

1 **Impact on childhood mortality of interventions to improve drinking water,**  
2 **sanitation and hygiene (WASH) to households: systematic review and meta-**  
3 **analysis**

4 **Short title: Water supply, hygiene and sanitation (WASH) interventions and**  
5 **childhood mortality**

6 Hugh Sharma Waddington

7 Environmental Health Group, Department of Disease Control, London School of  
8 Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), London International Development Centre  
9 (LIDC), 20 Bloomsbury Square, London, WC1A 2NS, United Kingdom

10 [Hugh.waddington@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:Hugh.waddington@lshtm.ac.uk)

11 +44 7779 261108

12 Edoardo Masset

13 Department of Public Health, Environments and Society, LSHTM, and Deputy  
14 Director, Centre of Excellence for Development Impact and Learning (CEDIL), LIDC,  
15 20 Bloomsbury Square, London, WC1A 2NS, United Kingdom

16 Sarah Bick

17 Environmental Health Group, Department of Disease Control, LSHTM, Keppel Street,  
18 London, WC1E 7HT

19 Sandy Cairncross

20 Environmental Health Group, Department of Disease Control, LSHTM, Keppel Street,  
21 London, WC1E 7HT

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 22 **Abstract**

### 23 Background

24 In low- and middle-income countries (L&MICs), the biggest contributing factors to the  
25 global burden of disease in childhood are deaths due to respiratory illness and  
26 diarrhoea, both of which are closely related to use of water, sanitation and hygiene  
27 (WASH) services. However, current estimates of the health impacts of WASH  
28 improvements use self-reported morbidity, which may fail to capture longer-term or  
29 more severe impacts. Moreover, reported mortality is thought to be less prone to bias.  
30 This study aimed to answer the question: what are the impacts of WASH intervention  
31 improvements on reported childhood mortality in L&MICs?

### 32 Methods and findings

33 We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis, using a published protocol.  
34 Systematic searches of 11 academic databases and trial registries, plus  
35 organisational repositories, were undertaken to locate studies of WASH interventions  
36 which were published in peer review journals or other sources (e.g., organisational  
37 reports and working papers). Intervention trials of WASH improvements implemented  
38 under endemic disease conditions in L&MICs were eligible, from studies which  
39 reported findings at any time until March 2020. We used the participant flow data  
40 supplied in response to journal editors' calls for greater transparency. Data were  
41 collected by two authors working independently.

42 We included evidence from 24 randomized and 11 non-randomized studies of  
43 WASH interventions from all global regions, incorporating 2,600 deaths. Effects of 48  
44 WASH treatment arms were included in analysis. We critically appraised and

45 synthesised evidence using meta-analysis to improve statistical power. We found  
46 WASH improvements are associated with a significant reduction of 17 percent in the  
47 odds of all-cause mortality in childhood (OR=0.83, 95%CI=0.74, 0.92, evidence from  
48 38 interventions), and a significant reduction in diarrhoea mortality of 45 percent  
49 (OR=0.55, 95%CI=0.35, 0.84; 10 interventions).

50 Further analysis by WASH technology suggested interventions providing improved  
51 water in quantity to households were most consistently associated with reductions in  
52 all-cause mortality. Community-wide sanitation was most consistently associated  
53 with reductions in diarrhoea mortality. Around one-half of the included studies were  
54 assessed as being at 'moderate risk of bias' in attributing mortality in childhood to the  
55 WASH intervention, and no studies were found to be at 'low risk of bias'. The review  
56 should be updated to incorporate additional published and unpublished participant  
57 flow data.

## 58 Conclusions

59 The findings are congruent with theories of infectious disease transmission. Washing  
60 with water presents a barrier to respiratory illness and diarrhoea, which are the two  
61 main components of all-cause mortality in childhood in L&MICs. Community-wide  
62 sanitation halts the spread of diarrhoea. We observed that evidence synthesis can  
63 provide new findings, going beyond the underlying data from trials to generate  
64 crucial insights for policy. Transparent reporting in trials creates opportunities for  
65 research synthesis to answer questions about mortality, which individual studies of  
66 interventions cannot be reliably designed to address.

67

## 68 **Author summary**

### 69 *Why was this study done?*

- 70 • The biggest contributor to the global burden of infectious disease in childhood  
71 in developing countries is mortality due to respiratory and diarrhoeal  
72 infections, both of which are closely linked to deficient water, sanitation and  
73 hygiene (WASH) availability and use.
- 74 • Multiple systematic reviews and meta-analyses of WASH-related morbidity  
75 have been conducted, but there is a shortage of rigorous, systematic  
76 evidence on the effectiveness of WASH improvements in reducing mortality.

### 77 *What did the researchers do and find?*

- 78 • We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of the impacts of  
79 WASH interventions on all-cause and diarrhoea-related mortality in L&MICs,  
80 incorporating evidence from 35 studies comprising 48 distinct WASH  
81 intervention arms.
- 82 • We found significant effects on all-cause mortality among children aged under  
83 5 of interventions to improve the quantity of water available (34 percent  
84 reduction), hygiene promotion when water supplies were improved (29  
85 percent reduction), and community-wide sanitation (21 percent reduction).
- 86 • We also found significant effects of WASH interventions on diarrhoea  
87 mortality among under-5s (45 percent reduction).

### 88 *What do these findings mean?*

- 89       • Interventions to prevent water-related mortality in childhood in endemic  
90       circumstances provide adequate water supplies to households, enabling  
91       domestic hygiene, and safe excreta disposal in the household and  
92       community.
- 93       • Systematic reviews can provide new evidence for decision makers but the  
94       approach we present is reliant on trial authors and journals adhering to  
95       agreed standards of reporting.

## 96       **1. Introduction**

97       Diarrhoeal diseases and respiratory infections are thought to kill 4.1 million people  
98       each year [1,2]. Half of these deaths are of infants and young children aged less  
99       than 5 years old [3], around 1.2 million of whom live in circumstances without  
100       adequate drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) in low- and middle-income  
101       countries (L&MICs) [4]. The global burden of disease (GBD) for communicable  
102       causes is weighted heavily by mortality in childhood, the two biggest single causes of  
103       which are diarrhoea and respiratory infection. Ninety percent of the total diarrhoea  
104       GBD and 99 percent of the total respiratory infection GBD is due to years of life lost  
105       (YLL) (S1 Annex Table A1).

106

107       Unfortunately, studies of the effects of WASH interventions on diarrhoea and other  
108       causes of mortality are beset by such ethical and logistical difficulties that, with very  
109       few exceptions (e.g., [5]) practically none were carried out until recently (e.g., [6–8]).  
110       For example, it could not be ethical to allow young children to die when life-saving  
111       oral rehydration solution (ORS) is widely available and affordable. As a result, and in

112 accordance with the recommendation of the Grading of Recommendations,  
113 Assessment, Development and Evaluations (GRADE) procedure [9], the focus  
114 shifted from mortality to morbidity – mainly from diarrhoea – as a more accessible  
115 outcome.

116

117 GBD estimates of WASH-related mortality are presently calculated using estimated  
118 coefficients on diarrhoea morbidity impacts from systematic reviews and meta-  
119 analyses. Estimates vary widely (S1 Annex Table A2), suggesting great imprecision  
120 affecting our measurement of the gravity of the diarrhoea problem, globally or in any  
121 specific context. Of the 44 systematic reviews included in a recent WASH sector-  
122 wide interventions evidence map [10], half of which concerned effects of WASH  
123 provision on diarrhoea, none had synthesised the evidence on mortality in childhood.  
124 The most recent systematic evidence on WASH interventions and diarrhoeal illness  
125 was reported in the Lancet in July 2022 [11].

126

127 A common finding in existing reviews is that bundling WASH together does not  
128 produce additive effects in comparison with single water, sanitation or hygiene  
129 technologies [12]. One major reason for this finding is bias in reporting. For example,  
130 the most common method of collecting health outcomes data in impact evaluations  
131 of WASH interventions is through participant report [10]. However, data on reported  
132 illness have been shown to be biased in open (also called “unblinded”) trials [13–16].  
133 Perhaps carers might misrepresent illness to minimise the time spent with  
134 enumerators when data are collected repeatedly over time [17,18]. Social desirability  
135 bias may also arise where participants are inadvertently induced to report favourably.

136 Briscoe et al. [19] highlighted how diarrhoeal illness becomes normalised among  
137 highly exposed groups over time which leads to underreporting, a problem we might  
138 expect to become worse when reporting is done by someone other than the patient,  
139 in this case the child’s carer. Or illness may be acknowledged differently by sex [20],  
140 where girls who complain about pain are less likely than boys to be pacified by their  
141 carers and therefore may not report it. In other words, we may not see additive  
142 effects of multiple WASH technologies provided together if bias in the reporting of  
143 disease outcomes, rather than diarrhoea epidemiology, is driving the findings.

144

145 The key advantage of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) over other methods is the  
146 clarity with which randomisation balances unobservable differences across groups in  
147 expectation, not in any single trial, but over multiple draws from the population [21].  
148 Thus the “gold standard” for evidence on health impacts from these studies uses  
149 meta-analysis of findings from multiple studies [22]. However, meta-analysis can  
150 also magnify biases, because is harder to identify errors where they pervade the  
151 whole data set. Some approach is clearly needed to address reporting bias. Of great  
152 potential concern is publication bias, the phenomenon whereby trials are more likely  
153 to be published if they find significant effects, a factor that is made more likely when  
154 trials are funded by private manufacturers, as has been common in studies of water  
155 treatment (chlorine, water filters) and hygiene (soap) [23].

156

157 In this paper, we present a different approach to estimate the health effects of WASH  
158 improvements. There is a large number of trials of WASH interventions, sufficient  
159 numbers on which to estimate global effects on mortality, even when the individual

160 studies themselves did not aim to do so. We conducted a systematic review of the  
161 effects of WASH interventions on child mortality in L&MIC contexts, drawing on a  
162 number of sources including losses to follow-up due to mortality as reported in  
163 participant flows. It is an established finding that study participants do not misreport  
164 death, even in open studies [15,16]. This might be because death of a child is a rare  
165 and salient event. The crucial advantage of this approach, therefore, is that reported  
166 mortality is less prone to bias.

167

168 We sought to answer four review questions:

- 169 1) What are the effects of interventions promoting improved water supply, water  
170 treatment and storage, sanitation and hygiene in L&MICs on all-cause mortality,  
171 and to what extent do these effects vary by contextual factors?
- 172 2) What are the effects of WASH interventions in L&MICs on diarrhoea mortality, and  
173 to what extent do they vary by contextual factors?
- 174 3) What are the predicted effects of WASH interventions at different baseline  
175 mortality levels?
- 176 4) To what extent are the findings robust to potential biases at the individual study  
177 and review levels?

