water and sanitation
47 reduce the risk of water-borne diseases, improve health, and are considered fundamental
48 human rights. The Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP), a collaboration between the World
49 Health Organization (WHO) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), defines improved
50 drinking water sources as those that have the potential to deliver safe water, including piped
51 water, boreholes, protected dug wells, protected springs, rainwater, and packaged water, and
52 improved sanitation as those facilities designed to hygienically separate excreta from human
53 contact.

54 *Vibrio cholerae*, the bacteria that causes cholera disease, is primarily transmitted through
55 contaminated food and water. While eliminating fecal contamination of water and food by *V*
56 *cholerae* should greatly reduce cholera risk, evidence documenting the impact of water,
57 sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) on cholera in contemporary settings remains limited. This is
58 likely due to heterogeneity in WASH intervention implementation, and the gap between access
59 and use of safely managed infrastructure. Two systematic reviews identified low and medium-
60 quality studies that measured the impact of short-term WASH interventions on cholera
61 incidence; the settings, study designs, and interventions were highly variable, and the estimated
62 reduction in cholera incidence ranged from 0 to 88% across studies and interventions.^{1,2}

63 Ecological studies examining the association of WASH infrastructure and/or behaviors (without
64 an explicit intervention) and cholera risk found more consistent evidence that WASH-related
65 exposures were positively associated with cholera risk. A systematic review of individual and
66 household-level factors found that unimproved water sources and open container water storage
67 increased the odds of symptomatic cholera, while household water treatment and hand hygiene
68 decreased it.³ Another systematic review of 51 case-control studies found that eight WASH risk
69 factors were associated with higher odds of cholera and five out of seven WASH protective
70 factors were associated with lower odds of cholera, although 80% of the studies were evaluated
71 to have medium or high risk of bias.⁴ Finally, an ecological analysis found that national
72 estimates of access to improved water sources and improved sanitation only had limited
73 predictive value in identifying endemic cholera countries.⁵

74 With current global commitments to making significant progress in reducing cholera burden,
75 including the Cholera Roadmap 2030,⁶ several countries are developing multi-year, multi-
76 sectoral national cholera control plans. In developing these plans, countries must determine
77 how to best utilize limited resources and seek an evidence base to help make these decisions.
78 In this context, robust, quantitative evidence of the association between specific water and
79 sanitation exposures and cholera risk can inform future decision making on the geographic
80 prioritization of cholera interventions.

81 In our study, we leverage fine-scale estimates of water and sanitation services⁷ and suspected
82 cholera incidence from sub-Saharan Africa⁸ to explore the association between water and
83 sanitation infrastructure access and cholera risk at national and sub-national scales.

84 Methods

85 *Data sources*

86 We used previously published mean annual incidence estimates of suspected cholera (referred
87 to throughout simply as ‘cholera’) from 2010 to 2016 in 20 km x 20 km grid cells across sub-
88 Saharan Africa excluding Botswana, Djibouti, and Eritrea.⁸ We obtained mean annual estimates
89 originally made at the 5km x 5km grid cell level of two sets of four mutually exclusive and
90 collectively exhaustive indicators of access—one set for drinking water and one for sanitation.⁷
91 Both the drinking water indicator set (piped water on or off premises, other improved facilities,
92 unimproved, and surface water) and sanitation indicator set (septic or sewer sanitation, other
93 improved, unimproved, and open defecation) collectively accounts for 100% of the population in
94 the respective geographical area. In our analysis, we grouped four putative protective
95 measures: access to improved water, access to piped water on or off premises, access to
96 improved (sewer or septic) sanitation, and access to piped sanitation). The remaining measures
97 (reliance on unimproved (unprotected wells and springs) water, surface water (untreated from
98 lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams), unimproved sanitation (flush toilets to open channels,
99 unimproved latrines), and open defecation) were considered as putative risk factors. We
100 obtained 1km X 1km resolution population size estimates from the WorldPop Open Population
101 Repository for 2010 to 2016. We conducted analyses at two spatial scales: country (n=40) and
102 second-level administrative unit level (n=4,146) with administrative boundaries based on the
103 Database of Global Administrative Areas version 3.6.⁹

104 *Analysis*

105 Our analyses included 40 countries in sub-Saharan Africa where both suspected cholera case
106 incidence data and water and sanitation data were available. All water and sanitation measures
107 were reported as percent of people with access to protective measures or reliance on risk
108 measures. For the water and sanitation measures, we first calculated mean access/reliance
109 across annual estimates from 2010 to 2016 and mean population counts across the same
110 period; this period matched the period corresponding to the mean annual cholera incidence
111 estimates. Then we calculated population-weighted country means for water and sanitation
112 measures and annual cholera incidence. To quantify the association between mean annual
113 cholera incidence and mean water and sanitation measures by country, we used univariate
114 Quasi-Poisson regression with water and sanitation measures as linear predictors of cholera
115 incidence and total population of the country as an offset term.

