

1 **Fidelity and adherence to a liquefied petroleum gas stove and fuel intervention: the multi-**
2 **country Household Air Pollution Intervention Network (HAPIN) trial**

3
4 **Authors:** Kendra N. Williams (1, 2), Ashlinn Quinn (3), Hayley North (4), Jiantong Wang (5), Ajay
5 Pillarisetti (6), Lisa M. Thompson (7), Anaité Díaz-Artiga (8), Kalpana Balakrishnan (9), Gurusamy
6 Thangavel (9), Ghislaine Rosa (10), Florian Ndagijimana (11), Lindsay J. Underhill (12), Miles A.
7 Kirby (13), Elisa Puzzolo (10), Shakir Hossen (1, 2), Lance A. Waller (5), Jennifer L. Peel (14),
8 Joshua P. Rosenthal (4), Thomas F. Clasen (15), Steven A. Harvey (16), William Checkley (1, 2),
9 on behalf of the HAPIN Investigators*

- 10
11 1. Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University,
12 Baltimore, MD, USA
13 2. Center for Global Non-Communicable Disease Research and Training, School of Medicine,
14 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA
15 3. Berkeley Air Monitoring Group, Berkeley, CA, USA
16 4. Fogarty International Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA
17 5. Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory
18 University, Atlanta, GA, USA
19 6. Division of Environmental Health Sciences, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA,
20 USA
21 7. Nell Hodgson Woodruff School of Nursing, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
22 8. Center for Health Studies, Universidad del Valle de Guatemala, Guatemala City, Guatemala
23 9. ICMR Center for Advanced Research on Air Quality, Climate and Health, Department of
24 Environmental Health Engineering, Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education and
25 Research, Chennai, India
26 10. Public Health, Policy & Systems, Institute of Population Health, University of Liverpool,
27 Liverpool, UK
28 11. Eagle Research Center Limited, Kigali, Rwanda
29 12. Cardiovascular Division, John T. Milliken Department of Medicine, Washington University
30 School of Medicine in St. Louis, MO, USA
31 13. Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard University T.H. Chan School of Public
32 Health, Boston, MA, USA
33 14. Department of Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences, Colorado State University,
34 Fort Collins, CO, USA
35 15. Gangarosa Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory
36 University, Atlanta, GA, USA
37 16. Department of International Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins
38 University, Baltimore, MD, USA

39
40
41 **Correspondence:**

42 William Checkley, MD, PhD
43 Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care
44 Johns Hopkins University

45 1830 E. Monument St. Room 555
46 Baltimore, MD 21287, USA
47 E-mail: wcheckl1@jhmi.edu

48
49

50 ***HAPIN Investigators:** Vigneswari Aravindalochanan, Gloriose Bankundiye, Dana Boyd Barr,
51 Vanessa Burrowes, Alejandra Bussalleu, Devan Campbell, Eduardo Canuz, Adly Castañaza,
52 Howard H. Chang, Yunyun Chen, Marilú Chiang, Maggie L. Clark, Rachel Craik, Mary Crocker,
53 Victor G. Davila-Roman, Lisa de las Fuentes, Oscar De León, Ephrem Dusabimana, Lisa Elon,
54 Juan Gabriel Espinoza, Irma Sayury Pineda Fuentes, Sarada Garg, Ahana Ghosh, Dina Goodman-
55 Palmer, Savannah Gupton, Sarah Hamid, Stella Hartinger, Mayari Hengstermann, Ian
56 Hennessee, Phabiola Herrera, Marjorie Howard, Penelope P. Howards, Lindsay Jaacks, Shirin
57 Jabbarzadeh, Michael A. Johnson, Katherine Kearns, Jacob Kremer, Margaret A. Laws, Pattie
58 Lenzen, Jiawen Liao, Amy E. Lovvorn, Jane Mbabazi, Eric McCollum, John P. McCracken, Julia N.
59 McPeck, Rachel Meyers, J. Jaime Miranda, Erick Mollinedo, Libny Monroy, Lawrence Moulton,
60 Alexie Mukeshimana, Krishnendu Mukhopadhyay, Bernard Mutariyani, Luke Naeher, Abidan
61 Nambajimana, Durairaj Natesan, Florian Ndagijimana, Laura Nicolaou, Azhar Nizam, Jean de
62 Dieu Ntivuguruzwa, Aris Papageorghiou, Ricardo Piedrahita, Naveen Puttaswamy, Karthikeyan
63 Dharmapuri Rajamani, Sarah Rajkumar, Usha Ramakrishnan, Rengaraj Ramasami, Alexander
64 Ramirez, P. Barry Ryan, Sudhakar Saidam, Zoe Sakas, Sankar Sambandam, Jeremy A. Sarnat,
65 Suzanne Simkovich, Sheela S. Sinharoy, Kirk R. Smith, Kyle Steenland, Damien Swearing, Ashley
66 Toenjes, Jean Damascene Uwizeyimana, Viviane Valdes, Amit Verma, Megan Warnock, Wenlu
67 Ye, Bonnie N. Young, Ashley Younger.

68

69 **ABSTRACT** (word count: 298)

70 **Background:** Reducing household air pollution (HAP) to levels associated with health benefits
71 requires nearly exclusive use of clean cooking fuels and abandonment of traditional biomass
72 fuels.

73 **Methods:** The Household Air Pollution Intervention Network (HAPIN) trial randomized 3,195
74 pregnant women in Guatemala, India, Peru, and Rwanda to receive a liquefied petroleum gas
75 (LPG) stove intervention (n=1,590), with controls expected to continue cooking with biomass
76 fuels (n=1,605). We assessed fidelity to intervention implementation and participant adherence
77 to the intervention starting in pregnancy through the infant’s first birthday using fuel delivery
78 and repair records, surveys, observations, and temperature-logging stove use monitors (SUMs).

79 **Results:** Fidelity and adherence to the HAPIN intervention were high. Median time required to
80 refill LPG cylinders was 1 day (interquartile range 0-2). Although 26% (n=410) of intervention
81 participants reported running out of LPG at some point, the number of times was low (median:
82 1 day [Q1, Q3: 1, 2]) and mostly limited to the first four months of the COVID-19 pandemic.
83 Most repairs were completed on the same day as problems were reported. Traditional stove
84 use was observed in only 3% of observation visits, and 89% of these observations were followed
85 up with behavioral reinforcement. According to SUMs data, intervention households used their
86 traditional stove a median of 0.4% of all monitored days, and 81% used the traditional stove <1
87 day per month. Traditional stove use was slightly higher post-COVID-19 (detected on a median
88 [Q1, Q3] of 0.0% [0.0%, 3.4%] of days) than pre-COVID-19 (0.0% [0.0%, 1.6%] of days). There
89 was no significant difference in intervention adherence pre- and post-birth.

90 **Conclusion:** Free stoves and an unlimited supply of LPG fuel delivered to participating homes
91 combined with timely repairs, behavioral messaging, and comprehensive stove use monitoring
92 contributed to high intervention fidelity and near-exclusive LPG use within the HAPIN trial.

93

94

95 **Keywords:** liquefied petroleum gas, intervention fidelity, adherence, household air pollution,
96 clean cooking, health behavior change

97

98 **Word count:** 5,019 (not including tables, figures, or references)

99

100

101 **Acronyms and abbreviations:**

102 Intvn: Intervention group

103 Cntrl: Control group

104 HAP: Household Air Pollution

105 HAPIN: Household Air Pollution Intervention Network trial

106 LPG: Liquefied petroleum gas

107 K-S: Kolmogorov–Smirnov test

108 Preg: Follow-up that occurred during the pregnancy period, from delivery of the LPG stove
109 through birth of the child

110 Infncy: Follow-up that occurred during the post-birth or “infancy” period, from birth through the
111 child’s first birthday

112 Pre-COVID-19: Period of follow-up occurring prior to the onset of the global COVID-19
113 pandemic, between May 7, 2018 and March 16, 2020
114 Post-COVID-19: Period of follow-up occurring after the onset of the global COVID-19 pandemic,
115 between March 17, 2020 and the end of the trial (September 22, 2021)
116 PM_{2.5}: Fine particulate matter
117 SUMs: Stove use monitors
118 TS: Traditional stove
119 TSU: Traditional stove use
120 WHO: World Health Organization
121
122
123
124

125 **INTRODUCTION**

126 Household air pollution (HAP), caused by the inefficient combustion of polluting fuels such as
127 wood, dung, coal, charcoal, crop residue, and kerosene for household energy needs, was
128 responsible for an estimated 3.2 million premature deaths and 82 million healthy life years lost
129 in 2019.¹ Transitioning to energy sources that are cleaner at the point of use, such as liquefied
130 petroleum gas (LPG), electricity, natural gas, or ethanol, can significantly reduce exposure to
131 HAP.^{2,3} Exposure to HAP is associated with an array of poor health outcomes, including
132 diabetes, kidney diseases, chronic respiratory diseases, cardiovascular diseases, maternal and
133 neonatal disorders, respiratory infections, and tuberculosis.^{4,5} However, there is a lack of
134 evidence from randomized controlled trials on whether switching to cleaner fuels improves
135 health.