## 178 **2. Methods**

### 179 **Search and selection of studies**

180 This review was registered with Prospero under registration number  
181 CRD42020210694 and is reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for  
182 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guideline (S2 PRISMA 2020 Checklist). A



183 full description of the procedures followed for searches, study inclusion, outcomes  
184 data collection, analysis and reporting is presented in the published protocol [24].  
185 Searches for literature were done as part of an evidence and gap map [10]. Studies  
186 selected were published at any time until March 2020. Eleven academic databases  
187 and trial registries (e.g., Cochrane, Econlit, Medline, OpenTrials, Scholar, Web of  
188 Science) and sources of nonpeer reviewed literature including databases and  
189 organisational repositories were searched (e.g., 3ie Repositories, J-PAL, IRC  
190 International Water and Sanitation Center, UNICEF, the World Bank and the regional  
191 development banks). We used reference snowballing, including bibliographic  
192 backreferencing and forward citation tracking of studies and existing reviews. As a  
193 measure to reduce publication bias, studies published in any format were eligible,  
194 and searches done of repositories of this information. As a measure to avoid  
195 language bias, studies published in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese were  
196 included, and searches done of repositories of this information. A priority search  
197 algorithm based on machine learning was used in filtering studies at title and  
198 abstract stage using EPPI-reviewer software [25]. Selection of studies was done by  
199 two authors working independently.

200

201 Eligible studies were RCTs and non-randomised studies of interventions (NRSI)  
202 promoting access to or use of WASH technologies to households in L&MICs in  
203 endemic disease conditions. We included new or improved water supplies, drinking  
204 water treatment and storage, sanitation and hygiene technologies, including those  
205 enabling or promoting hand-washing at key times and other beneficial household  
206 practices (e.g., the washing of food, clothing and fomites). We excluded trial arms

207 with a major non-WASH component (e.g., nutrition interventions). We classified  
208 WASH interventions according to the “main WASH” technology provided, which was  
209 either water supply, water treatment and storage, sanitation or hygiene technologies  
210 provided or promoted alone, or multiple combinations of WASH technologies. It was  
211 also possible to characterise interventions by whether they provided any  
212 improvements in water supply, water treatment, sanitation and/or hygiene alone or in  
213 combination with others, which we refer to as “any WASH”. This was due to  
214 problems in clearly identifying all the components of an intervention. For example, a  
215 debate among practitioners suggested that hand hygiene messaging is usually  
216 incorporated in CLTS [26].

217

218 Counterfactual conditions were categorised as “improved” or “unimproved” according  
219 to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) classification. Improved  
220 water supplies were defined where the majority of households in the sample used  
221 drinking water from an improved source (e.g., piped water to the household, a  
222 community standpipe or protected spring) within a 30-minute round-trip including  
223 waiting time. For sanitation, the counterfactual scenario was defined as “improved” if  
224 the majority of controls had a sewer connection to the home or an improved pit  
225 latrine was used by a single household. Where insufficient information was reported  
226 about the counterfactual scenario to categorise baseline water supply or sanitation  
227 use, the figures were imputed from online data provided by the JMP for the relevant  
228 country, year and location.

229

230 A risk-of-bias tool was developed for WASH impact evaluations that drew on  
231 Cochrane’s tools for RCTs [27], cluster-RCTs [28] and non-randomised studies of  
232 interventions [29], and a tool for appraising quasi-experiments [30]. Six bias domains  
233 were assessed: confounding, selection bias, departures from intended interventions,  
234 missing data, outcome measurement bias and reporting bias. The studies were  
235 assessed on the likelihood of bias in estimating effects of WASH access on mortality  
236 in children aged under 5 years. This may or may not have been a primary research  
237 question in the papers themselves, hence our ratings do not provide risk-of-bias  
238 assessments for the study overall. The risk-of-bias assessments were done by two  
239 researchers working independently, at the outcome level for each included study  
240 arm, as recommended by Cochrane [22] and the Campbell Collaboration [31].  
241 Template data collection forms are available in the study protocol [24]. Data  
242 extracted from included studies is provided in S1 Annex Table A3. The dataset used  
243 in analysis is provided in S4 Dataset.

#### 244 **Measuring mortality outcomes**

245 The primary outcomes for the review were all-cause mortality and mortality due to  
246 diarrhoeal disease. Outcomes data were collected independently by two researchers  
247 from two sources. The first source was the few studies that reported mortality  
248 alongside statistical information [6–8,32,33]. Mortality data were also recoverable  
249 from studies that reported losses to follow-up (attrition) in sample populations.  
250 Participant flow diagrams were reviewed in all studies of WASH technologies in  
251 L&MICs to obtain crude mortality rates for field trials by intervention group. These  
252 studies therefore formed the major source of evidence on all-cause mortality. Some

253 studies also reported cause-specific mortality rates, including diarrhoea and other  
254 infections, defined by carers in verbal autopsy and/or clinicians, or collected from  
255 vital registries. All-cause mortality and mortality due to diarrhoea or other infections  
256 were defined by carers in self-report or taken from vital registries.

257

258 Mortality rates were computed over a standard period, as mortality measurements  
259 increase over longer exposure periods. Age-specific (e.g., under-2) mortality rates  
260 were defined where these data were available [6–8,34], or, if they were not, crude  
261 mortality rates were taken over the data collection period. Intervention effects were  
262 measured as the odds ratio (OR) of the mortality rates, and their 95 percent  
263 confidence intervals. Where studies reported multiple intervention arms against a  
264 single control arm, we split the control sample assuming an equal mortality rate for  
265 each comparison. We applied a continuity correction in study arms where there were  
266 no deaths, by adding 0.5 to all frequencies, which can cause bias in meta-analysis of  
267 rare events [35]. These studies were assessed as being at ‘high risk of bias’ in the  
268 outcome measurement domain [36–40].

## 269 **Evidence synthesis approach**

270 Overall pooled effects were estimated for all-cause mortality (review question 1) and  
271 diarrhoea mortality (review question 2) using Stata. We assessed the consistency of  
272 the pooled effects using I-squared and tau-squared statistics to measure the relative  
273 and absolute heterogeneity between studies. We tested for effect moderators in  
274 meta-analysis and meta-regression analysis, including the WASH intervention  
275 technology provided to study participants, water supply and sanitation conditions in

276 the counterfactual group, participant characteristics (age and if from  
277 immunocompromised group), and study characteristics (season of data collection  
278 and length of follow-up). We report forest plots showing WASH technologies for each  
279 analysis (we also report the same forest plots by study author in S3 Annex Figs A1-  
280 A4). To aid interpretation of the meta-regression coefficients, we calculated OR  
281 prediction values at the means, minima and maxima of the dichotomous variables  
282 and the mean and interquartile range of the continuous variable. Moderator variables  
283 were pre-specified based on theory and previous reviews, with the exception of the  
284 moderator analysis by baseline mortality rate. We used meta-regression plots to  
285 assess the predicted effects of the interventions by baseline mortality rate (review  
286 question 3).

287

288 We evaluated the likelihood that potential biases could cast doubt on the findings  
289 results through a negative control, formal publication bias assessment, and  
290 sensitivity analysis (review question 4). The effects of WASH improvements on  
291 mortality are largely expected to occur by blocking transmission of infectious  
292 diseases, primarily faeco-oral and respiratory infections, in childhood. People who  
293 survive beyond the age of 5 are thought to have developed sufficiently robust  
294 immunity to these diseases, hence the effects of WASH improvements on mortality  
295 among older groups is expected to be far weaker. Therefore, as a negative control  
296 [41,42], meta-analysis was estimated for those studies that reported all-cause  
297 mortality among participants aged over 5 years. We also assessed the sensitivity of  
298 the pooled effects to exclusion of each single effect, examined whether there was a  
299 correlation between risk-of-bias rating and the estimated effect, and tested for small-

300 study effects (publication bias) at the review level using graphical inspection of  
301 funnel plots and regression tests.

### 302 **3. Results**


#### 303 **Description of searches and included studies**

304 From 13,500 de-duplicated records, 684 full text reports of WASH intervention  
305 studies were screened, of which 35 were identified that reported mortality outcomes,  
306 30 of which were measured among children aged 5 or under (Fig 1). We were not  
307 able to incorporate trials that met the review inclusion criteria but did not report  
308 participant flows (e.g., [43]). We found 24 RCTs that measured mortality, all of which  
309 were published in peer review journals. RCTs were of water treatment and storage,  
310 sanitation and/or hygiene interventions, which mainly used cluster design, with  
311 clustering at the community level. We found no RCTs of water supply provision or  
312 promotion that reported mortality estimates. Several studies used prospective non-  
313 randomised trial designs [33,36,44], five analysed cohort data [38,45–48], one used  
314 a matched pipeline approach [49] and two used repeated cross-section data with  
315 double-differences [50,51]. Six of the studies were designed retrospectively after the  
316 WASH intervention had been conducted [47–51]. The effect of the WASH  
317 intervention was not calculable for one non-randomised study [51]. All RCTs were  
318 reported in English. Of the nine included non-randomised studies of interventions,  
319 which were published in peer review journals and reports, three were in French [33],  
320 Spanish [49] or Portuguese [44]. The studies were published from 1985 onwards, the  
321 majority in the 2010s. The evidence is representative of all lower-income global

322 regions and many relevant contexts, including rural, urban and peri-urban informal  
323 settlements.

324

325 *Fig 1 PRISMA study search flow*



348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354 We included in meta-analysis 38 WASH study arms examining all-cause mortality in  
355 childhood, of which 26 were from RCTs, and 10 examining diarrhoea mortality, of  
356 which 6 were from RCTs. For six studies we could also extract seven estimates of  
357 effects on mortality among adults and/or children aged over-5 [32,39,47,52–54]. In  
358 five studies comprising seven study arms, mortality was reported for all age groups  
359 combined [39,40,55–57]. There was a total of 168,500 participants in the included

360 studies of all-cause mortality and 2,600 deaths. When including the natural  
361 experiment of Galiani et al. [50], we estimated there were 165,000 more child  
362 deaths.

363

364 We grouped the interventions by WASH technology provided. Many concerned direct  
365 hardware provision – water supplies, filters, handwashing stations and/or latrines –  
366 and health messaging. Thus, the WASH technology provided in six studies was  
367 household water treatment by chlorine alone [6,8,37,40,54,57] or alongside safe  
368 storage devices [56,58]. Three studies evaluated filter provision with safe storage  
369 [59–61] and two evaluated UV irradiation (solar disinfection, SODIS) [62,63]. A  
370 further 11 studies incorporated arms evaluating hygiene promotion alone  
371 [6,8,34,36,39,40,45,58,64–66]. Others included arms combining household water  
372 treatment with handwashing promotion [38,40,65] or alongside handwashing and  
373 sanitation [6–8]. A water supply improvement was provided alone in three non-  
374 randomised studies [46,48,67], another concerned improved water supply and  
375 sewage connections [50], three were of water supplies and latrines [44,47,49], and  
376 one other was of water supply, latrines and handwashing promotion [33]. Three  
377 study arms were evaluated of latrine provision or promotion alone [8,8,52], but ten  
378 studies evaluated sanitation alongside other WASH technology improvements [6–  
379 8,32,33,44,47,49,50,53]. For example, the Total Sanitation Campaign in India  
380 provided hygiene education alongside CLTS, subsidies and sanitation marketing  
381 [53].