116 We aggregated water and sanitation and cholera measures at the second-level subnational
117 administrative unit (n=4,146), hereafter “district.” We defined high cholera incidence areas as
118 districts where >10% of the population or >100,000 people lived in a grid cell with a mean
119 annual incidence rate >1 per 1000 cases/year, following previous work.⁸ To study the
120 relationship between district-level mean annual cholera incidence and water and sanitation
121 measures, we used univariate Poisson generalized estimating equations (GEE) with country as
122 cluster variable and district population as an offset term. Estimates of risk ratios for exposures
123 that are ordinal in nature can be challenging to interpret (e.g. risk ratio for access to improved
124 water will include both those with ‘better’ (piped water) and ‘worse’ (unimproved water and

125 surface water) access to water in the comparison group). Therefore, to have more interpretable
126 relative risk estimates we arranged the water measures as piped water, piped or “other
127 improved” water, and surface water and sanitation measures as piped sanitation, piped or “other
128 improved” sanitation, and open defecation.


129 We then used random forest models to understand the potential predictive value of all water and
130 sanitation measures combined for predicting suspected cholera incidence rates and for
131 identifying high cholera incidence areas (e.g., identifying administrative units where incidence
132 rates exceed a specific threshold). We conducted leave-one-district-out cross-validation to
133 evaluate the model performance and then ran the model on the full data to understand the
134 predictive importance of the water and sanitation measures. For the regression models, which
135 had mean annual incidence as the dependent variable, model fit was judged by cross-validated
136 root mean square error (cvRMSE). In classification models, meant to discriminate areas with
137 high incidence from those without high incidence, model fit was judged by area under the cross-
138 validated receiver operator characteristic curve (cvAUC). We performed oversampling with
139 replacement from the minority class to address the class imbalance between high incidence
140 areas (n=309) and areas without high incidence (n= 3,837) in each fold using previously
141 published methods.¹⁰ To understand the relative importance of each water and sanitation
142 measure within the models, we calculated the conditional permutation importance (CPI)
143 matrix.¹¹ In secondary analysis, we fit high incidence area classification models only including
144 countries where at least one district was classified as high cholera incidence area (25 countries)
145 and explored the performance of gradient boosting machine (GBM) models.

146 The data aggregation for district- and country-level estimates were completed using the
147 *Exactextract*,¹² generalized estimating equations using *gee*,¹³ the random forest models were
148 completed using the *randomForest*,¹⁴ variable importance were obtained using *permimp*,¹¹ and
149 GBM models were completed using *gbm*¹⁵ packages in R. Code and data needed to reproduce
150 primary analyses are available at the [code repository](#).

151 Results

152 *Country-level*

153 Country-level population weighted mean water and sanitation measures varied across the study
154 area (Figure 1 and Table S1).⁷ Of the four protective factors, access to improved water had the
155 highest mean prevalence (mean: 68%, range: 34-92%) and access to piped sanitation had the
156 lowest (10%, range: <1%-55%). Among the risk factors, reliance on open defecation had the
157 highest (32%, range: 2-70%) and reliance on surface water had the lowest prevalence (11%,
158 <1-30%). The 2010-2016 mean annual incidence of suspected cholera at the national-level
159 ranged from 1.83 (95% CI 0.96-4.01) cases per 10,000 population (Sierra Leone) to 0.0003
160 (95% CI 0.0001-0.0005) cases per 10,000 population (Gabon).⁸




161

162 **Figure 1:** Water and sanitation measures and incidence rate of suspected cholera (2010-2016):
 163 (A) mean water and sanitation measures and log of mean annual incidence of cholera per 1,000
 164 population by country; scatter plots with point color indicating mean cholera cases in 1,000
 165 people (B) between reliance on surface water and open defecation (extremes) by district; (C)
 166 between improved water and improved sanitation by district. Univariate histograms of district-
 167 level measures shown along the axes of (B) and (C) are in blue and orange.