136
137 Although some stove intervention trials have found substantial exposure-response
138 relationships between specific air pollutants and health outcomes^{6,7}, most have not
139 demonstrated significant health impacts of the interventions in intention-to-treat analyses.⁸⁻¹¹
140 These null findings, however, have largely been ascribed to a lack of exclusive use of the clean
141 fuel stove and HAP exposure levels that remained above both interim target and guideline
142 levels of PM_{2.5} recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO).¹² Recently, a small
143 (n=180) randomized controlled trial of an LPG intervention in Peru was able to achieve near
144 exclusive LPG stove use (>98% of total cooking minutes across all stoves in the household were
145 done with LPG) and an average personal exposure to PM_{2.5} below the WHO interim target 1 in
146 intervention participants (mean of 30 µg/m³ compared to 98 µg/m³ in control participants).
147 However, the study found no impact of the stove intervention on blood pressure, lung function,
148 or respiratory symptoms among non-pregnant adult women.¹³

149
150 The Household Air Pollution Intervention Network (HAPIN) randomized controlled trial sought
151 to assess the effects of an LPG stove and fuel intervention in populations relying chiefly on solid
152 biomass fuels (wood, charcoal, dung, agricultural residue) on four primary outcomes: infant
153 birth weight, stunting at one year of age, and severe pneumonia in children under one year of
154 age, and blood pressure in non-pregnant adult women living in the same household.¹⁴ The
155 research questions raised by the trial required high levels of intervention fidelity and adherence
156 in order to reach the levels of HAP believed necessary to achieve health benefits.¹⁵ Stoves and
157 an unlimited supply of LPG were accompanied by behavior change approaches to attain as close
158 to exclusive LPG use as possible.¹⁶

159
160 We previously reported high levels of intervention fidelity and adherence during pregnancy in
161 the HAPIN trial as part of an assessment of pregnancy and birth outcomes.¹⁷ Here, we report on
162 fidelity and adherence during the child's first year of life and over the entire trial period, from
163 LPG stove delivery through the child's first birthday, as well as adherence in the subset of
164 households in which a second non-pregnant adult woman was enrolled (to understand
165 adherence in relation to the blood pressure primary outcome). We also explore the impact of
166 the COVID-19 pandemic on intervention fidelity and adherence.

167
168 **METHODS**

169 **Study Setting and Design**

170 Details on the HAPIN study design have been published separately.^{14,16} Briefly, we enrolled
171 approximately 800 pregnant women between 9 to 19 weeks of gestation who primarily used
172 biomass fuels for cooking in each of four countries: Jalapa, Guatemala; Puno, Peru; Kayonza,
173 Rwanda; and Tamil Nadu, India. Participants who were randomly assigned to the intervention
174 arm received an LPG stove, free LPG replacement cylinders delivered as needed, behavioral
175 reinforcement to promote exclusive LPG use, and free stove repairs, if required. Control
176 participants were expected to continue relying primarily on biomass cooking fuels. We also
177 enrolled a subset of non-pregnant adult women (aged 40-79 years) living in the same
178 household as the pregnant woman (n=417).

179

180 **Intervention and Delivery**

181 Intervention participants received an LPG stove with at least two burners (see Quinn et al.,
182 2021 for details on stove models) together with a continuous supply of free LPG fuel from two
183 exchangeable cylinders.¹⁷ Households were instructed to request an LPG refill from the HAPIN
184 study team when the first cylinder in their household ran out, thus, under typical consumption
185 patterns, enabling them to continue cooking using their second cylinder and allowing HAPIN
186 staff up to seven days to complete the refill request. At every LPG delivery visit in Guatemala,
187 Peru, and Rwanda, and at every SUMs download visit in India, HAPIN field staff checked the
188 functionality of the LPG stove and cylinders and recorded their observations in a survey. If a
189 problem was identified, field staff either fixed it immediately or returned as soon as possible to
190 resolve the issue. In between visits, participants were instructed to inform study staff if they
191 had any problems with the LPG equipment. Dates of repair requests and repair completion,
192 including actions taken to complete the repair, were recorded.

193

194 Upon LPG stove delivery, all intervention participants received the following behavioral support
195 package: 1) a pledge by which they agreed to cook exclusively with the LPG stove during the
196 trial, 2) training on how to safely operate the LPG equipment, and 3) behavioral messaging and
197 materials to motivate exclusive LPG use and discourage biomass stove use. The messaging on
198 exclusive LPG use was reinforced for any participants who showed evidence of traditional stove
199 use during the trial. During reinforcement visits, participants were asked about their reasons for
200 using the traditional stove and fieldworkers offered suggestions for alternatives.

201

202 **Stove Use Monitoring**

203 We used a combination of stove use monitors (SUMs - data logging temperature sensors),
204 surveys, and visual observations to assess stove use in our trial. Our SUMs monitoring efforts
205 focused on ensuring that traditional stoves in intervention households were not used. This
206 decision was driven by the evidence that traditional stove use must be nearly eliminated (<1
207 hour per week) to achieve clinically significant reductions in HAP.¹⁵ As such, we installed SUMs
208 on all traditional stoves in intervention households. The SUMs recorded temperature readings
209 every five minutes throughout the duration of the trial and were downloaded every two weeks.
210 Temperature readings were used to flag cooking events based on temperature increases above
211 identified thresholds that lasted at least five minutes (details on the algorithm are available in
212 Quinn et al. 2021).¹⁷ In the event of device malfunction, we eliminated data that occurred after

213 the error until the faulty SUM was repaired or replaced. We included only households that had
214 at least two weeks of continuous SUMs data during pregnancy and/or the post-birth period
215 (n=1,095 out of 1,584). We also installed SUMs in a subset of LPG stoves in intervention homes
216 (n=276) and a subset of traditional stoves in control homes (n=214).

217
218 Surveys asking participants to report which stoves they had used in the prior 24 hours were
219 administered with both intervention and control participants, twice during pregnancy (24-28
220 and 32-36 weeks of gestation) and three times post-birth (when the infant was approximately
221 3, 6, and 12 months old). Field staff conducted visual observations for evidence of traditional
222 stove use at SUMs download visits in India, Peru, and Rwanda and at all visits in Guatemala. Any
223 signs of recent traditional stove use (i.e., traditional stove being used during the visit, warm to
224 the touch, or with fresh ashes) were recorded, in addition to whether the traditional stove in
225 use had a SUMs installed in it.

226

227 **Data Analysis**

228 Table 1 shows the indicators and metrics we used to evaluate fidelity and adherence to the
229 intervention. We define fidelity (i.e., the extent to which the intervention was implemented as
230 planned) as fulfillment of continuous LPG fuel delivery, timely repairs to LPG equipment, and
231 behavioral reinforcement of exclusive LPG use. We define adherence as abandonment of
232 traditional biomass stoves and adoption of the LPG stove among intervention participants,
233 continued biomass stove use by control participants, and the extent to which these practices
234 continued during temporary or permanent moves.