382




383 Counterfactual groups often received standard WASH access with no additional  
384 interventions, although occasionally they received another intervention; for example,  
385 all participants received hygiene education in one study [56]. Most counterfactual  
386 populations were assessed as using improved water supplies [7,8,8,34,36–  
387 38,40,44,45,48–50,53,57,58,63–66]. In a few instances, counterfactuals received  
388 piped water inside the compound [36,50], otherwise it was sourced by household  
389 members from outside. In one study of continuous water supply (“safely managed  
390 drinking water”) provision, controls received water for only a few hours a week on  
391 average [48]. There were also concerns about reliability of or distance to the water  
392 supply in a few studies [8,65], which would have affected ability of study participants  
393 to practice improved hygiene. In under half of cases, sanitation was classified as  
394 being improved [6,36,38,40,44,48–50,56,63–65]. In all others, the majority of  
395 households openly defaecated, or used shared facilities or unimproved facilities like  
396 pits without concrete slabs. Imputations were made where it was not clear exactly  
397 what types of water and sanitation services were used by households in the  
398 counterfactual scenario [33,34,37,38,44–46,49,50,52,55,58,61].

### 399 **Assessment of biases at the study level**


400 In general, just under half of studies (40%) were found to be at ‘moderate risk of  
401 bias’ overall in attributing changes to the intervention, for all-cause mortality (Fig 2a)  
402 and mortality due to diarrhoea (Fig 2b). No studies were at ‘low risk of bias’.

403

404 *Fig 2 Risk-of-bias assessments*



405



406

407

408 One-third of RCTs reported using adequate allocation sequence and concealment,  
 409 and demonstrated baseline covariate balance, to satisfy a 'low risk' rating on  
 410 confounding. In some cases, data were collected on water, sanitation and hygiene at  
 411 pre-test, but balance was not presented for all relevant variables, such as sanitation  
 412 and hygiene access. Three NRSI were assessed as being at 'moderate risk of bias'

413 in confounding. These were all studies of water supply improvements including:  
414 privatised water provision in Argentinean municipalities [50], improved water supply  
415 reliability in India [48], and piped water supply and latrines in India [47]. In all cases,  
416 participation was largely determined by programme placement, which is thought less  
417 problematic to address than self-selection into programmes by participants. In  
418 Argentina, it was the local government's decision to implement a central government  
419 policy allowing for privatisation of the water supply [50]. For piped water in India, all  
420 households in a community were simultaneously connected to the water supply by  
421 the NGO Gram Vikas [47]. For the study examining the reliability of water supplies in  
422 India, all households were connected to the municipal supply [58]. Participation was  
423 then carefully modelled using a rich set of covariates measured at baseline and  
424 based on factors thought to influence programme targeting. Each study also  
425 presented null findings for a negative control (placebo outcome): mortality due to  
426 non-infectious causes [50], and the incidence of bruising and scrapes [47,48].

427

428 Where participants were recruited before allocation in cluster-RCTs, or where  
429 recruiters were blinded to allocation, the studies were judged to be at 'low risk' of  
430 selection bias. Where recruitment was done afterwards by those potentially with  
431 knowledge of allocation or where individuals needed to be recruited later due to  
432 attrition (losses to follow-up during the trial), the study was judged to be at risk of  
433 bias. Studies were also assessed as being at 'high risk of bias' when overall attrition  
434 rates were greater than 20 percent, or differential attrition greater than 10 percentage  
435 points, or where no information was provided about reasons for dropouts by  
436 intervention group, tests for covariate balance or robustness of findings. Selection

437 bias and attrition bias were deemed less problematic where studies used census  
438 data [50] or vital registration [44].

439

440 In general, departures from intended interventions due to contamination (controls  
441 receive the treatment) or spill-over effects (control outcomes are caused by  
442 treatment outcomes) were judged unlikely to be problematic in many studies, which  
443 used cluster-randomisation and reported geographical separation of groups. Of  
444 specific relevance to mortality estimates, studies providing ORS to severely ill  
445 children and/or encouraging mothers to attend health clinic were judged to have high  
446 risk of bias in the outcome measure.

447

448 Regarding outcome measurement, all-cause mortality was usually categorised as  
449 being a reliable measure even when self-reported with long recall, owing to the  
450 salience and rarity of the event; the longest recall was 6 years [65], the shortest two  
451 days [38], and usually it was 12 months or less. However, there is greater suspicion  
452 about cause-specific mortality where reporting is through verbal autopsy by the  
453 child's carer. If cause-specific mortality was measured, assessment was therefore  
454 made as to whether it was verified by a clinician or taken from vital registration, in  
455 which case it was assessed as being at 'low risk of bias'. While observational studies  
456 of WASH provision have verified cause of death through consultation with a clinician  
457 [5], no RCTs and only two NRSI used vital registration data [44,50]. One study [44]  
458 was assessed as at 'low risk' of outcome reporting bias for diarrhoea mortality, while  
459 another was assessed as at 'high risk of bias' because the study did not attribute

460 cause-specific mortality to diarrhoea, using infectious and parasitic disease mortality  
461 instead [50]. In all other studies the cause of death was given by verbal autopsy.

462


463 Nearly all trials were pre-registered, four reported publishing a protocol with pre-  
464 analysis plan [6–8,60], and three blinded data analysts [6–8]. In addition, one NRSI  
465 was deemed to have ‘low risk of bias’ on reporting, because it published a baseline  
466 report with pre-analysis plan [68].

#### 467 **Impacts of WASH on all-cause mortality (review question 1)**

468 We conducted meta-analysis across intervention arms reporting all-cause mortality  
469 in children aged under 5 years (Fig 3). WASH improvements typically reduced the  
470 odds of all-cause mortality in childhood by 17 percent overall (OR=0.83,  
471 95%CI=0.74, 0.92, 38 estimates). There was a small degree of estimated relative  
472 heterogeneity (I-squared=16%) and absolute heterogeneity (tau-squared=0.01).

473

474 **Fig 3 Effects on all-cause mortality in childhood of WASH improvements**



475

476 For the stratified meta-analyses by WASH technology, trial arms incorporating “any

477 WASH” – that is, any single water supply, water treatment, sanitation or hygiene

478 technology, whether provided alone or alongside any other WASH technology –

479 were meta-analysed. We found a 34 percent reduction in the odds of mortality for

480 water supply improvements (OR=0.66, 95%CI=0.50, 0.88; I-squared=66%; 7

481 estimates) (Fig 4a). Four of these were studies where the risk of bias was high

482 [33,44,49,67], while three were at ‘moderate risk of bias’ [47,48,50]. For sanitation,

483 we estimated 13 percent reduction in mortality overall (OR=0.87, 95%CI=0.75, 1.00;

484 I-squared=33%; 13 estimates). Four of the studies were assessed as being at ‘high

485 risk of bias’ [33,44,49,52], and seven were at ‘moderate risk of bias’. We tested for a

486 threshold effect of sanitation improvement – that is, whether there needed to be a  
487 certain share of households in a community covered before the benefits of sanitation  
488 were realised [69]. When sanitation improvements targeted the whole community  
489 rather than individual households, or if households were targeted for sanitation  
490 improvements in circumstances when most of the community already used improved  
491 sanitation facilities, there were greater effects on mortality among children  
492 participating in the study (Fig 4b). There was an estimated 21 percent reduction in  
493 the odds of mortality when sanitation was being improved community-wide  
494 (OR=0.79, 95%CI=0.66, 0.95; I-squared=43%; 8 estimates), but no effect of  
495 sanitation where it was provided to specific households, where the majority of  
496 community members did not already use improved sanitation (OR=1.07,  
497 95%CI=0.83, 1.36; I-squared=0%; 4 estimates).

498  
499 The overall effect of hygiene promotion was not statistically significant (OR=0.85,  
500 95%CI=0.69, 1.04; I-squared=33%; 17 estimates). Five of the studies were assessed  
501 as being at ‘high risk of bias’ [33,36,45,65,66] and seven were at ‘moderate risk of  
502 bias’. Further analysis was done to test the hypothesis that hygiene promotion would  
503 be more effective when done under conditions of improved water supply, or, if not,  
504 when water supply was an intervention component alongside hygiene, and there  
505 were no concerns about the reliability of or distance to the water supply. The results  
506 suggested that this was indeed the case: there was no estimated effect of hygiene in  
507 circumstances where water supplies were not already improved (OR=1.02,  
508 95%CI=0.84, 1.23; I-squared=0%; 6 estimates). In contrast, there was a 29 percent  
509 reduction in the odds of mortality, when hygiene was provided in circumstances

510 where the water supply was also being improved or had been improved previously  
511 (OR=0.71, 95%CI=0.56, 0.90; I-squared=18%; 11 estimates) (Fig 4c).

512

513 There were no significant effects on mortality of household water treatment and  
514 storage overall (OR=0.93, 95%CI=0.75, 1.14; I-squared=0%; 15 estimates), or for  
515 individual water treatment technologies including chlorination (OR=0.90,  
516 95%CI=0.72, 1.12; I-squared=2%; 10 estimates), filtration (OR=0.94, 95%CI=0.39,  
517 2.28; I-squared=28%; 3 estimates) or SODIS (OR=0.77, 95%CI=0.20, 2.92; I-  
518 squared=0%; 2 estimates) (Fig 4d). Five of the studies were assessed as being at  
519 'high risk of bias' [59,61–63,65] and seven were at 'moderate risk of bias'.

520


521 Meta-analysis by the “main WASH” technology that was provided suggested  
522 reductions in odds of death in childhood which were of the same magnitude but not  
523 statistically significant for any single technology provided alone. But there was a  
524 significant reduction in mortality where multiple water, sanitation and/or hygiene  
525 technologies were promoted or provided of 16 percent (OR=0.84, 95%CI=0.71, 0.99,  
526 I-squared=41%, 11 estimates). Five of the seven studies with the largest effects of  
527 multiple WASH technologies incorporated a water supply improvement  
528 [33,44,47,49,50], usually piped water to the household or yard.