168 At the country-level, we found that increases in access to piped or “other improved” water were
 169 associated with a significant decrease in mean annual cholera incidence in univariate analysis.
 170 A 1% increase in piped or “other improved” water access was associated with a 7.0% (95%CI
 171 4.0–10.0) decrease in mean annual cholera incidence within the country. The remaining

172 putative protective factors, access to piped water (3.0%, 95%CI 0.0–6.0), piped or “other
 173 improved” sanitation (1.0%, 95%CI -1.0–4.0), and piped sanitation (3.0%, 95%CI -1.0–9.0), had
 174 point estimates consistent with being protective though they were not significantly associated
 175 with mean annual cholera incidence (Figure 2). Among the putative risk factors, none achieved
 176 statistical significance at the 0.05 level. Effect estimates for reliance on surface water and open
 177 defecation were uncertain and confidence intervals spanned the null.



178

179 **Figure 2:** Risk ratio of water and sanitation measures from univariate models at country (Quasi-
 180 Poisson) and district scales (Poisson GEE). Reference groups (denoted ‘ref’) for each model
 181 are included to compare the risk ratios.


182 *District-level*

183 When aggregating data to the district-level, results were qualitatively consistent with the
 184 country-level analyses. Increases in access to piped water, piped or “other improved” water,
 185 piped sanitation, and piped or “other improved” sanitation were associated with a significant
 186 decrease in mean annual cholera incidence (Figure 2, Table S2). For example, a 1% increase in
 187 access to piped or “other improved” water was associated with a 3.5% decrease (95%CI 1.9–
 188 5.1) in mean annual cholera incidence and a slightly larger reduction in incidence with piped
 189 sanitation (5.2% decrease, 95%CI 2.9-7.6). The proportion of the population using surface water
 190 was associated with an increase of mean annual incidence of 1.1% (95%CI -0.1–2.3%) and
 191 open defecation was associated with an increase of mean annual incidence of 1.4% (95%CI -
 192 0.1–2.9%), though neither was statistically significant (Figure 2, Table S2).

193 To better understand the potential predictive value of multiple water and sanitation measures
194 combined for identifying high risk cholera areas, we used random forest regression models to
195 predict mean annual cholera incidence and classification models to identify high incidence area
196 districts. The cvRMSE of the random forest regression model was 0.92 (95% CI 0.90-0.94).
197 With all six water and sanitation measures, the random forest model was able to explain 37% of
198 the observed variability in mean annual cholera incidence in districts. The cross-validation
199 predictions were weakly correlated with the true incidence (Spearman rho = 0.60) (Figure 3). In
200 the full data model, the most influential predictors of mean annual incidence tended to be at the
201 extreme ends of the water and sanitation hierarchy; open defecation followed by piped
202 sanitation, piped water, surface water, piped or “other improved” water, and piped or “other
203 improved” sanitation (Figure S1A). Similar qualitative results were found with the GBM model
204 (see Supplement) though the model did not fit as well (leave-one-district-out cvRMSE 1.06 95%
205 CI 1.04-1.08) and piped water and piped sanitation were among the top three important
206 variables in both models (Figure S1).

207

208



209

210 **Figure 3:** Summary of random forest models' performance. Panel A illustrates the observed
211 mean annual incidence versus the predicted values in cross validation. Panel B illustrates the
212 cross-validated receiver operator characteristic curve from the random forest classification
213 model used to identify high incidence areas. Youden cut-off point (jointly maximized sensitivity
214 and specificity) shown as a red dot in panel B.

215 The random forest high incidence area classification model demonstrated moderate
216 performance with a cvAUC of 0.81 (95% CI 0.78-0.83). At the point that maximized model
217 sensitivity and specificity, it incorrectly classified 28.5% of true high incidence areas (1-
218 sensitivity) and falsely classified 26.0% of districts as high incidence areas (1-specificity). While
219 the positive predictive value of these classification models varied across cutoff thresholds
220 (range 7.6-98.6%), the negative predictive value remained high (range 92.5-100.0%, Table S4).
221 This high negative predictive value suggests that even in the absence of reliable cholera
222 incidence data, water and sanitation variables, ideally in conjunction with other factors, might be
223 useful in screening out areas that are unlikely to be at risk for having high cholera incidence.
224 The most influential water and sanitation measure in high incidence area classification models
225 was surface water followed by piped sanitation, open defecation, piped water, piped or “other
226 improved” water, and piped or “other improved” sanitation (Figure S2A).