235

236 For each metric, we calculated the value during pregnancy, during the 12 months of follow-up
237 after birth (infancy period), and across the full trial, by country and overall. We also calculated
238 values for the follow-up that occurred before the onset of the global COVID-19 pandemic ('pre-
239 COVID,' defined here as before March 17, 2020, which was the date across our study regions
240 that best approximates the onset of major disruptions associated with local and national
241 COVID-19 mitigation measures) and 'post-COVID' (March 17, 2020 or later) to assess any
242 potential impact of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on our results. We additionally divided the
243 post-COVID period into early (March 17-July 17, 2020) and late (after July 17, 2020) to assess
244 for any differences between the initial months after the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (when
245 nationally mandated lockdowns were instituted and new operating procedures were being
246 developed) and later months after new routines were established. We used the Kolmogorov–
247 Smirnov (K-S) test to compare differences by COVID-19 period and generalized estimating
248 equations (GEE) in a logistic regression model with repeated measures, and accounting for
249 overdispersion, to compare differences by birth period controlling for COVID-19 period.

250

251 Survey data were analyzed using StataSE version 15. SUMs data were analyzed using SAS
252 version 9.4 and R version 4.2.2 (2022-10-31) -- "Innocent and Trusting".

253

254

Table 1. Indicators and metrics used to measure intervention fidelity and adherence.

Measure	Indicator	Metrics of assessment	Data source	
Intervention Fidelity	Continuous LPG fuel delivery	# days between request for refill (or identification of refill need by fieldworkers) and LPG cylinder delivery	Surveys	
		% intervention participants reporting traditional stove use because they ran out of LPG		
	Timeliness of repairs	# and types of repairs made	Surveys	
		# days between problem identification and successful repair		
		# repairs per intervention participant		
	Behavioral reinforcement of exclusive LPG use	% intervention participants who reported using traditional stove due to problems or concerns with LPG	Surveys	
		# times intervention participants reported concerns with LPG		
		% intervention participants with observed traditional stove use who later received behavioral reinforcement		
		# days between observation of traditional stove use and reinforcement visit		
	Intervention Adherence	Disuse of traditional stoves in intervention households*	% of days with traditional stove use	SUMs
			% intervention households with no traditional stove use	
			% intervention households with <1 day of traditional stove use per month	
# days with traditional stove use per month				
Average minutes of traditional stove use per day				
% intervention households where traditional stove use was ever observed			Observations of traditional stove use	
# observations of traditional stove use per intervention household				
% observations indicating traditional stove use				

	LPG stove use by intervention participants	% intervention participants who reported exclusive LPG use across the study visits	Surveys
		% days with LPG stove use	SUMs
		# days with LPG stove use per month	
		Minutes of LPG stove use per day	
	Biomass stove use by control participants	% control participants who reported exclusive biomass use, mixed use of biomass and LPG, or exclusive LPG use across the study visits	Surveys
		% days with biomass stove use	SUMs
		Minutes of biomass stove use per day	
	Impact of temporary or permanent moves on adherence	% intervention participants who used biomass stoves in a new permanent home or temporary home	Surveys
		% control participants who used exclusively clean fuel in new permanent or temporary home	
		# days in the new permanent or temporary home	

255 * Note that we refer to intervention adherence at the household level given that the SUMs data do not distinguish which household
256 member(s) are using the stove during flagged use events.

257

258 RESULTS

259 Study population

260 A total of 3,195 participants were enrolled and randomized between May 7, 2018 and February 29, 2020, 1,590 in the intervention
261 group and 1,605 in the control group. Follow-up during pregnancy occurred between May 16, 2018 and September 17, 2020. Post-
262 birth follow-up (the infancy period) occurred between September 21, 2018 and September 22, 2021. For the purposes of our
263 analysis, we excluded six intervention participants who exited the study prior to receiving their LPG stove. Intervention participants
264 were followed for nearly twice as many days in the infancy period compared to the pregnancy period (Table 2). Follow-up time was
265 similar for control households (data not shown). Only 224 participants (14%) were still pregnant at the start of the global COVID-19
266 pandemic on March 17, 2020, with a remaining gestational period of a median 40.5 days (Q1, Q3: 14, 79) after March 17, 2020. A
267 total of 1,324 participants (87%) contributed post-birth follow-up time for a median 237 days (Q1, Q3: 139.5, 345.5) after March 17,
268 2020.

269

270 Table 2. Average time in the study, stove repairs, and LPG deliveries for intervention participants during pregnancy (“preg”), the
 271 post-birth or infancy period (“infcy”), and total across the full trial (“full”).
 272

	Guatemala			India			Peru			Rwanda			Total		
Study period in relation to the baby’s birth	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full
N Intervention Participants	400	382	400	398	384	398	394	379	394	392	372	392	1584	1517	1584
Median number of days in study period, (Q1, Q3)	150 (130, 167)	394 (383, 408)	545 (521, 562)	139 (120, 157)	373 (366, 384)	514 (494, 534)	153 (133, 176)	386 (377, 394)	541 (517, 564)	153 (135, 170)	395 (377, 421)	549 (522, 580)	149 (129, 168)	386 (374, 401)	536 (511, 560)
# (%) of intervention participants who ever received a stove repair	46 (12%)	166 (43%)	182 (46%)	22 (6%)	25 (7%)	45 (11%)	56 (14%)	274 (72%)	286 (73%)	68 (17%)	317 (85%)	330 (84%)	192 (12%)	782 (52%)	843 (53%)
Median (Q1, Q3) # of stove repairs received per participant, among those with any repair	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 2)	2.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 1)	2.0 (1, 2)	2.0 (1, 3)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 2)	2.0 (1, 2)

Total repair visits made	58	290	348	22	28	50	64	483	547	74	567	641	218	1368	1586
Median (Q1, Q3) days between repair identification / request and successful repair	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0.5)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0,0)	0 (0,0)	0 (0,0)
Total LPG delivery visits made*	4950	14673	19623	846	3423	4269	3293	9032	12325	1534	5101	6635	10623	32229	42852
Median (Q1, Q3) days between delivery identification / request and successful delivery	2 (1,3)	2 (1,3)	2 (1,3)	5 (3,8)	4 (3,6)	4 (3,6)	0 (0,0)	0 (0,0)	0 (0,0)	1 (0,2)	1 (0,3)	1 (0,2)	1 (0,2)	1 (0,2)	1 (0,2)

* Note that LPG cylinder sizes differed by country: 11.3 kg in Guatemala, 14.2 kg in India, 10 kg in Peru, and 12 or 15 kg in Rwanda.

Intervention Fidelity

Continuous LPG fuel delivery

Across settings, a total of 42,852 visits were made to deliver LPG to households (10,623 during pregnancy and 32,229 post-birth) (Table 2). The median (Q1, Q3) time between request for or identification of the need for a refill and delivery of the LPG cylinder(s) was 1.0 days (0, 2). Median (Q1, Q3) time between refill request and delivery was highest in India (4 [3, 6] days), where local LPG distributors delivered LPG to households in coordination with the HAPIN team. Overall, 95.6% of LPG deliveries were completed within the 7-day target specified in the protocol. Time between refill request and delivery was lowest in Peru (median [Q1, Q3]: 0 [0,


282 0]), where fieldworkers often observed that cylinders were empty at SUMs download visits and installed a replacement cylinder at
283 the same visit. Median (Q1, Q3) delivery times were similar during pregnancy (1.0 days; 0, 2) and post-birth (1.0 days; 0, 2) (Table 2),
284 as well as pre-COVID (1.0 days; 0, 3) and post-COVID (1.0 days; 0, 2) (data not shown).

285

286 Overall, 26% of participants reported ever using their traditional stove because they ran out of LPG before a refill was delivered
287 (Supplemental Table S1); however, despite this seemingly large percentage, the median (Q1, Q3) number of times these participants
288 reported running out was low: 1 (1, 2). The percent of participants reporting running out of LPG was highest in Rwanda (67%),
289 followed by Peru (27%) and Guatemala (11%). In India, no participants reported running out of LPG prior to a refill being delivered.
290 Reports of running out of LPG were higher in the post-birth compared to the pre-birth period; however, this is likely due to the
291 COVID-19 pandemic, which started when most participants were in the post-birth period. Figure 1 indicates that most reports of
292 running out of LPG occurred in the first four months following the COVID-19 shutdowns in March 2020 (mostly from Peru and
293 Rwanda). Instances of running out of LPG were less frequent in the later months of the COVID-19 pandemic once permissions were
294 obtained and/or new operating procedures were established.