529




530 **Fig 4 Effects on all-cause mortality in childhood by “any WASH” technology**

531 **a) Water supply improvement**




532

533 **b) Sanitation improvement**




534

535 c) Hygiene improvement



536

537 d) Drinking water treatment and storage



538

539 We estimated meta-regressions to explore further whether the variation in effects by  
540 WASH technology intervention, and the other contextual factors we had identified  
541 from theory, might explain differences across studies (Table 1). The regression  
542 pooled data from study participants of any age, incorporating the 14 additional  
543 estimates measured among all population groups or adults and children aged over 5.  
544 The reductions in mortality were significantly larger when interventions were  
545 conducted in circumstances where: participants were children aged under 5 years, or  
546 data collection was limited to the summer rainy season. Where the study collected  
547 data over a shorter follow-up period, the effect on mortality was also significantly  
548 larger. Impacts on mortality were significantly greater when water supply  
549 improvements were made. The explanatory power of the regression was high (R-  
550 squared=76%) and there was very little residual heterogeneity (I-squared=0%; Tau-  
551 squared<0.01). The findings suggested a predicted value of 12 percent reduction in  
552 odds of mortality at the data means (OR=0.88) (Table 1 Panel 3). The maximum  
553 value of 74 percent reduction in odds of mortality (OR=0.26) is for children from  
554 immunocompromised groups who would receive all WASH interventions, with  
555 measurement made against comparators living in very poor communities with  
556 unimproved sanitation services, during the summer rainy season at 6-months  
557 intervention follow-up.  
558

559 *Table 1 Meta-regression analysis of all-cause mortality with prediction values*

	OR	95% Conf. Interval		p-value
<i>Panel 1: Intervention technology</i>				
1=Water supply improvement	0.60	0.41	0.01	0.89
1=Water treatment and/or storage	1.13	0.85	0.40	1.51
1=Hygiene improvement	1.14	0.80	0.46	1.61
1=Hygiene and improved water supply	0.82	0.63	0.14	1.07
1=Household sanitation	1.06	0.82	0.64	1.38
1=Community-wide sanitation	0.87	0.63	0.41	1.22
<i>Panel 2: Contextual factors</i>				
1=Sanitation unimproved at baseline	0.80	0.55	0.23	1.16
1=Adult participants and older children	1.38	1.07	0.01	1.77
1=Immunocompromised group	0.72	0.33	0.39	1.55
1=Summer/rainy season	0.58	0.31	0.09	1.08
Follow-up period (years)	1.06	1.00	0.06	1.12
Constant	0.96	0.63	0.81	1.43
<i>Panel 3: Prediction values of OR</i>				
Data means	0.88			
Minimum values of variables	1.07			
Maximum values of variables	0.26			
<i>Panel 4: Test information</i>				
Number of observations	52			
Tau-squared	0.01			
I-squared	0%			
Adjusted R-squared	76%			


560

561 **Impacts of WASH on diarrhoea mortality (review question 2)**

562 The meta-analysis of diarrhoea mortality in childhood suggested WASH provision  
 563 and promotion lead to a reduction in the odds of death due to diarrhoea by 45  
 564 percent (OR=0.55, 95%CI=0.35, 0.84; 10 estimates) (Fig 5). Six of the studies were  
 565 assessed as being at 'high risk of bias' [33,38,44,46,50,65] and three were at  
 566 'moderate risk' [32,60,64]. The relatively high degree of absolute and relative  
 567 heterogeneity in findings (I-squared=43%, tau-squared=0.15) suggested additional  
 568 analysis was needed of factors that could explain the variation across study  
 569 contexts.

570

571 *Fig 5 Effects on diarrhoea mortality in childhood of WASH improvements*



572

573 One of those factors is the degree of movement along the WASH ladders. We tested  
574 this hypothesis in moderator analysis according to the type of water supply and  
575 sanitation facilities used in the counterfactual group. When the WASH interventions  
576 were provided when counterfactuals were using no or unimproved sanitation and  
577 water supplies, and therefore exposed to very high risk of environmental  
578 contamination by pathogens, there was an estimated 69 percent reduction in  
579 diarrhoea mortality in childhood (OR=0.31, 95%CI=0.16, 0.60, I-squared=17%, 4  
580 estimates). But for interventions provided in circumstances when most people  
581 already had access to improved water supply and sanitation, there was only a 22  
582 percent reduction in odds of mortality (OR=0.78, 95%CI=0.62, 0.98, I-squared=0%, 6  
583 estimates) (Fig 5). The impacts of WASH interventions on childhood diarrhoea  
584 mortality were significantly greater ( $p<0.01$ ) when counterfactual groups lacked  
585 access to improved water supply and sanitation – and most people were therefore  
586 using unimproved facilities, or none at all and openly defaecating – than when most  
587 people in counterfactual groups were using improved facilities.

588

589 The largest effects on diarrhoea mortality were from studies of multiple WASH  
590 technologies: two contained a component that aimed to provide latrines to all  
591 households in intervention communities [32,33] and two involved water supply  
592 improvements [33] or hygiene promotion when water supplies were already  
593 improved [38]. With regard to the two studies of latrine provision or promotion to  
594 whole communities, both were provided alongside hygiene promotion, but only in  
595 Côte d'Ivoire was the water supply also improved [33]. In the case of the CLTS  
596 intervention in Mali [32], hygiene promotion was given when water supplies were

597 limited. Another longitudinal follow-up study of an RCT of hygiene improvement,  
598 which was rated at ‘high risk of bias’, was conducted among communities where  
599 some households had access to running water for only two hours each week [65],  
600 suggesting these households had limited opportunities for adherence to improved  
601 hygiene practices.

602

603 Few studies of household water treatment in endemic circumstances have reported  
604 diarrhoea mortality outcomes. Among the studies examining HWT, only one was of  
605 an approach which has been found to reduce diarrhoea morbidity; the study was of  
606 filtration [60] and it found large but statistically insignificant impacts in children from  
607 immunocompromised populations (HIV-positive mothers). The other was a study of  
608 chlorine provision alongside safe storage and hygiene education [38]. Meta-  
609 regression analysis suggested interventions providing community-wide sanitation,  
610 and hygiene promotion in circumstances when water supplies were improved, were  
611 associated with significantly larger impacts on diarrhoea mortality (S1 Annex Table  
612 A4).

613 **Predicted effects of WASH improvements by baseline mortality rates (review**  
614 **question 3)**


615 We tested for a theoretical relationship between the contextual starting values and  
616 programme effectiveness – that is, one might expect higher returns from a lower  
617 base – by plotting the relationships between the baseline mortality rate measured in  
618 the counterfactual group and the log-odds ratios for all-cause (Fig 6a) and diarrhoea  
619 mortality (Fig 6b). The results suggested that, at higher baseline mortality rates,

620 WASH interventions tended to have larger effects on mortality. For example, where  
621 the crude mortality rate was 75 per 1,000 live children, as it is in many African  
622 countries and communities in South Asia, the estimated reduction in odds of all-  
623 cause mortality in childhood was 33 percent (OR=0.67, 95%CI=0.47, 0.86). At the  
624 same baseline mortality rate, there was a reduction of 61 percent in the odds of  
625 diarrhoea mortality (OR=0.39; 95%CI=0.20, 0.67).

626

627 *Fig 6 Meta-regression plots of all-cause mortality in childhood against prevalence*


628 a) *All-cause mortality*



629

630 b) *Diarrhoea mortality*





631

632 Note: fitted values are from inverse-variance weighted regression.


#### 633 **Evaluation of biases at the review level (review question 4)**

634 In this section we present findings from a negative control, analysis of small study  
635 effects and the results of sensitivity analyses. Using meta-analysis to power studies  
636 adequately with small effect sizes does not necessarily generate effects that are  
637 statistically significant if there is no underlying causal relationship [70]. The meta-  
638 analysis of studies reporting all-cause mortality among participants aged over 5  
639 years did not suggest WASH improvements affected mortality when participants  
640 were restricted to adults and children aged over 5 (OR=1.05, 95%CI=0.93, 1.19, I-  
641 squared=0%, 7 estimates) (Fig 7). The study with the largest effect on mortality was  
642 of health messaging among 10-year-old school children [39]. Several of the studies  
643 were of chlorination [54,56,57]. We might expect to see effects on maternal mortality

644 due to sepsis, which improved WASH – particularly in places of birth like health  
 645 facilities – is thought to alleviate [71]. None of the interventions provided a WASH  
 646 intervention in a health facility.

647

648 *Fig 7 Effects on all-cause mortality for study participants aged over 5 years*



649

650 Since the mortality data were largely collected from participant flow diagrams, the  
 651 fact that mortality estimates are available at all is indicative of the good standards of  
 652 reporting in the studies included in this review. This suggested publication bias was  
 653 likely to be limited, most clearly for prospective trials of WASH interventions, as  
 654 found in the analysis of small study effects (S3 Annex Fig A5). We also tested the  
 655 sensitivity of the findings to exclusion of particular studies. For example, the pooled  
 656 effect estimate might be influenced by studies with large samples [50] or those  
 657 conducted among extremely poor or vulnerable groups [32,60]. The overall findings,

658 and the findings for particular WASH technologies or circumstances, were not  
659 significantly affected by exclusion of these, or any other individual studies. We also  
660 examined whether there was a correlation between risk-of-bias rating and the  
661 estimated effect on mortality. The effects assessed at 'high risk of bias' incorporated  
662 studies that did not distinguish under-5s from other population groups [40,57]. The  
663 meta-analysis of NRSI at 'high risk of bias' found a greater reduction in odds of all-  
664 cause mortality than other studies (OR=0.58, 95%CI=0.48, 0.70; I-squared=0%; 8  
665 estimates) (S3 Annex Fig A6a). In contrast, we found no significant change in the  
666 odds of death for RCTs that had 'high risk of bias' in measuring the effect on  
667 mortality in children aged under 5 years (OR=1.41; 95%CI=0.99, 2.01; I-  
668 squared=0%; 15 estimates) (S3 Annex Fig A6b).

#### 669 **4. Discussion**

##### 670 **Summary of main findings**

671 This systematic review and meta-analysis estimated the impacts of WASH  
672 improvements on children's mortality by pooling data, collected mainly from reported  
673 participant flows in multiple studies, for all-cause and diarrhoea mortality. The  
674 approach helped overcome two critical issues in primary study research. Firstly, it is  
675 difficult to design prospective impact evaluations like RCTs with sufficient statistical  
676 power to estimate precise effects for rare outcomes. And, secondly, mortality is  
677 thought to be reported with less bias than other measures. The findings suggested  
678 WASH improvements cause large and statistically significant reductions in the odds  
679 of mortality in childhood in endemic circumstances. For mortality due to any cause,  
680 we estimated around one-in-five deaths are averted by WASH improvements. For

681 severe diarrhoea disease we estimated a reduction in odds of mortality by nearly  
682 half. However, these averages concealed important heterogeneity in effects. Further  
683 analysis suggested that the reduction in all-cause mortality was most consistently  
684 established where the interventions provided an improved water supply.

685

686 Since many of the studies examining water improvements were of piped water to the  
687 household or yard, the analysis therefore suggested a mechanism through which  
688 water affects mortality: by enabling domestic hygienic practices around  
689 handwashing, food preparation and cleanliness. Indeed, where hygiene was  
690 promoted, the analysis suggested it was effective in circumstances where there was  
691 likely to be sufficient water available. In other words, when people have more water  
692 to wash in, they are able to wash properly, which significantly improves the survival  
693 chances of their children. Effects in individual studies of hygiene also appeared  
694 related to water supply access. For example, in Côte d'Ivoire [33], hygiene education  
695 was provided alongside village water pumps which gave 76 cubic metres per day for  
696 a community of 400 people, equivalent to 190 litres per capita per day. The study  
697 with the smallest effect on diarrhoea mortality was conducted among communities  
698 where some households had access to running water for only two hours each week  
699 [65].