227 We found similar qualitative results using the GBM model (cvAUC 0.73, 95% CI 0.70-0.76;
228 Table S3). When we focused only on the 25 countries that had at least one high cholera
229 incidence area, we found that performances of the models were reduced (cvAUC 0.71 (95% CI
230 0.68-0.74) for random forest and 0.66 (95% CI 0.62-0.69) for the GBM model; Figure S3, Table
231 S3).

232 Discussion

233 We investigated the relationship between water and sanitation access and suspected cholera
234 incidence at both the national and district-level across sub-Saharan Africa. While the direction of
235 the association between individual water and sanitation measures and cholera generally aligned
236 with prevailing evidence and beliefs, the size and significance of these associations varied
237 across models and geographic scale of analysis. When combining all measures together, our
238 classification models, while far from perfect, demonstrated moderate skill in discriminating high
239 cholera incidence areas from areas without high incidence, and may be especially useful in
240 excluding areas as potential cholera hotspots. As most of the evidence on water and sanitation
241 and cholera come from small scale highly local interventions, often in response to outbreaks,
242 with outcomes measured over a short timeframe, our results help fill the evidentiary gap on the
243 associations between multi-annual cholera incidence rates and access to water and sanitation
244 infrastructure in sub-Saharan Africa over the same period. They highlight some of the
245 complexities of using these water and sanitation metrics in identifying priority targets for cholera
246 control but suggest that there is likely value in including these in risk assessment.

247 The variable association of water and sanitation estimates and cholera incidence between
248 country- and district-level analyses indicates the importance of the spatial scale of analysis.
249 Water and sanitation access can significantly vary within countries, within and between
250 subnational units, and particularly between urban and rural areas^{16,17}, and while interventions
251 like piped water might be implemented in whole jurisdictions, others like installation of sanitation
252 facilities may occur on smaller scales. It is possible that more accurate and finer resolution data
253 may have better predictive value for high cholera incidence areas, but these data are difficult to
254 collect and rarely available when national cholera control planning is underway.

255 Beyond the general limitations of ecological analyses, the modeled gridded estimates of water
256 and sanitation access and cholera incidence are imperfect given the sparse data in both data
257 sets. Measures of access or reliance on different water and sanitation measures do not reflect
258 behavior at the individual- or population-level, which directly influences disease risk; access is
259 not a measure of usage and when used in analyses circumvents a step in the casual pathway
260 leading to biased associations in either direction.¹⁸ Behavior data across geographies and at
261 such large scales, however, is yet unavailable. Further, the cholera incidence estimates were
262 based primarily on data of reported suspected, not laboratory confirmed, cases. Among
263 suspected cases, there are almost certainly those with diarrhea caused by other pathogens than
264 *V. cholerae* O1/O139;¹⁹ similarly, under-reporting can lower the actual incidence. Additionally,
265 these estimates represented an average over time, which may have attenuated the apparent
266 associations between measures. Previous work has suggested that incomplete and erroneous
267 reporting in water quality can produce misleading results²⁰, which would then propagate to
268 modeled estimates. Finally, our analysis measures cholera risk only through mean annual
269 incidence, but metrics like outbreak size and frequency²¹ may better capture the relationship
270 between water and sanitation access and cholera transmission efficiency.

271 Our analysis highlights the relationships between water and sanitation measures and suspected
272 cholera incidences and the potential predictive power of these measures in estimating incidence
273 and identifying high cholera incidence areas. Water and sanitation measures alone cannot
274 explain the variability in cholera incidence seen throughout sub-Saharan Africa, but our
275 analyses do suggest that they contain important information for helping to distinguish areas of
276 high and low cholera risk. While not demonstrated in these analyses, using these measures in
277 conjunction with data on previous incidence of cholera may help improve future guidance on
278 assessing cholera risk. Future work to collect more precise and health-relevant metrics on water
279 and sanitation (e.g., water quality tests, service quality indicators and other metrics following
280 revised JMP standards on safely managed services²²), data on water and sanitation related
281 behaviors, and data on confirmed, rather than suspected cholera, can help refine our
282 understanding of these important relationships.

283 References:

- 284 1. Taylor, D. L., Kahawita, T. M., Cairncross, S. & Ensink, J. H. J. The impact of water,
285 sanitation and hygiene interventions to control cholera: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE* vol.
286 10 e0135676 (2015).
- 287 2. Yates, T., Vujcic, J. A., Joseph, M. L., Gallandat, K. & Lantagne, D. Efficacy and
288 effectiveness of water, sanitation, and hygiene interventions in emergencies in low- and
289 middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Waterlines* **37**, 31–65 (2018).