295

296 Figure 1. Number of participants reporting running out of LPG out of all enrolled intervention participants by month. Dashed line
297 indicates onset of the global COVID-19 pandemic (March 17, 2020).



298
299

300 *Timely repairs and assurance of LPG equipment functionality*

301

302 Over the course of the study, a total of 1,586 repair visits were made to repair the LPG equipment, with most done the same day as
 303 the need for repair was identified (Table 2). Overall, 53% of participants required repairs, with a median (Q1, Q3) of 2.0 (1.0, 2.0)
 304 repairs per participant among those who ever received a repair (see Supplemental Table S2 for types of repairs). The need for
 305 repairs was lowest in India (11%), followed by Guatemala (46%), Peru (73%), and Rwanda (84%). There were no clear trends in the
 306 frequency of stove repairs over time (Supplemental Figure S1).

307

308 *Behavioral reinforcement of exclusive LPG use*

309


310 Overall, 43% of intervention participants reported problems, difficulties, or concerns with the LPG stove (including both equipment
311 problems and user perceptions) at any behavioral reinforcement visit (Supplemental Table S1). Issues were more frequently
312 reported in Rwanda (77% of participants ever reported a problem or difficulty), followed by Peru (54%), Guatemala (42%), and India
313 (1%). The percent of participants reporting problems or difficulties was higher in the post-birth period compared to the pre-birth
314 period in Guatemala (38% vs. 15%) and Rwanda (78% vs. 17%), but similar between periods in Peru (37% vs. 37%) and India (0% vs.
315 1%). Although nearly half of participants reported ever experiencing a problem, difficulty, or concern with the LPG stove, the median
316 (Q1, Q3) number of reports per participant (among those with any reports) was low: 2 (1, 3).

317

318 Reported reasons for occasional use of the traditional stove were similar in pre-birth and post-birth periods (data not shown), except
319 for running out of LPG, which was more common in the post-birth compared to the pre-birth period in Guatemala, Peru, and
320 Rwanda (likely driven by the higher frequency of running out of LPG in the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic, see Figure 1). In
321 Rwanda, reported challenges with cleaning or maintaining the LPG stove or the stove not functioning correctly also increased post-
322 birth compared to pre-birth. Few problems with the LPG stove were reported in India. The most commonly reported reasons for
323 traditional stove use by country across the full trial are shown in Figure 2.

324

325 Figure 2. Top reasons for traditional stove use (including the top five reported reasons from each country), showing the total number
326 of people who ever reported each reason by country. Bars for India are very small given that very few people ever reported a
327 problem or concern about LPG (n=3).



328
329

330 Eighty-nine percent (n= 1,346) of observations of traditional stove use were followed up with a behavioral reinforcement visit
331 (Supplemental Table S3). The median (Q1, Q3) number of days between observation of traditional stove use and the reinforcement
332 visit was 9 (0, 56).

333

334 **Intervention Adherence**

335 *Disuse of traditional stoves in intervention households*

336 Of the 1,087 intervention participants who retained a traditional stove in their household during pregnancy following LPG stove
 337 installation, 96% (n=1,039) had their traditional stove(s) successfully monitored by a SUM (Supplemental Table S4). Similarly, of the
 338 1,020 intervention participants who had a traditional stove in their household after birth (including some households who re-
 339 installed a traditional stove that had been destroyed during pregnancy), 86% (n=877) had their traditional stove(s) successfully
 340 monitored by a SUM (see Supplemental Table S4 for potential reasons for missing SUMs data). A total of 218 participants had SUMs
 341 data only in pregnancy, 56 only post-birth, and 821 in both pregnancy and post-birth, for a total of 1,095 intervention households
 342 with traditional stoves monitored by SUMs at some point during the trial. In households with SUMs installed, the SUMs successfully
 343 recorded data for the majority of follow-up time: 84.3% of days between each participant’s date of LPG stove delivery and their exit
 344 date were monitored by SUMs (Table 3). The proportion of follow-up time monitored by SUMs was lower in Guatemala because
 345 many participants destroyed their traditional stove and thus only had SUMs data from a small percentage of their total time in the
 346 study.

347

348 Table 3. Traditional stove use (TSU) by intervention participants based on SUMs data during pregnancy (“preg”), the post-birth or
 349 infancy period (“infcy”), and total across the full trial (“full”).

350


Study period in relation to the baby’s birth	Guatemala			India			Peru			Rwanda			Total		
	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full
Total households with valid SUMs data	133	102	164	182	139	184	385	304	387	339	332	360	1039	877	1095
Proportion of follow-up time monitored by SUMs	69.5 (21.5, 100)	92.3 (40.6, 99.5)	35.5 (8.7, 95.4)	100 (81.7, 100)	99.5 (87.6, 99.7)	95.8 (43.2, 99.8)	100 (98.1, 100)	99.0 (56.7, 99.7)	94.6 (40.9, 99.8)	100 (69, 100)	86.6 (64.1, 99.5)	84.0 (65.4, 96.1)	100 (76.7, 100)	95.8 (61.4, 99.7)	84.3 (42.2, 99.5)
Percent of monitored days with	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.5 (0.0, 3.9)	0.0 (0.0, 2.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.2)	0.6 (0.0, 3.4)	0.5 (0.0, 3.3)	0.8 (0.0, 4.2)	0.0 (0.0, 1.3)	0.8 (0.0, 2.3)	0.8 (0.0, 2.1)	0.0 (0.0, 1.6)	0.3 (0.0, 2.3)	0.4 (0.0, 2.3)

TSU detected: median (Q1, Q3)															
Avg # days with TSU per 30 days of monitoring	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.1 (0.0, 1.2)	0.0 (0.0, 0.6)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)	0.2 (0.0, 1.0)	0.1 (0.0, 1.0)	0.2 (0.0, 1.3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.4)	0.2 (0.0, 0.7)	0.2 (0.0, 0.6)	0.0 (0.0, 0.5)	0.1 (0.0, 0.7)	0.1 (0.0, 0.7)
Traditional stove cooking minutes per day among those with TSU: median (Q1, Q3)	143.5 (44.4, 380.2)	139 (52.5, 218.2)	142.0 (52.5, 244.1)	85.0 (48.9, 121.5)	42.5 (18.1, 135.6)	78.1 (30.7, 123.5)	93.7 (54.0, 131.7)	103 (61, 156.2)	101.5 (65, 144.5)	82.2 (45.0, 153.3)	115.0 (58.8, 189.1)	113.6 (57.1, 182.5)	90.8 (47.5, 141.9)	109.2 (53, 184)	105.3 (55.8, 168.1)


351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364

Over the full trial, intervention households with SUMs installed rarely used their traditional stove, for a median (Q1, Q3) of 0.4% (0.0%, 2.3%) of monitored days (Table 3, Supplemental Table S5). The median percent of days in which the traditional stove was used was slightly higher in Peru (0.8%) and Rwanda (0.8%) than in Guatemala (0.0%) and India (0.0%), but consistently low overall. Although a few intervention households used their traditional stoves more frequently (Figure 3; Supplemental Figures S2, S3), 85% either removed their traditional stove (29%), never used their traditional stove (29%), or used their traditional stove on less than one day out of every 30 days (27%) (Figure 4). Households with SUMs had a median (Q1, Q3) of 0.1 (0.0, 0.7) days with TSU per 30 days of monitoring (Table 3). On days with any traditional stove use, intervention participants spent a median (Q1, Q3) of 105.3 (55.8, 168.1) minutes cooking with the traditional stove. Results were similar in the subset of households with a non-pregnant adult woman enrolled (aged 40-79 years; n=143 with SUMs monitoring): traditional stove use was detected on a median (Q1, Q3) of 0.4% (0.0%, 3.6%) of monitored days and 0.1 days (0.0, 1.1) per 30 days of monitoring (Supplemental Table S6).

365 Figure 3. Frequency of the percent of stove-use-monitored days in which traditional stove use (TSU) was detected via stove use
366 monitors (SUMs) in intervention households over the full trial period.