700

701 Latrine promotion to whole communities was most consistently associated with the  
702 reductions in diarrhoea mortality in childhood, although we note the small number of  
703 intervention effects available (n=2). Thus, when sanitation is available and used by  
704 the majority of people in a community, it lessens children's interactions with faeces in

705 the public realm, reducing infection transmission and the mortality risk. In contrast,  
706 the effect on all-cause or diarrhoea mortality of household water treatment was not  
707 significant. Few studies have estimated the effects of water treatment and storage on  
708 diarrhoea mortality, and only one used a method (filtration) thought to be efficacious  
709 in removing common causes of enteric infection in low-income settings [60]. Most of  
710 the studies of HWT evaluated chlorination, which is not thought efficacious in  
711 removing common diarrhoea pathogens in low-income settings like cryptosporidium  
712 [72].

713

714 The analysis suggested WASH interventions were most effective when they were  
715 given in circumstances of high environmental risk, where most households openly  
716 defaecated or used unimproved water supply and sanitation amenities, and the  
717 baseline mortality rate was consequently higher. WASH interventions were also  
718 more effective in the summer rainy season, when environmental contamination is  
719 thought greater in warm country contexts. Diarrhoea mortality in South Asia and sub-  
720 Saharan Africa has been shown as largely associated with E. Coli infection in infants  
721 and cryptosporidium in children [73], both of which are expected to be more  
722 prevalent in warmer conditions. Shorter trials, which are usually conducted in the  
723 peak diarrhoea season when the intervention is most efficacious, also tended to  
724 have significantly larger effects on all-cause mortality. Because the season of data  
725 collection was already accounted for in meta-regression analysis, this suggested  
726 there may be other reasons for studies with longer follow-ups to have smaller effects,  
727 such as maintenance faults in the WASH technology and/or reduced adherence over  
728 time.

729

730 Meta-regression analysis suggested approximately three-quarters of deaths in  
731 childhood could be averted when WASH interventions are provided to  
732 immunocompromised groups during the peak diarrhoea season, against  
733 counterfactuals living in very poor communities with unimproved sanitation services.  
734 We found no evidence of publication bias due to small-study effects in trials of  
735 WASH interventions, presumably because mortality was not defined as an outcome  
736 in these studies.

### 737 **What the study adds to existing research**

738 These results support predictions from theory. One would expect a stronger  
739 relationship between improved WASH access and diarrhoea mortality, than all-cause  
740 mortality, as we have found. Inadequate WASH may cause death in young children  
741 through other routes such as respiratory infection and under-nutrition, but diarrhoea  
742 is thought the biggest single cause [4]. The findings are therefore consistent with the  
743 main causes of mortality in childhood: domestic hygiene is the common factor which  
744 can block transmission of faeco-oral and respiratory infections [74]; community-wide  
745 sanitation breaks transmission of diarrhoea from open defaecation in the public and  
746 domestic domains [75]. These effects would tend to be greater over a counterfactual  
747 where existing water supply and sanitation services are not available or unimproved,  
748 so that community members are not able to practice hand washing and are openly  
749 defaecating, or using facilities that are either shared between two or more  
750 households or ones that do not adequately separate excreta from the environment.

751

752 Therefore, the significantly greater impacts of WASH interventions in contexts where  
753 environmental contamination and the baseline mortality are high, and the greater  
754 significance of findings when WASH interventions were provided together, are  
755 consistent with the WASH ladders concept: where the WASH improvement is from a  
756 lower base, or enhances access to water, sanitation and hygiene together, one  
757 would expect bigger effects on health. The review's findings of null effects on all-  
758 cause mortality for study participants aged over 5 years is also consistent with the  
759 maturation of immunity systems with age, causing older children and adults to be  
760 less susceptible to infectious disease mortality than under-5s [76]. This finding is in  
761 contrast to reviews of diarrhoea morbidity that have found significant effects for those  
762 aged over 5 years too [77]. The F-diagram includes six intermediate transmission  
763 vectors (fluids, fields, flies, fingers, food and fomites), of which only the fluids route is  
764 addressed through water quality [78]. While we did not find significant effects, on all-  
765 cause or diarrhoea mortality, of water treatment interventions, which act on water  
766 quality, where drinking water of quality is used to prepare food it may help address  
767 food-borne transmission, thought particularly important for weaning children [79].  
768  
769 Non-randomised studies at 'high risk of bias' can produce inflated effects, as we  
770 found here, because *p*-hacking would tend to increase effect size magnitudes.  
771 However, we estimated the opposite effect for RCTs – that 'high risk of bias' is  
772 associated with smaller effects on mortality – a finding which is consistent with site  
773 selection bias [80,81]. In other words, trials that are more carefully conducted and  
774 reported are of interventions that also tend to be designed and implemented  
775 appropriately to the local context, and therefore adhered to, hence being more

776 effective. An example is when interventions promote hand washing (e.g., education,  
777 social marketing, soap provision) in contexts where the quantity of water available to  
778 households is sufficient to practice domestic cleanliness; or, if it is thought not to be,  
779 improvements in water supply access or reliability are made too.

## 780 **Findings in relation to other systematic reviews**

781 The evidence presented here, that water supply, hygiene improvements and  
782 community-wide sanitation save children's lives in L&MICs, is consistent with  
783 findings from an early review [82], but in several respects is quite different from later  
784 reviews. These have not tended to find significant effects on diarrhoea morbidity of  
785 interventions which aim to improve access to water in quantity for household use.  
786 The most recent review by the WHO suggests that clean drinking water provided at  
787 the point-of-use, particularly by filtration, reduces reported diarrhoeal illness by  
788 around one-half [11]. Reviews have found that HWT appears to be more effective  
789 when a protective container is also provided [83], as it may be for example in  
790 household filtration devices when drinking water is accessed through a straw or tap.  
791 Reviews have also found smaller or null effects for household water treatment  
792 technologies like chlorination, when studies were double-blinded [13,23,83], or when  
793 methods were used to correct for lack of blinding [84,85]. Hand hygiene interventions  
794 have been found to have varying effects on diarrhoeal illness [74,86,87] and a review  
795 is underway to update the evidence on respiratory infection [88]. The difference  
796 between our findings for mortality and the reviews of morbidity might arise because  
797 of the contexts in which the studies have been conducted and specifically the



798 availability of treatment. However, many of the papers and contexts included in this  
799 review are also represented in the reviews of morbidity.

800

801 A few other published reviews have provided estimates of mortality reduction due to  
802 factors associated with WASH provision. Morris et al. [89] reviewed evidence on  
803 cause-specific mortality among under-5s, estimating 22 percent of deaths were due  
804 to diarrhoea and 20 percent to pneumonia. Benova et al. [90] estimated significant  
805 reductions in maternal mortality due to improvements in water and sanitation, which  
806 appeared most closely related to water supply access (OR=0.42, 95%CI=0.29, 0.83,  
807 I-squared=0%, 2 estimates).

#### 808 **Limitations of the study**

809 The reporting of children's deaths through interviews with mothers is susceptible to  
810 some biases and omissions, which have been investigated and documented in the  
811 literature [91,92]. Omissions are relatively common in the reporting of deaths  
812 occurring 10 to 15 years before a survey takes place, but there is no evidence of  
813 underreporting of deaths for more recent time periods. As for biases, there is no  
814 evidence that mothers from a variety of countries tend to underreport deaths  
815 occurring soon after birth or deaths of girls. Given the relatively shorter recall period  
816 employed in the studies considered in our review, we believe underreporting of  
817 deaths is unlikely. It is also not obvious why underreporting of deaths should differ  
818 between treated and untreated groups.

819

820 Hence, regarding the quality of the evidence collected here, reported mortality is not  
821 thought to be a biased measure *per se*. All-cause mortality data can also be  
822 triangulated with corresponding data from other sources, such as vital registration,  
823 and even the possible effect of other diseases, such as respiratory infections [93].  
824 Cause-specific death rates are thought less reliable [16], dependent as they are on a  
825 verbal autopsy interview with the bereaved family of the patient, who may be too  
826 distraught to give an unbiased, let alone a coherent account of the patient's last  
827 days. But, like all-cause mortality, verbal autopsy can be triangulated with, or done  
828 by, a physician, which we incorporated in the risk-of-bias assessment. Vital  
829 registration and verbal autopsy estimates are also used in GBD calculations.  
830  
831 A potentially more serious source of bias is differential attrition. During survey  
832 interviews deaths will not be reported for mothers who migrated or died. To the  
833 extent that WASH interventions affect migration and adult mortality rates, child  
834 mortality rates might be downwards biased in intervention areas. In other words, a  
835 potential source of bias affecting the crude death rate calculations used in this study  
836 is that they are right-censored: that is, where data are collected contemporaneously  
837 among participants regardless of age, children born into the study or who migrate out  
838 and younger children will have completed shorter durations than older children; the  
839 data on pre- and neo-natal mortality may also be right censored by maternal deaths  
840 in pregnancy or labour. This causes downwards bias in the estimate of mortality in  
841 any single trial arm, although the bias may be less problematic in randomised trials  
842 with contemporaneous data collection across arms. A final source of bias in mortality  
843 estimates is where severely ill children were given ORS or encouraged to attend

844 health clinic [37,40,56–58,60,64]. Hence, for all of these reasons the results should  
845 be interpreted as providing lower-bound estimates of the impacts of WASH on  
846 mortality in childhood.

847

848 The evidence synthesis combined a variety of WASH technologies, promotional  
849 interventions, and counterfactuals. We attempted to address potential sources of  
850 inconsistency through the stratified meta-analysis by WASH technologies which  
851 incorporated information about the counterfactual scenarios. However, inconsistency  
852 of the interventions is an important potential limitation of meta-analyses of general  
853 WASH improvements. For example, we included many promotional approaches,  
854 including hygiene social marketing [34], community-led total sanitation (CLTS) [32]  
855 and latrine promotion with subsidies [53], the decentralisation of water services to  
856 local government [67] and the privatisation of local water supply and sanitation  
857 provision [50]. This inconsistency may be addressed through systematic analysis of  
858 adherence to measure actual exposures to improved WASH technologies [94], and  
859 as more studies and participant flows become available for syntheses of particular  
860 interventions.

## 861 **What the findings imply for policy and research**

862 In 2016, the UN proclaimed 2018-2028 the International Decade for Action on Water  
863 for Sustainable Development (<https://www.unwater.org/new-decade-water/>). Our  
864 results provide evidentiary support for greater attention to ensuring populations can  
865 access and use improved water supplies for domestic hygiene and sanitation. We  
866 present evidence that suggests these simple interventions may significantly improve

867 survival in early childhood from infection. Even though the review was restricted to  
868 endemic disease circumstances, the findings may also be relevant for epidemic  
869 disease control including coronavirus 2019 [95]. It is well-known that water supplies  
870 and sanitation are pro-poor and gender-inclusive interventions due to the time-  
871 savings and safety they may enable [96,97]. Our results suggest significant  
872 contributions could be made to reducing the global disease burden for diarrhoea and  
873 respiratory infections from improvements in water supplies, hygiene and sanitation  
874 where access is particularly inadequate, especially in sub-Saharan Africa and parts  
875 of South Asia.