- 290 3. Richterman, A., Sainvilien, D. R., Eberly, L. & Ivers, L. C. Individual and Household Risk
291 Factors for Symptomatic Cholera Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Infect*
292 *Dis* **218**, S154–S164 (2018).
- 293 4. Wolfe, M., Kaur, M., Yates, T., Woodin, M. & Lantagne, D. A Systematic Review and Meta-
294 Analysis of the Association between Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Exposures and
295 Cholera in Case–Control Studies. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*
296 **99**, 534–545 (2018).
- 297 5. Nygren, B. L., Blackstock, A. J. & Mintz, E. D. Cholera at the Crossroads: The Association
298 Between Endemic Cholera and National Access to Improved Water Sources and Sanitation.
299 *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* **91**, 1023–1028 (2014).
- 300 6. Global Task Force on Cholera Control. *Ending Cholera — A Global Roadmap to 2030*.
301 <https://www.who.int/cholera/publications/global-roadmap/en/> (2017).
- 302 7. Deshpande, A. *et al.* Mapping geographical inequalities in access to drinking water and
303 sanitation facilities in low-income and middle-income countries, 2000–17. *The Lancet Global*
304 *Health* **8**, e1162–e1185 (2020).
- 305 8. Lessler, J. *et al.* Mapping the burden of cholera in sub-Saharan Africa and implications for
306 control: an analysis of data across geographical scales. *The Lancet* **391**, 1908–1915 (2018).
- 307 9. GADM. Global Administrative Areas. <https://gadm.org/about.html> (2020).
- 308 10. Lunardon, N., Menardi, G. & Torelli, N. ROSE: a Package for Binary Imbalanced Learning.
309 *The R Journal* **6**, 79 (2014).
- 310 11. Debeer, D., Hothorn, T. & Strobl, C. permimp: Conditional Permutation Importance. R
311 package version. (2021).
- 312 12. Baston, D. exactextractr: Fast extraction from raster datasets using polygons. vol. R
313 package Version 0.1.1 (2019).
- 314 13. Carey, V. J., Lumley, T. & Ripley, B. D. gee: Generalized estimation equation solver. (2019).

- 315 14. Liaw, A. & Wiener, M. Classification and Regression by randomForest. *R News* **2**, 18–22
316 (2002).
- 317 15. Greenwell, B., Boehmke, B., Cunningham, J. & Developers ([https://github.com/gbm-](https://github.com/gbm-developers)
318 developers), G. B. M. gbm: Generalized Boosted Regression Models. (2020).
- 319 16. Fuller, J. A., Westphal, J. A., Kenney, B. & Eisenberg, J. N. S. The joint effects of water and
320 sanitation on diarrhoeal disease: A multicountry analysis of the demographic and health
321 surveys. *Tropical Medicine and International Health* **20**, 284–292 (2015).
- 322 17. Roche, R., Bain, R. & Cumming, O. A long way to go - Estimates of combined water,
323 sanitation and hygiene coverage for 25 sub-Saharan African countries. *PLoS ONE* **12**,
324 e0171783 (2017).
- 325 18. Lopez, V. K. *et al.* Determinants of Latrine Use Behavior: The Psychosocial Proxies of
326 Individual-Level Defecation Practices in Rural Coastal Ecuador. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **100**,
327 733–741 (2019).
- 328 19. Wiens, K. E. *et al.* Towards estimating true cholera burden: a systematic review and meta-
329 analysis of *Vibrio cholerae* positivity. 2022.10.05.22280736 Preprint at
330 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.05.22280736> (2022).
- 331 20. Sikder, M., Naumova, E. N., Ogudipe, A. O., Gomez, M. & Lantagne, D. Fecal indicator
332 bacteria data to characterize drinking water quality in low-resource settings: Summary of
333 current practices and recommendations for improving validity. *International Journal of*
334 *Environmental Research and Public Health* **18**, 1–19 (2021).
- 335 21. Zheng, Q. *et al.* Cholera outbreaks in sub-Saharan Africa during 2010-2019: a descriptive
336 analysis. *Int J Infect Dis* **122**, 215–221 (2022).
- 337 22. WHO/UNICEF. *WASH in the 2030 Agenda*. [https://data.unicef.org/resources/wash-2030-](https://data.unicef.org/resources/wash-2030-agenda/)
338 agenda/ (2017).

339