367
368
369 Figure 4. Percent of intervention households who destroyed their traditional stove at LPG stove installation and have no subsequent
370 SUMs data (blue), had zero traditional stove use (TSU) according to SUMs data (sepia), or had less than one day of TSU per month
371 (red), by country and overall. Percentages displayed in white represent the total percent of participants falling into either of these
372 three categories. Grey bars represent participants with one or more day with traditional stove use per month (dark grey) or who
373 retained their traditional stove but are missing SUMs data (light grey).



374
375

376 After controlling for COVID-19, there were no statistically significant differences in traditional stove use during the pregnancy period
 377 (median 0.0% [Q1, Q3: 0.0%, 1.6%]) as compared to the infancy period (median 0.3% [Q1, Q3: 0.0%, 2.3%]) (odds ratio=1.11 [CI:
 378 0.95-1.30], $p=0.1866$) (Table 3, Figure 5). The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic was associated with a statistically significant increase
 379 in traditional stove use among some users, but medians remained the same at 0.0% during the pre-COVID-19 period (Q1, Q3: 0.0%,
 380 1.6%) and 0.0% during the post-COVID-19 period (Q1, Q3: 0.0%, 3.4%) (Supplemental Table S7) (KS test $D=0.12$, $p<0.001$). More
 381 people had a significantly greater proportion of days with traditional stove use in the first four months after the start of the COVID-
 382 19 pandemic (median: 0.0%; Q1, Q3: 0.0%, 3.5%) compared to later months of the COVID-19 period (median: 0.0%; Q1, Q3: 0.0%,
 383 1.5%) (Figure 5, Supplemental Table S8) (KS test $D=0.12$, $p=0.001$).
 384

385 Figure 5. Percent of monitored days with traditional stove use as recorded by SUMs by calendar month during pregnancy and post-
 386 birth (“infancy”) periods, by country and overall among intervention participants. The dashed line indicates the onset of the COVID-
 387 19 pandemic, which began March 17, 2020 (shown at the March '20 position given that all March data was aggregated into one
 388 point).
 389



390
 391

392 Nearly all intervention participants (1,575/1,584 or 99%) received at least one visit in which fieldworkers looked for signs of any
393 traditional stove use, with a median (Q1, Q3) of 29 (23, 34) observation visits per participant over the course of the trial
394 (Supplemental Table S9). A total of 55,241 observation visits were made, of which only 1,506 (3%) indicated recent traditional stove
395 use (Supplemental Table S3). Observations indicating traditional stove use were rare in India (only 5 participants [1.3%] were ever
396 observed to have used their traditional stove recently) (Supplemental Table S9). Although more participants were observed to have
397 ever used their traditional stove in Guatemala (n=224; 56%), Peru (n=202; 51%), and Rwanda (n=229; 58%), the median (Q1, Q3)
398 number of traditional stove use observations per participant among those with any observed use was low: 2.0 (1, 3) observations
399 per participant (excluding India). Overall, among participants with any observations of traditional stove use, traditional stove use
400 was only observed in a median (Q1, Q3) of 4.5% (3%, 9%) of observation visits.

401

402 Most traditional stoves that were observed to have been recently used had a SUMs installed (64%) (Supplemental Table S3),
403 suggesting that most traditional stove use events were captured and reflected in the SUMs data. For the 547 households with no
404 SUMs data during pregnancy and the 640 households with no SUMs data post-birth (i.e., due to removal of the traditional stove or
405 missing SUMs data), observations for traditional stove use were completed in 531 (97%) and 639 (99%) of households during the
406 pregnancy and post-birth periods, respectively (Supplemental Table S10). Out of a median (Q1, Q3) of 10 (6, 16) observations
407 completed in those households during pregnancy and 22 (18, 47) post-birth, the median (Q1, Q3) number of traditional stove uses
408 observed was 0 (0, 0) in both periods. This indicates that traditional stove use was also low or non-existent in households lacking
409 SUMs data.


410

411 *Use of the LPG stove in intervention households:*

412 In the subset of 276 intervention households who had SUMs installed on their LPG stoves, LPG use was detected on a median (Q1,
413 Q3) of 95.2% (87.8%, 98.6%) of all monitored days. The LPG stove was used for a median (Q1, Q3) of 28.6 (26.3, 29.6) days per 30
414 days of monitoring and 260.9 (204.2, 325.4) minutes of use per day. Self-reported data showed that in the majority of pregnancy
415 and post-birth survey visits (96.6%), intervention participants reported using LPG exclusively in the preceding day (Figure 6). Nearly
416 90% of participants reported using LPG exclusively in all survey visits, and 99.3% of participants reported exclusive LPG use in 75% or
417 more of survey visits.

418

419 Figure 6. Self-reported stove use in the 24-hours preceding the survey at baseline, 24-28 and 32-36 weeks gestation, and 3, 6, and 12
420 months post-birth among intervention and control participants. Pink represents exclusive biomass use; green, exclusive LPG use;
421 orange, mixed use of biomass and LPG; dark blue, no cooking; and light blue, cooking with other clean technologies such as electric
422 stoves.



423
424

425 *Use of biomass and LPG stoves in control households*

426 Across all study visits in pregnancy and post-birth, control participants in Guatemala, India, and Rwanda reported exclusive use of
 427 biomass (97.9%) or a mix of LPG and biomass (0.3%) (Figure 6). In Peru, control participants reported some use of biomass in 76% of
 428 all visits (42% exclusive and 34% mixed); although 24% of all visits indicated exclusive LPG use, only 17 participants (4.5%) reported
 429 exclusive LPG use at every survey visit. Across all countries, approximately 84% of control participants reported using biomass in all

430 survey visits, and 91.1% reported using biomass in 75% or more of survey visits. In the subset of control households with SUMs
431 installed in traditional stoves (n=214), traditional stove use was recorded on a median (Q1, Q3) of 69.3% (43.4%, 87.8%) of
432 monitored days and used for 245.7 (165.5, 334.4) minutes per day of use.

433

434 *Impact of temporary or permanent moves on adherence*

435 Overall, 22% of intervention participants and 23% of control participants moved to either a temporary or permanent home during
436 the trial (Supplemental Table S11). Most intervention participants continued using LPG exclusively in their new or temporary home
437 (95%), and most control participants continued using biomass either primarily or secondarily in their new or temporary home
438 (96.5%).

439

440

441 **DISCUSSION**

442

443 The research questions that the HAPIN trial sought to answer required an understanding of the
444 intervention fidelity and adherence. To achieve the highest possible adherence, special steps
445 were undertaken, including free LPG stoves and fuel delivered directly to the home, timely
446 repairs, locally tailored behavioral messaging, and comprehensive stove use monitoring. The
447 trial achieved high fidelity to implementation of these intervention components, which were
448 successful in contributing to high intervention adherence by intervention participants
449 throughout the 18-month trial period, while most control participants continued to use
450 primarily biomass fuels for cooking. The level of adherence to LPG stove use achieved among
451 the intervention participants in the HAPIN trial aligns with that observed in a smaller scale
452 randomized controlled LPG intervention in Peru¹³, and is much higher than has been reported
453 in other clean cooking trials^{8,18,19}.

454

455 Our study did not find that adherence to exclusive LPG use was significantly different during
456 pregnancy compared to post-birth. This contrasts with Carrión et al. (2020), who found that LPG
457 stove use was higher during pregnancy compared to during the infant's first year of life in a
458 randomized controlled trial in Ghana (95.4% reported using the LPG stove for the main meal
459 the previous day during pregnancy, compared to 82.8% over one year post-birth).¹⁸ Although
460 we found that traditional stove use was slightly higher post-birth compared to during
461 pregnancy, this was likely an effect of COVID-19 given that most participants were already in or
462 near the post-birth follow-up period when the COVID-19 shutdown began. Indeed, after
463 controlling for the COVID-19 pandemic, differences in adherence between pregnancy and post-
464 birth periods were non-significant.

465

466 Notably, we found that participants in India had higher adherence (both in terms of traditional
467 stove use flagged by SUMs and by observations), fewer reports of problems or concerns with
468 LPG, and fewer documented stove repairs than in Peru, Guatemala, or Rwanda. Greater
469 exclusivity of LPG use in India may have been driven by enhanced awareness of and motivation
470 to use LPG in the country due to national policies, such as the Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana
471 (PMUY) LPG subsidization program for households below the poverty line.^{20,21} Additionally,
472 because LPG was delivered by local distributors in India, they may have made simple stove or
473 tank repairs or addressed small concerns that were not reported to the study team, thus
474 resulting in a lower number of documented repairs and reported problems in India compared
475 to other countries where study staff made LPG deliveries.