876

877 Transparent study reporting is crucial for accountability and learning by enabling  
878 effects for relevant outcomes to be measured. A common source of bias in WASH  
879 trials is caused by differential losses to follow-up out of the study (attrition). How  
880 much attrition there is, and the reasons for it – for example, participant deaths –  
881 should be known. Reporting standards are well-known in health research due to the  
882 work of the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) Group [98,99],  
883 and standards are available in development economics too [100]. Many authors and  
884 journals do now report this information, but there are lags in practices across the  
885 research communities producing WASH trials. According to a recent survey,  
886 participant flows have been reported in around half of studies in environmental  
887 health, but they are not typically provided in studies in development economics [10].

888

889 Water is an important enabling factor for practising hand and food hygiene and some  
890 forms of sanitation (e.g., flush toilets), but articles do not typically report data on

891 distance to the water source, or water consumption (litres per capita per day) and  
892 how it is used (e.g., whether consumed or used in bathing). This information is  
893 crucial for understanding mechanisms and therefore the generalisability of the  
894 findings. Three studies provided information on distance to the water supply  
895 [8,32,55], one of which also reported water consumption [32]. In addition, it was not  
896 always clear exactly which interventions were provided to participants, not just the  
897 nature of the water supply improvement but whether hand or food hygiene were  
898 promoted. Therefore, a final recommendation is for more transparent reporting about  
899 the conditions being compared, including clearer information about the WASH  
900 technology itself that is being promoted and the counterfactual scenario. For  
901 example, if hygiene messaging is part of the intervention, it should be clearly  
902 indicated in the title or abstract.

## 903 **5. Conclusions and suggested research directions**

904 We found large and consistent effects of water supply improvements on all-cause  
905 mortality in childhood, and of community-wide sanitation improvements on diarrhoea  
906 mortality. The contribution of this synthesis – to use participant flow data to provide  
907 estimates of changes in child mortality associated with WASH interventions – has  
908 been enabled by studies that use agreed standards of reporting such as CONSORT.  
909 There is potentially a large number of estimates of mortality in childhood from studies  
910 which do not use these methods of reporting, as a recent meta-analysis of  
911 household water treatment has indicated [101]. Going forward, the challenge will be  
912 for an author collaborative to provide sufficient incentives to obtain unpublished  
913 participant flow data, to ensure that future systematic reviews and meta-analyses are

914 representative of the complete data available on mortality in WASH intervention  
915 studies. There is also a need for more rigorous studies of water supply  
916 improvements. Although prospective evaluations of water supply interventions are  
917 being done (e.g., [102]), we are only aware of one published randomised field trial of  
918 a water supply improvement in Ghana [103] and one study that randomised  
919 encouragement of subsidies for household connections in Morocco [104]. If services  
920 are allocated by administrative area or according to a threshold rule (e.g., the share  
921 of community members currently covered by a service), it may be possible to use a  
922 discontinuity design, an approach that has been shown to generate the same effect  
923 estimates as RCTs, whether applied prospectively or retrospectively [105]. We are  
924 hopeful that the evidence presented in this review, and the evidence we are calling  
925 for, will prove useful for those taking decisions about what WASH improvements are  
926 needed in the second half of the International Decade for Action on Water.

## 927 **Acknowledgements**

928 Helpful comments were given by participants at UNC Water and Health 2021, the  
929 What Works Global Summit 2021, the LSHTM-IFS WASH Economics Conference in  
930 September 2022, the University of Salford, Britta Augsburg, Paul Hunter and our  
931 colleagues at the Environmental Health Group at LSHTM.

932

## 933 References

- 934 1. Naghavi M, Abajobir AA, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abd-Allah F, Abera SF, et al. Global, regional,  
935 and national age-sex specific mortality for 264 causes of death, 1980–2016: a systematic  
936 analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet*. 2017;390(10100):1151–210.
- 937 2. Troeger C, Blacker BF, Khalil IA, Rao PC, Cao S, Zimsen SR, et al. Estimates of the global,  
938 regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and aetiologies of diarrhoea in 195 countries: a  
939 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Infect Dis*.  
940 2018;18(11):1211–28.
- 941 3. Walker CLF, Rudan I, Liu L, Nair H, Theodoratou E, Bhutta ZA, et al. Global burden of  
942 childhood pneumonia and diarrhoea. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 2013 Apr 20;381(9875):1405–16.
- 943 4. Prüss-Ustün A, Wolf J, Bartram J, Clasen T, Cumming O, Freeman MC, et al. Burden of disease  
944 from inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene for selected adverse health outcomes: An  
945 updated analysis with a focus on low- and middle-income countries. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*.  
946 2019 Jun;222(5):765–77.
- 947 5. Victora CG, Smith PG, Vaughan JP, Nobre LC, Lombard C, Teixeira AMB, et al. Water supply,  
948 sanitation and housing in relation to the risk of infant mortality from diarrhoea. *Int J*  
949 *Epidemiol*. 1988;17(3):651–4.
- 950 6. Luby SP, Rahman M, Arnold BF, Unicomb L, Ashraf S, Winch PJ, et al. Effects of water quality,  
951 sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural  
952 Bangladesh: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018;6(3):e302–15.
- 953 7. Humphrey JH, Mbuya MN, Ntozini R, Moulton LH, Stoltzfus RJ, Tavengwa NV, et al.  
954 Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved  
955 complementary feeding, on child stunting and anaemia in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-  
956 randomised trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2019;7(1):e132–47.
- 957 8. Null C, Stewart CP, Pickering AJ, Dentz HN, Arnold BF, Arnold CD, et al. Effects of water  
958 quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth  
959 in rural Kenya: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018 Mar  
960 1;6(3):e316–29.
- 961 9. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1.  
962 Introduction—GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol*.  
963 2011;64(4):383–94.
- 964 10. Chirgwin H, Cairncross S, Zehra D, Sharma Waddington H. Interventions promoting uptake of  
965 water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) technologies in low-and middle-income countries: An  
966 evidence and gap map of effectiveness studies. *Campbell Syst Rev*. 2021;17(4):e1194.
- 967 11. Wolf J, Hubbard S, Brauer M, Ambelu A, Arnold BF, Bain R, et al. Effectiveness of interventions  
968 to improve drinking water, sanitation, and handwashing with soap on risk of diarrhoeal  
969 disease in children in low-income and middle-income settings: a systematic review and meta-  
970 analysis. *The Lancet*. 2022;400(10345):48–59.

- 971 12. Fewtrell L, Colford JMJ. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene : Interventions and Diarrhoea  
972 [Internet]. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2004 Jul [cited 2022 Sep 15]. Available from:  
973 <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/13742>
- 974 13. Schmidt WP, Cairncross S. Household water treatment in poor populations: is there enough  
975 evidence for scaling up now? *Environ Sci Technol*. 2009;43(4):986–92.
- 976 14. Zwane AP, Zinman J, Van Dusen E, Pariente W, Null C, Miguel E, et al. Being surveyed can  
977 change later behavior and related parameter estimates. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*.  
978 2011;108(5):1821–6.
- 979 15. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud LL, Schulz KF, Jüni P, Altman DG, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in  
980 treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes:  
981 meta-epidemiological study. *Bmj*. 2008;336(7644):601–5.
- 982 16. Savović J, Jones HE, Altman DG, Harris RJ, Jüni P, Pildal J, et al. Influence of reported study  
983 design characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised controlled trials:  
984 combined analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. *Health Technol Assess*. 2012;16(35):1–82.
- 985 17. Clasen T. Comments from Dr. Thomas Clasen on a draft of the GiveWell Water Quality Report,  
986 November 15, 2013 [Internet]. GiveWell; 2013 [cited 2019 Jan 1]. Available from:  
987 <https://files.givewell.org/files/DWDA%202009/Interventions/Water/Water%20Purification%20Assessment/eBeer-clasen-comments.pdf>  
988
- 989 18. Schmidt WP, Arnold BF, Boisson S, Genser B, Luby SP, Barreto ML, et al. Epidemiological  
990 methods in diarrhoea studies—an update. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2011 Dec;40(6):1678–92.
- 991 19. Briscoe J, Feachem RG, Rahaman MM. Evaluating health impact: water supply, sanitation, and  
992 hygiene education. IDRC, Ottawa, ON, CA; 1986.
- 993 20. Imo State Evaluation Team. Evaluating water and sanitation projects: lessons from Imo State,  
994 Nigeria. *Health Policy Plan*. 1989;40–9.
- 995 21. Deaton A, Cartwright N. Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials.  
996 *Soc Sci Med*. 2018;210:2–21.
- 997 22. Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page M, et al. Cochrane handbook for  
998 systematic reviews of interventions version 6.2 (updated February 2021) [Internet].  
999 Cochrane; 2021 [cited 2021 May 31]. Available from: <https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current>  
1000
- 1001 23. Waddington H, Snilstveit B, White H, Fewtrell L. Water, sanitation and hygiene interventions  
1002 to combat childhood diarrhoea in developing countries. *New Delhi Int Initiat Impact Eval*.  
1003 2009;
- 1004 24. Sharma Waddington H, Cairncross S. PROTOCOL: Water, sanitation and hygiene for reducing  
1005 childhood mortality in low-and middle-income countries. *Campbell Syst Rev*.  
1006 2021;17(1):e1135.



- 1007 25. Thomas J, Brunton J, Graziosi S. EPPI-Reviewer 4.0: software for research synthesis. EPPI-  
1008 Centre Software. London: Social Science Research Unit. Inst Educ Univ Lond. 2010;20(18):8-  
1009 11.
- 1010 26. Bongartz P. CLTS Update February 2012 [Internet]. Institute of Development Studies; 2012  
1011 [cited 2021 Nov 1]. Available from:  
1012 [https://archive.ids.ac.uk/clts/sites/communityledtotalsanitation.org/files/CLTS\\_Update\\_Feb\\_](https://archive.ids.ac.uk/clts/sites/communityledtotalsanitation.org/files/CLTS_Update_Feb_2012.pdf)  
1013 [2012.pdf](https://archive.ids.ac.uk/clts/sites/communityledtotalsanitation.org/files/CLTS_Update_Feb_2012.pdf)
- 1014 27. Higgins JP, Sterne JA, Savovic J, Page MJ, Hróbjartsson A, Boutron I, et al. A revised tool for  
1015 assessing risk of bias in randomized trials. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016;10(Suppl 1):29-  
1016 31.
- 1017 28. Eldridge S, Campbell M, Campbell M, Drahota-Towns A, Giraudeau B, Higgins J, et al. Revised  
1018 Cochrane risk of bias tool for randomized trials (RoB 2.0): additional considerations for  
1019 cluster-randomized trials. 2016 [cited 2021 Jan 1]; Available from:  
1020 [https://methods.cochrane.org/bias/resources/rob-2-revised-cochrane-risk-bias-tool-](https://methods.cochrane.org/bias/resources/rob-2-revised-cochrane-risk-bias-tool-randomized-trials)  
1021 [randomized-trials](https://methods.cochrane.org/bias/resources/rob-2-revised-cochrane-risk-bias-tool-randomized-trials)
- 1022 29. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al. ROBINS-I: a  
1023 tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *bmj.* 2016;355.
- 1024 30. Waddington H, White H, Snilstveit B, Hombrados JG, Vojtkova M, Davies P, et al. How to do a  
1025 good systematic review of effects in international development: a tool kit. *J Dev Eff.*  
1026 2012;4(3):359-87.
- 1027 31. Campbell Collaboration. Campbell Collaboration Systematic Reviews: Policies and Guidelines  
1028 [Internet]. The Campbell Collaboration; 2021 [cited 2022 Sep 15]. Available from:  
1029 [https://campbellcollaboration.org/library/campbell-collaboration-systematic-reviews-](https://campbellcollaboration.org/library/campbell-collaboration-systematic-reviews-policies-and-guidelines.html)  
1030 [policies-and-guidelines.html](https://campbellcollaboration.org/library/campbell-collaboration-systematic-reviews-policies-and-guidelines.html)
- 1031 32. Pickering AJ, Djebbari H, Lopez C, Coulibaly M, Alzua ML. Effect of a community-led sanitation  
1032 intervention on child diarrhoea and child growth in rural Mali: a cluster-randomised  
1033 controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2015 Nov 1;3(11):e701-11.
- 1034 33. Messou E, Sangaré SV, Josseran R, Le Corre C, Guélain J. [Effect of hygiene measures, water  
1035 sanitation and oral rehydration therapy on diarrhea in children less than five years old in the  
1036 south of Ivory Coast]. *Bull Soc Pathol Exot* 1990. 1997;90(1):44-7.
- 1037 34. Ram PK, Nasreen, S, Kamm, K, Allen, J, Kumar, S, Rahman, MA, et al. Impact of an Intensive  
1038 Perinatal Handwashing Promotion Intervention on Maternal Handwashing Behavior in the  
1039 Neonatal Period: Findings from a Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural Bangladesh. *BioMed*  
1040 *Res Int* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Sep 15]; Available from:  
1041 <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/bmri/2017/6081470/>
- 1042 35. Efthimiou O. Practical guide to the meta-analysis of rare events. *Evid Based Ment Health.*  
1043 2018 May;21(2):72-6.

- 1044 36. Cole EC, Hawkey M, Rubino JR, Crookston BT, McCue K, Dixon J, et al. Comprehensive family  
1045 hygiene promotion in peri-urban Cape Town: Gastrointestinal and respiratory illness and skin  
1046 infection reduction in children aged under 5. *South Afr J Child Health*. 2012;6(4):109–17.
- 1047 37. Mengistie B, Berhane Y, Worku A. Household Water Chlorination Reduces Incidence of  
1048 Diarrhea among Under-Five Children in Rural Ethiopia: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial.  
1049 *PLOS ONE*. 2013 Oct 23;8(10):e77887.
- 1050 38. Semenza JC, Roberts L, Henderson A, Bogan J, Rubin CH. Water distribution system and  
1051 diarrheal disease transmission: a case study in Uzbekistan. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*.  
1052 1998;59(6):941–6.
- 1053 39. Gyorkos TW, Maheu-Giroux M, Blouin B, Casapia M. Impact of health education on soil-  
1054 transmitted helminth infections in schoolchildren of the Peruvian Amazon: a cluster-  
1055 randomized controlled trial. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2013;7(9):e2397.
- 1056 40. Luby SP, Agboatwalla M, Painter J, Altaf A, Billhimer W, Keswick B, et al. Combining drinking  
1057 water treatment and hand washing for diarrhoea prevention, a cluster randomised controlled  
1058 trial. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2006;11(4):479–89.
- 1059 41. Lipsitch M, Tchetgen ET, Cohen T. Negative controls: a tool for detecting confounding and  
1060 bias in observational studies. *Epidemiol Camb Mass*. 2010;21(3):383.
- 1061 42. Arnold BF, Ercumen A. Negative Control Outcomes: A Tool to Detect Bias in Randomized  
1062 Trials. *JAMA*. 2016 Dec 27;316(24):2597–8.
- 1063 43. Kremer M, Leino J, Miguel E, Zwane AP. Spring Cleaning: Rural Water Impacts, Valuation, and  
1064 Property Rights Institutions\*. *Q J Econ*. 2011 Feb 1;126(1):145–205.
- 1065 44. Rasella D. Impacto do Programa Água para Todos (PAT) sobre a morbi-mortalidade por  
1066 diarreia em crianças do Estado da Bahia, Brasil. *Cad Saúde Pública*. 2003;29:40–50.
- 1067 45. Rhee V, Mullany LC, Khatri SK, Katz J, LeClerq SC, Darmstadt GL, et al. Maternal and Birth  
1068 Attendant Hand Washing and Neonatal Mortality in Southern Nepal. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc  
1069 Med*. 2008 Jul 7;162(7):603–8.
- 1070 46. Ryder R, Reeves W, Singh N, Hall C, Kapikian A, Gomez B, et al. The childhood health effects of  
1071 an improved water supply system on a remote Panamanian island. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*.  
1072 1985;34(5):921–924.
- 1073 47. Reese H, Routray P, Torondel B, Sinharoy SS, Mishra S, Freeman MC, et al. Assessing longer-  
1074 term effectiveness of a combined household-level piped water and sanitation intervention on  
1075 child diarrhoea, acute respiratory infection, soil-transmitted helminth infection and  
1076 nutritional status: a matched cohort study in rural Odisha, India. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2019 Dec  
1077 1;48(6):1757–67.
- 1078 48. Ercumen A, Arnold BF, Kumpel E, Burt Z, Ray I, Nelson K, et al. Upgrading a piped water supply  
1079 from intermittent to continuous delivery and association with waterborne illness: a matched  
1080 cohort study in urban India. *PLoS Med*. 2015;12(10):e1001892.

- 1081 49. Instituto Apoyo. Evaluacion de impacto y sostenibilidad de los proyectos de foncodes.  
1082 Instituto Apoyo, Tegucigalpa. [Internet]. Instituto Apoyo, Tegucigalpa; 2000 [cited 2021 Feb  
1083 8]. Available from: [https://fdocuments.ec/document/sexta-evaluacin-expost-del-foncodes-  
1084 world-rubio-en-la-definicion-del-diseo.html?page=7](https://fdocuments.ec/document/sexta-evaluacin-expost-del-foncodes-world-rubio-en-la-definicion-del-diseo.html?page=7)
- 1085 50. Galiani S, Gertler P, Schargrotsky E. Water for life: The impact of the privatization of water  
1086 services on child mortality. *J Polit Econ.* 2005;113(1):83–120.
- 1087 51. Granados C, Sánchez F. Water reforms, decentralization and child mortality in Colombia,  
1088 1990–2005. *World Dev.* 2014;53:68–79.
- 1089 52. Gebre T, Ayele B, Zerihun M, House JI, Stoller NE, Zhou Z, et al. Latrine Promotion for  
1090 Trachoma: Assessment of Mortality from a Cluster-Randomized Trial in Ethiopia. *Am J Trop  
1091 Med Hyg.* 2011 Sep 1;85(3):518–23.
- 1092 53. Clasen T, Boisson S, Routray P, Torondel B, Bell M, Cumming O, et al. Effectiveness of a rural  
1093 sanitation programme on diarrhoea, soil-transmitted helminth infection, and child  
1094 malnutrition in Odisha, India: a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2014 Nov  
1095 1;2(11):e645–53.
- 1096 54. Crump JA, Otieno PO, Slutsker L, Keswick BH, Rosen DH, Hoekstra RM, et al. Household based  
1097 treatment of drinking water with flocculant-disinfectant for preventing diarrhoea in areas  
1098 with turbid source water in rural western Kenya: cluster randomised controlled trial. *Bmj.*  
1099 2005;331(7515):478.
- 1100 55. Emerson PM, Lindsay SW, Alexander N, Bah M, Dibba SM, Faal HB, et al. Role of flies and  
1101 provision of latrines in trachoma control: cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet.*  
1102 2004;363(9415):1093–8.
- 1103 56. Lule JR, Mermin J, Ekwaru JP, Malamba S, Downing R, Ransom R, et al. Effect of home based  
1104 water chlorination and safe storage on diarrhea among persons with human  
1105 immunodeficiency virus in Uganda. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2005;73(5):926–33.
- 1106 57. Jain S, Sahanoon OK, Blanton E, Schmitz A, Wannemuehler KA, Hoekstra RM, et al. Sodium  
1107 dichloroisocyanurate tablets for routine treatment of household drinking water in periurban  
1108 Ghana: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2010;82(1):16.
- 1109 58. Ercumen A, Naser AM, Unicomb L, Arnold BF, Colford JMJ, Luby SP. Effects of Source versus  
1110 Household Contamination of Tubewell Water on Child Diarrhea in Rural Bangladesh: A  
1111 Randomized Controlled Trial. *PLOS ONE.* 2015 Mar 27;10(3):e0121907.
- 1112 59. Boisson S, Kiyombo M, Sthreshley L, Tumba S, Makambo J, Clasen T. Field Assessment of a  
1113 Novel Household-Based Water Filtration Device: A Randomised, Placebo-Controlled Trial in  
1114 the Democratic Republic of Congo. *PLOS ONE.* 2010 Sep 10;5(9):e12613.
- 1115 60. Peletz R, Simunyama M, Sarenje K, Baisley K, Filteau S, Kelly P, et al. Assessing water filtration  
1116 and safe storage in households with young children of HIV-positive mothers: a randomized,  
1117 controlled trial in Zambia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2012;101(3):555–65.