476

477 Our results indicate that the COVID-19 pandemic temporarily impacted the timely delivery of
478 LPG (mainly in Peru and Rwanda), contributing to slightly higher traditional stove use during
479 this period. Nonetheless, traditional stove use remained extremely low overall. Our findings
480 suggest that the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic were mainly limited to the first four
481 months of the pandemic, and that this did not jeopardize the high rate of fidelity and
482 adherence achieved.

483

484 Our field teams' frequent observations for traditional stove use aligned with the adherence
485 data obtained from the SUMs. Across over 55,000 observations made, only 3% indicated any
486 traditional stove use and only 1% indicated use of a traditional stove that did not have a SUMs
487 installed. Additionally, in households lacking SUMs data either due to removal of the traditional
488 stove or missing data, observations rarely indicated any traditional stove use. Also, our tracking
489 of household moves showed that most participants continued to use the stove indicated by
490 their assigned randomization group.

491
492 Factors driving the high rates of adherence to LPG use observed among our intervention
493 participants may include the study's rapid delivery of free LPG in response to refill needs (with
494 deliveries completed in a median of 1 day from the time of request), provision of behavioral
495 reinforcement to participants who used their traditional stove (89% of traditional stove use
496 events were followed up with behavioral reinforcement), and timely completion of repairs to
497 LPG equipment (with repairs completed in a median of 0 days from the time that the need for a
498 repair was identified). Additionally, the extensive training and education provided to
499 participants at the beginning of the study and the participants' completion of pledges to use the
500 LPG stove for all household cooking needs may have also motivated high adherence, as
501 reported in Quinn et al. (2021).¹⁷ Another research trial in Peru that also reported high
502 adoption of LPG similarly found that behavioral training and reinforcement, as well as support
503 from fieldworkers, motivated LPG use.²²

504
505 Overall, we found that occasional traditional stove use was mainly driven by factors outside of
506 the participants' control (i.e. running out of LPG, other household members using the
507 traditional stove, or problems with the LPG stove); cultural traditions and taste preferences
508 were less commonly cited as reasons for using the traditional stove, suggesting that such
509 factors, which have been previously believed to influence adoption decisions²³, are no longer
510 significant when financial and structural barriers to LPG use are removed. Our study found that
511 other household members using the traditional stove was among the top five reasons for
512 traditional stove use across all four countries. This indicates that a large portion of the
513 traditional stove use flagged in our study may have been done by someone else in the
514 household other than the pregnant woman/mother. Thus, our adherence estimates may
515 overestimate the extent to which the pregnant women/mothers were using and directly
516 exposed to the emissions of the traditional stoves. Additionally, as similarly reported by
517 Williams et al. (2020)²², LPG delivery delays, resulting in participants running out of LPG, also
518 triggered some traditional stove use. Problems with the LPG stove also resulted in some
519 traditional stove use while waiting for repairs or behavioral support on specific issues.

520
521 We found a fairly consistent need for stove and equipment repairs over time, despite the fact
522 that stove models selected were all expected to be of high quality, durable, and compatible
523 with local cooking needs based on formative research and pilot results.^{16,24} This indicates that
524 programs seeking to distribute or promote LPG stoves must ensure the infrastructure is
525 available and affordable for continued repair and maintenance to ensure continued stove
526 functionality, as highlighted by Gould et al. (2018).²⁵ However, the need for complete stove

527 replacement was rare, suggesting that with continuous maintenance and small repairs, the
528 stoves were sufficiently durable to last throughout the trial.

529
530 Strengths of our study include use of multiple sources of adherence data to assess consistency
531 (i.e., direct-reading instruments, self-report, and observations), bi-weekly visits to households
532 to verify placement and download SUMs data to limit any data loss, checking LPG stoves twice
533 monthly to ensure functionality, and systematic tracking of intervention implementation (i.e.,
534 LPG delivery, repairs, and behavioral reinforcement). However, several limitations to our
535 fidelity and adherence data should be noted. First, although we deployed high quality SUMs
536 with continuous tracking through an online dashboard²⁶, it is possible that some traditional
537 stove use events may have been missed or that some non-events may have been erroneously
538 flagged as use. Additionally, some participants may have used unmonitored traditional stoves
539 not observed by fieldworkers. Observations and stove use surveys typically occurred on
540 weekdays, meaning weekend use may have been less likely to be captured through these
541 methods (although SUMs were continuously in place and thus captured both weekday and
542 weekend use). Our extensive follow-up and examination of multiple adherence data sources
543 suggests that unmonitored traditional stove use was infrequent. Second, national shutdowns
544 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which began partway through our trial, necessitated some
545 adjustments and adaptations to trial implementation. Although we adapted study procedures
546 and data collection methods to align with global safety protocols as described in Simkovich et
547 al. (2021)²⁷, there were some delays and interruptions to fidelity as new procedures were
548 established. Despite these, however, overall fidelity and adherence remained high.

549
550 **CONCLUSION**

551 High fidelity to timely delivery of LPG, repairs, and behavioral reinforcement contributed to
552 near-exclusive LPG use among intervention participants across four distinct HAPIN study sites.
553 Results provide insight into the level of LPG adoption that can be achieved with intensive
554 economic, behavioral, fuel delivery, and maintenance support. This level of fidelity and
555 adherence helps us to answer the health outcome research questions posed by the HAPIN trial.
556 However, the same should not be assumed from clean fuel interventions delivered
557 programmatically that rely on household members to bear most or all of the costs of the stoves
558 and fuel, where access is challenging, behavior change messaging limited, and stove use
559 monitoring absent.

560
561
562

563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601

Institutional Review Board Statement

The study protocol was reviewed and approved by institutional review boards (IRBs) or Ethics Committees at Emory University (00089799), Johns Hopkins University (00007403), Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education and Research (IEC-N1/16/JUL/54/49) and the Indian Council of Medical Research – Health Ministry Screening Committee (5/8/4-30/(Env)/Indo-US/2016-NCD-I), Universidad del Valle de Guatemala (146-08-2016) and Guatemalan Ministry of Health National Ethics Committee (11-2016), Asociación Beneficia PRISMA (CE2981.17), the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (11664-5) and the Rwandan National Ethics Committee (No.357/RNEC/2018), and Washington University in St. Louis (201611159). The study was registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (Identifier NCT02944682). Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Acknowledgements

The HAPIN trial was funded by the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH; cooperative agreement 1UM1HL134590) in collaboration with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (OPP1131279). A multidisciplinary, independent Data and Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) appointed by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) monitored the quality of the data and protected the safety of patients enrolled in the HAPIN trial. NHLBI DSMB: Catherine Karr (Chair), Nancy R. Cook, Stephen Hecht, Joseph Millum, Nalini Sathiakumar, Paul K. Whelton, Gail Weinmann, and Thomas Croxton (Executive Secretaries). Program Coordination: Gail Rodgers, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; Claudia L. Thompson, National Institute of Environmental Health Science; Mark J. Parascandola, National Cancer Institute; Marion Koso-Thomas, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; Joshua P. Rosenthal, Fogarty International Center; Concepcion R. Nierras, NIH Office of Strategic Coordination Common Fund; Katherine Kavounis, Dong- Yun Kim, Antonello Punturieri, and Barry S. Schmetter, NHLBI. The investigators would like to thank the Drs. Patrick Breyse, Donna Spiegelman, and Joel Kaufman (members of the advisory committee) for their valuable insight and guidance throughout the implementation of the trial. We also wish to acknowledge all the research staff and study participants for their dedication to and participation in this important trial. The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the US National Institutes of Health or Department of Health and Human Services. Under the grant conditions of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Generic License has already been assigned to the Author Accepted Manuscript version that might arise from this submission. The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

602

603 **REFERENCES**

- 604 1. IEA, IRENA, UNSD, World Bank, WHO. Tracking SDG 7: The energy progress report. *World*
605 *Bank, Washington DC. 2022.*
- 606 2. Fandiño-Del-Rio Magdalena, Kephart Josiah L, Williams Kendra N, et al. Household air
607 pollution concentrations after liquefied petroleum gas interventions in rural Peru: Findings
608 from a one-year randomized controlled trial followed by a one-year pragmatic crossover
609 trial. *Environ Health Perspect.* ;130(5):057007. doi: 10.1289/EHP10054.
- 610 3. Chillrud SN, Ae-Ngibise K, Gould CF, et al. The effect of clean cooking interventions on
611 mother and child personal exposure to air pollution: Results from the Ghana randomized air
612 pollution and health study (GRAPHS). *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental*
613 *Epidemiology.* 2021.
- 614 4. GBD 2019 Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and
615 territories, 1990-2019: A systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2019.
616 *Lancet.* 2020;396(10258):1223-1249.
- 617 5. Lee KK, Bing R, Kiang J, et al. Adverse health effects associated with household air pollution:
618 A systematic review, meta-analysis, and burden estimation study. *The Lancet Global Health.*
619 2020;8(11):e1427-e1434. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30343-0.
- 620 6. Balakrishnan K, Steenland K, Clasen T, et al. Exposure–response relationships for personal
621 exposure to fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), carbon monoxide, and black carbon and
622 birthweight: Results from the multi-country household air pollution intervention network
623 (HAPIN) trial. *MedRxiv.* 2022:2022.08.06.22278373. doi: 10.1101/2022.08.06.22278373.
- 624 7. Smith KR, McCracken JP, Weber MW, et al. Effect of reduction in household air pollution on
625 childhood pneumonia in Guatemala (RESPIRE): A randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.*
626 2011;378(9804):1717-1726.
- 627 8. Katz J, Tielsch JM, Khatri SK, et al. Impact of improved biomass and liquid petroleum gas
628 stoves on birth outcomes in rural Nepal: Results of 2 randomized trials. *Glob Health Sci*
629 *Pract.* 2020;8(3):372-382. doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-20-00011.
- 630 9. Jack DW, Ae-Ngibise KA, Gould CF, et al. A cluster randomised trial of cookstove interventions
631 to improve infant health in Ghana. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2021;6(8):e005599. doi:
632 10.1136/bmjgh-005599.
- 633 10. Alexander DA, Northcross A, Karrison T, et al. Pregnancy outcomes and ethanol cook stove
634 intervention: A randomized-controlled trial in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Environ Int.* 2018;111:152-
635 163.


- 636 11. Clasen TF, Chang HH, Thompson LM, et al. Liquefied petroleum gas or biomass for cooking
637 and effects on birth weight. *N Engl J Med*. 2022. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2206734.
- 638 12. Bruce N, Pope D, Rehfuess E, Balakrishnan K, Adair-Rohani H, Dora C. WHO indoor air
639 quality guidelines on household fuel combustion: Strategy implications of new evidence on
640 interventions and exposure-risk functions. *Atmos Environ*. 2015;106:451-457.
- 641 13. Checkley W, Williams KN, Kephart JL, et al. Effects of a household air pollution intervention
642 with liquefied petroleum gas on cardiopulmonary outcomes in Peru. A randomized
643 controlled trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2021;203(11):1386-1397. doi:
644 10.1164/rccm.202006-2319OC.
- 645 14. Clasen T, Checkley W, Peel JL, et al. Design and rationale of the HAPIN study: A multicountry
646 randomized controlled trial to assess the effect of liquefied petroleum gas stove and
647 continuous fuel distribution. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2020;128(4):047008.
- 648 15. Johnson MA, Chiang RA. Quantitative guidance for stove usage and performance to achieve
649 health and environmental targets. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2015;123(8):820-826.
- 650 16. Williams KN, Thompson LM, Sakas Z, et al. Designing a comprehensive behaviour change
651 intervention to promote and monitor exclusive use of liquefied petroleum gas stoves for the
652 household air pollution intervention network (HAPIN) trial. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(9).
- 653 17. Quinn AK, Williams KN, Thompson LM, et al. Fidelity and adherence to a liquefied petroleum
654 gas stove and fuel intervention during gestation: The multi-country household air pollution
655 intervention network (HAPIN) randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of
656 Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(23). doi: 10.3390/ijerph182312592.
- 657 18. Carrión D, Prah R, Gould CF, et al. Using longitudinal survey and sensor data to understand
658 the social and ecological determinants of clean fuels use and discontinuance in rural Ghana.
659 *Environmental Research Communications*. 2020;2(9):095003. doi: 10.1088/2515-
660 7620/abb831.
- 661 19. Aung TW, Baumgartner J, Jain G, et al. Effect on blood pressure and eye health symptoms in
662 a climate-financed randomized cookstove intervention study in rural India. *Environ Res*.
663 2018;166:658-667. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.044.
- 664 20. Gill-Wiehl A, Brown T, Smith K. The need to prioritize consumption: A difference-in-
665 differences approach to analyze the total effect of India's below-the-poverty-line policies on
666 LPG use. *Energy Policy*. 2022;164:112915. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2022.112915.
- 667 21. Ravindra K, Kaur-Sidhu M, Mor S, Chakma J, Pillarisetti A. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic
668 on clean fuel programmes in India and ensuring sustainability for household energy needs.
669 *Environ Int*. 2021;147:106335. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2020.106335.

- 670 22. Williams KN, Kephart JL, Fandino-Del-Rio M, et al. Beyond cost: Exploring fuel choices and
671 the socio-cultural dynamics of liquefied petroleum gas stove adoption in Peru. *Energy*
672 *Research & Social Science*. 2020;66:101591.
- 673 23. Puzzolo E, Pope D, Stanistreet D, Rehfuess EA, Bruce NG. Clean fuels for resource-poor
674 settings: A systematic review of barriers and enablers to adoption and sustained use.
675 *Environ Res*. 2016;146:218-234.
- 676 24. Liao J, Kirby MA, Pillarisetti A, et al. LPG stove and fuel intervention among pregnant women
677 reduce fine particle air pollution exposures in three countries: Pilot results from the HAPIN
678 trial. *Environmental Pollution*. 2021;291:118198. doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2021.118198.
- 679 25. Gould CF, Jagoe K, Moreno AI, et al. Prevalent degradation and patterns of use,
680 maintenance, repair, and access to post-acquisition services for biomass stoves in Peru.
681 *Energy Sustain Dev*. 2018;45:79.
- 682 26. Wilson DL, Williams KN, Pillarisetti A. An integrated sensor data logging, survey, and
683 analytics platform for field research and its application in HAPIN, a multi-center household
684 energy intervention trial. *Sustainability*. 2020;12(5).
- 685 27. Simkovich SM, Thompson LM, Clark ML, et al. A risk assessment tool for resumption of
686 research activities during the COVID-19 pandemic for field trials in low resource settings.
687 *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2021;21(1):68. doi: 10.1186/s12874-021-01232-x.
- 688

689 **Supplemental Materials**

690

691 Figure S1. Number of participants receiving a stove repair out of all enrolled participants by month. Dashed line indicates onset of
 692 the global COVID-19 pandemic (March 17, 2020).




693

694

695


696 Figure S2. Frequency of the percent of stove-use-monitored days in which traditional stove use (TSU) was detected via stove use
697 monitors (SUMs) in intervention households during the pregnancy period.
698



699
700
701

702 Figure S3. Frequency of the percent of stove-use-monitored days in which traditional stove use (TSU) was detected via stove use
703 monitors (SUMs) in intervention households during the post-birth or infancy period.

704
705



706
707
708
709

710 Table S1. Reports of general problems or concerns with the LPG stove and running out of LPG at behavioral reinforcement visits in
 711 pregnancy (“preg”), the post-birth or infancy period (“infcy”), and total across the full trial (“full”) among intervention participants.