- 1118 61. Morris JF, Murphy J, Fagerli K, Schneeberger C, Jaron P, Moke F, et al. A Randomized  
1119 Controlled Trial to Assess the Impact of Ceramic Water Filters on Prevention of Diarrhea and  
1120 Cryptosporidiosis in Infants and Young Children—Western Kenya, 2013. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*  
1121 2018 May;98(5):1260–8.
- 1122 62. Conroy RM, Meegan ME, Joyce T, McGuigan K, Barnes J. Solar disinfection of water reduces  
1123 diarrhoeal disease: an update. *Arch Dis Child.* 1999;81(4):337–8.
- 1124 63. du Preez M, Conroy RM, Ligondo S, Hennessy J, Elmore-Meegan M, Soita A, et al. Randomized  
1125 intervention study of solar disinfection of drinking water in the prevention of dysentery in  
1126 Kenyan children aged under 5 years. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2011;45(21):9315–23.
- 1127 64. Luby SP, Agboatwalla M, Painter J, Altaf A, Billhimer WL, Hoekstra RM. Effect of Intensive  
1128 Handwashing Promotion on Childhood Diarrhea in High-Risk Communities in Pakistan: A  
1129 Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA.* 2004 Jun 2;291(21):2547–54.
- 1130 65. Bowen A, Agboatwalla M, Luby S, Tobery T, Ayers T, Hoekstra RM. Association between  
1131 intensive handwashing promotion and child development in Karachi, Pakistan: a cluster  
1132 randomized controlled trial. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* 2012;166(11):1037–44.
- 1133 66. Nicholson JA, Naeeni M, Hoptroff M, Matheson JR, Roberts AJ, Taylor D, et al. An  
1134 investigation of the effects of a hand washing intervention on health outcomes and school  
1135 absence using a randomised trial in Indian urban communities. *Trop Med Int Health.*  
1136 2014;19(3):284–92.
- 1137 67. Abou-Ali H, El-Azony H, El-Laithy H, Haughton J, Khandker S. Evaluating the impact of Egyptian  
1138 social fund for development programmes. *J Dev Eff.* 2010;2(4):521–55.
- 1139 68. Reese H, Routray P, Torondel B, Sclar G, Delea MG, Sinharoy SS, et al. Design and rationale of  
1140 a matched cohort study to assess the effectiveness of a combined household-level piped  
1141 water and sanitation intervention in rural Odisha, India. *BMJ Open.* 2017;7(3):e012719.
- 1142 69. Shuval HI, Tilden RL, Perry BH, Grosse RN. Effect of investments in water supply and  
1143 sanitation on health status: a threshold-saturation theory. *Bull World Health Organ.*  
1144 1981;59(2):243.
- 1145 70. White H, Menon R, Waddington H. Community-driven development: Does it build social  
1146 cohesion or infrastructure? A mixed-method evidence synthesis. Working Paper 30.  
1147 International Initiative for Impact Evaluation, New Delhi; 2018.
- 1148 71. Otu A, Nsutebu EF, Hirst JE, Thompson K, Walker K, Yaya S. How to close the maternal and  
1149 neonatal sepsis gap in sub-Saharan Africa. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2020 Apr 1;5(4):e002348.
- 1150 72. Cumming O, Arnold BF, Ban R, Clasen T, Esteves Mills J, Freeman MC, et al. The implications  
1151 of three major new trials for the effect of water, sanitation and hygiene on childhood  
1152 diarrhea and stunting: a consensus statement. *BMC Med.* 2019 Aug 28;17(1):173.
- 1153 73. Kotloff KL, Nataro JP, Blackwelder WC, Nasrin D, Farag TH, Panchalingam S, et al. Burden and  
1154 aetiology of diarrhoeal disease in infants and young children in developing countries (the

- 1155 Global Enteric Multicenter Study, GEMS): a prospective, case-control study. *The Lancet*.  
1156 2013;382(9888):209–22.
- 1157 74. Curtis V, Cairncross S. Effect of washing hands with soap on diarrhoea risk in the community:  
1158 a systematic review. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2003;3(5):275–81.
- 1159 75. Cairncross S, Blumenthal U, Kolsky P, Moraes L, Tayeh A. The public and domestic domains in  
1160 the transmission of disease. *Trop Med Int Health*. 1996;1(1):27–34.
- 1161 76. Butz WP, Habicht JP, DaVanzo J. Environmental factors in the relationship between  
1162 breastfeeding and infant mortality: the role of sanitation and water in Malaysia. *Am J*  
1163 *Epidemiol*. 1984;119(4):516–25.
- 1164 77. Clasen T, Schmidt WP, Rabie T, Roberts I, Cairncross S. Interventions to improve water quality  
1165 for preventing diarrhoea: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2007 Apr  
1166 12;334(7597):782.
- 1167 78. Kawata K. Water and other environmental interventions—the minimum investment concept.  
1168 *Am J Clin Nutr*. 1978;31(11):2114–23.
- 1169 79. Gautam OP, Schmidt WP, Cairncross S, Cavill S, Curtis V. Trial of a Novel Intervention to  
1170 Improve Multiple Food Hygiene Behaviors in Nepal. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2017;96(6):1415–26.
- 1171 80. Kunz R, Oxman AD. The unpredictability paradox: review of empirical comparisons of  
1172 randomised and non-randomised clinical trials. *Bmj*. 1998;317(7167):1185–90.
- 1173 81. Allcott, H. Site Selection Bias in Program Evaluation. *Q J Econ*. 2015;130(3):1117–65.
- 1174 82. Esrey SA, Potash JB, Roberts L, Shiff C. Effects of improved water supply and sanitation on  
1175 ascariasis, diarrhoea, dracunculiasis, hookworm infection, schistosomiasis, and trachoma. *Bull*  
1176 *World Health Organ*. 1991;69(5):609.
- 1177 83. Clasen TF, Alexander KT, Sinclair D, Boisson S, Peletz R, Chang HH, et al. Interventions to  
1178 improve water quality for preventing diarrhoea. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015;(10).
- 1179 84. Hunter PR. Household water treatment in developing countries: comparing different  
1180 intervention types using meta-regression. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2009;43(23):8991–7.
- 1181 85. Wolf J, Prüss-Ustün A, Cumming O, Bartram J, Bonjour S, Cairncross S, et al. Systematic  
1182 review: assessing the impact of drinking water and sanitation on diarrhoeal disease in low-  
1183 and middle-income settings: systematic review and meta-regression. *Trop Med Int Health*.  
1184 2014;19(8):928–42.
- 1185 86. Freeman MC, Stocks ME, Cumming O, Jeandron A, Higgins JP, Wolf J, et al. Systematic review:  
1186 hygiene and health: systematic review of handwashing practices worldwide and update of  
1187 health effects. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2014;19(8):906–16.
- 1188 87. Wolf J, Hunter PR, Freeman MC, Cumming O, Clasen T, Bartram J, et al. Impact of drinking  
1189 water, sanitation and handwashing with soap on childhood diarrhoeal disease: updated  
1190 meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2018;23(5):508–25.

- 1191 88. Ross I, Bick S, Ayieko, P, Dreibelbis, R, Allen, E, Freeman, M, et al. Impact of handwashing with  
1192 soap on acute respiratory infections in low- and middle-income countries – a systematic  
1193 review [Internet]. PROSPERO CRD42021231414; 2021 [cited 2022 Jul 25]. Available from:  
1194 [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display\\_record.php?ID=CRD42021231414](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021231414)
- 1195 89. Morris SS, Black RE, Tomaskovic L. Predicting the distribution of under-five deaths by cause in  
1196 countries without adequate vital registration systems. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2003;32(6):1041–51.
- 1197 90. Benova L, Cumming O, Campbell OM. Systematic review and meta-analysis: association  
1198 between water and sanitation environment and maternal mortality. *Trop Med Int Health.*  
1199 2014;19(4):368–87.
- 1200 91. Institute for Resource Development. An assessment of DHS-I data quality. Institute for  
1201 Resource Development/Macro Systems, Incorporated, Westinghouse, Columbia MD; 1990.
- 1202 92. Pullum T, Becker S. Evidence of omission and displacement in DHS birth histories:  
1203 methodological reports vol. 11. *Rockv ICF Int.* 2014;
- 1204 93. Schmidt WP, Cairncross S, Barreto ML, Clasen T, Genser B. Recent diarrhoeal illness and risk  
1205 of lower respiratory infections in children under the age of 5 years. *Int J Epidemiol.*  
1206 2009;38(3):766–72.
- 1207 94. Pickering AJ, Null C, Winch PJ, Mangwadu G, Arnold BF, Prendergast AJ, et al. The WASH  
1208 Benefits and SHINE trials: interpretation of WASH intervention effects on linear growth and  
1209 diarrhoea. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2019;7(8):e1139–46.
- 1210 95. Howard G, Bartram J, Brocklehurst C, Colford JM, Costa F, Cunliffe D, et al. COVID-19: urgent  
1211 actions, critical reflections and future relevance of ‘WaSH’: lessons for the current and future  
1212 pandemics. *J Water Health.* 2020;18(5):613–30.
- 1213 96. Cairncross S, Cliff JL. Water use and health in Mueda, Mozambique. *Trans R Soc Trop Med*  
1214 *Hyg.* 1987 Jan 1;81(1):51–4.
- 1215 97. Churchill AA, de Ferranti D, Roche R, Tager C, Walters A, Yazer A. Rural water supply and  
1216 sanitation: time for a change. World Bank; 1987.
- 1217 98. Moher D. CONSORT: an evolving tool to help improve the quality of reports of randomized  
1218 controlled trials. *Jama.* 1998;279(18):1489–91.
- 1219 99. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting  
1220 parallel group randomised trials. *J Pharmacol Pharmacother.* 2010;1(2):100–7.
- 1221 100. Bose R. A checklist for the reporting of randomized control trials of social and economic policy  
1222 interventions in developing countries: CEDE Version 1.0. New Delhi: International Initiative  
1223 for Impact Evaluation; 2010.
- 1224 101. Kremer M, Luby S, Maertens R, Tan B. Water treatment and child mortality: a systematic  
1225 review and meta-analysis [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jul 26]. Available from: Available at:  
1226 [https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/voices.uchicago.edu/dist/0/2830/files/2022/02/Water-](https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/voices.uchicago.edu/dist/0/2830/files/2022/02/Water-meta-analysis-manuscript-2022.02.20.docx.pdf)  
1227 [meta-analysis-manuscript-2022.02.20.docx.pdf](https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/voices.uchicago.edu/dist/0/2830/files/2022/02/Water-meta-analysis-manuscript-2022.02.20.docx.pdf)

- 1228 102. Gallandat K, Cumming O. Impact Evaluation of Urban Water Supply Improvements on Cholera  
1229 and Other Diarrhoeal in Uvira, Democratic Republic of Congo [Internet]. [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov);  
1230 2022 Aug [cited 2022 Sep 15]. Report No.: NCT02928341. Available from:  
1231 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02928341>
- 1232 103. Cha S, Kang D, Tuffuor B, Lee G, Cho J, Chung J, et al. The Effect of Improved Water Supply on  
1233 Diarrhea Prevalence of Children under Five in the Volta Region of Ghana: A Cluster-  
1234 Randomized Controlled Trial. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2015 Oct;12(10):12127–43.
- 1235 104. Devoto F, Duflo E, Dupas P, Parienté W, Pons V. Happiness on tap: Piped water adoption in  
1236 urban Morocco. *Am Econ J Econ Policy*. 2012;4(4):68–99.
- 1237 105. Waddington HS, Villar PF, Valentine JC. Can Non-Randomised Studies of Interventions Provide  
1238 Unbiased Effect Estimates? A Systematic Review of Internal Replication Studies. *Eval Rev*.  
1239 2022;0193841X221116721.
- 1240
- 1241

1242 **Supporting information**

1243 S1 Annex tables

1244 S2 PRISMA 2020 checklist

1245 S3 Annex figures

1246 S4 Dataset

1247