	Guatemala			India			Peru			Rwanda			Total		
Study period in relation to the baby’s birth	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full
N Intervention Participants	400	382	400	398	384	398	394	379	394	392	372	392	1584	1517	1584
# (%) of intervention participants who indicated a problem or concern about LPG use at any reinforcement visit	58 (15%)	145 (38%)	169 (42%)	3 (1%)	0	3 (1%)	146 (37%)	140 (37%)	211 (54%)	68 (17%)	291 (78%)	302 (77%)	275 (17%)	576 (38%)	685 (43%)
Median (Q1, Q3) # of reinforcement visits in which participant indicated a problem or concern per participant, among those with >=1 problems/ concerns	1 (1, 1)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 2)	1 (1, 1)	0	1 (1, 1)	1 (1, 2)	2 (1, 3)	2 (1, 3)	1 (1, 1)	2 (1, 3)	2 (1, 3)	1 (1, 2)	2 (1, 3)	2 (1, 3)

# (%) of intervention participants who reported running out of LPG at any reinforcement visit	4 (1%)	39 (10%)	42 (11%)	0	0	0	27 (7%)	91 (24%)	105 (27%)	40 (10%)	255 (69%)	263 (67%)	71 (4%)	385 (25%)	410 (26%)
Median # (Q1, Q3) of reinforcement visits in which participant reported running out of LPG per participant, among those with >=1 instance of running out	1.0 (1, 1.5)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 1)	0	0	0	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1,1)	2.0 (1, 2)	2.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)

712
713

714 Table S2. Types of repairs made to LPG equipment by country and overall.

	Guatemala	India	Peru	Rwanda	Total
Total repair visits made	348	50	547	641	1586
Types of repairs					
Stove*	208 (60%)	32 (64%)	443 (81%)	611 (95%)	1294 (82%)
Knobs/burners	23 (7%)	23 (46%)	309 (56%)	513 (80%)	868 (55%)
Stove valves	187 (54%)	7 (14%)	113 (21%)	4 (1%)	311 (20%)
Stove or part replaced	1 (0.3%)	3 (6%)	41 (8%)	90 (14%)	135 (9%)
LPG cylinder/regulator	3 (1%)	13 (26%)	54 (10%)	13 (2%)	83 (5%)
Hose and connectors	1 (0.3%)	7 (14%)	127 (23%)	8 (1%)	143 (9%)
Switch valve	139 (40%)	N/A	N/A	12 (2%)	151 (15%)

715 *Only includes most commonly reported stove problems; a few “other” responses not summarized here

716 NOTE: Numbers may add up to greater than 100% because multiple problems may have been fixed at the same visit.

717

718 Repairs to the stove were most common, with repairs to the knobs or burners being most frequent in India, Peru, and Rwanda and
 719 repairs to the stove valves most frequent in Guatemala. Repairs to the switch valve (which was only used in Guatemala and Rwanda,
 720 to make it easier for households to switch from one cylinder of LPG when it became empty to the other one in the household) were
 721 much more common in Guatemala than in Rwanda. Repairs to the LPG cylinder or regulator were most common in India, and repairs
 722 to the hose connecting the cylinder to the stove were most common in Peru. Most repairs were completed on the same day as
 723 identification or request; the median (Q1, Q3) number of days between identification or request for a repair and successful
 724 completion of the repair was 0 (0, 0). Among the 1,563 intervention participants in which observation of the LPG stove was done at
 725 the conclusion of their participation in the trial, most LPG stoves were observed to be functioning properly (98.5%). Of the 23 stoves
 726 that were not functioning properly, the main two burners were still functioning in 19 (83%), and the 4 with non-working burners
 727 were repaired prior to the participant’s exit from the study (data not shown).

728

729

730

731 Table S3. Observations of traditional stove use and follow-up behavioral reinforcement in pregnancy (“preg”), the post-birth or
 732 infancy period (“infcy”), and total across the full trial (“full”) among intervention participants.
 733

Study period in relation to the baby’s birth	Guatemala			India			Peru			Rwanda			Total		
	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full
Total observations made	7012	1927 6	2628 8	2766	7079	9845	3360	8086	1144 6	2571	5091	7662	1570 9	3953 2	5524 1
n (%) of observation visits with traditional stove use observed	135 (2%)	413 (2%)	548 (2%)	3 (0.1%)	2 (0.03%)	5 (0.1%)	173 (5%)	347 (4%)	520 (5%)	131 (5%)	302 (6%)	433 (6%)	442 (3%)	1064 (3%)	1506 (3%)
n (%) of traditional stoves that were observed to be recently used with no SUMs installed	97 (72%)	309 (75%)	406 (74%)	0	1 (50%)	1 (20%)	17 (10%)	41 (12%)	58 (11%)	13 (10%)	57 (19%)	70 (16%)	127 (29%)	408 (38%)	535 (36%)
n (%) of traditional stove use observations with a	-	-	420 (77%)	-	-	2 (40%)	-	-	514 (99%)	-	-	410 (95%)	-	-	1346 (89%)

reinforcement visit at a later date															
Median (Q1, Q3) days between traditional stove use observation and reinforcement visit	-	-	26.5 (10, 179.5)	-	-	33.5 (3, 64)	-	-	0 (0, 0)	-	-	19 (0, 72)	-	-	9 (0, 56)

734
735

736 Table S4. Stove use monitoring in intervention households by country.

	Guatemala	India	Peru	Rwanda	Total
# Intervention households who received LPG stove	400	398	394	392	1584
# Households who voluntarily removed TS at LPG delivery and did not re-install it during pregnancy (%)	265 (66%)	214 (54%)	8 (2%)	10 (3%)	497 (31%)
# Households missing SUMs data during pregnancy for unknown reason* (%)	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)	43 (11%)	48 (3%)
Total households with valid SUMs during pregnancy	133	182	385	339	1039
# Households with miscarriage or stillbirth	16	10	9	13	48
# Households with infant death or drop-out <14 days after birth	2	4	6	7	19
# live births with post-birth follow-up of mother >14 days	382	384	379	372	1517
# Households who removed TS at LPG delivery and did not re-install it during pregnancy or post-birth (%)	222 (58%)	204 (53%)	5 (1%)	5 (1%)	436 (29%)
# Households who removed TS during pregnancy or <14 days after birth and did not re-install post-birth (%)	0	28 (7%)	33 (9%)	0	61 (4%)
# Households missing SUMs data post-birth for unknown reason* (%)	58 (15%)	13 (3%)	37 (10%)	35 (9%)	143 (9%)
Total households with valid SUMs post-birth	102	139	304	332	877
Total households with valid SUMs in pregnancy and/or post-birth periods	164	184	387	360	1095

737 TS=Traditional stove; SUMs=Stove use monitors; LPG=Liquefied petroleum gas

738 *Reasons for missing SUMs data may include SUM device errors, participant manipulation or removal of the SUMs, participant
 739 misclassification (i.e., failure to record removal of a traditional stove, or mistakenly indicating that participant retained a traditional
 740 stove when they had removed it), fieldworker errors in SUM installation, inability to match SUMs data to a household, among
 741 others.

742

743

744

745 Table S5. Additional details on traditional stove monitoring and traditional stove use (TSU) based on SUMs data from intervention
 746 households in pregnancy (“preg”), the post-birth or infancy period (“infcy”), and total across the full trial (“full”). This table
 747 complements the data in Table 6 of the main paper.
 748

Study period in relation to the baby’s birth	Guatemala			India			Peru			Rwanda			Total		
	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full
Total households with valid SUMs data	133	102	164	182	139	184	385	304	387	339	332	360	1039	877	1095
Days with stove-use-monitoring per household: median (Q1, Q3)	99 (29, 146)	358 (153.2, 392.8)	169.5 (41, 501.2)	127 (91.2, 149.5)	366 (315.5, 376)	460 (156.5, 510)	145 (121, 170)	370 (205.2, 384)	471 (196.5, 538)	134 (95, 161)	338 (243.8, 387)	451.5 (327.8, 511.2)	134 (97.5, 161)	363 (234, 385)	435 (193, 521)
Percent of monitored days with TSU detected: mean (range)	3.8 (0 - 95.2)	6.8 (0 - 100)	4.6 (0 - 94)	1.5 (0 - 53.2)	0.3 (0 - 6.1)	1.1 (0 - 53.2)	4.3 (0 - 81)	3.6 (0 - 51.8)	4.3 (0 - 81)	1.8 (0 - 94.1)	2.1 (0 - 41.6)	1.9 (0 - 31.5)	2.9 (0 - 95.2)	2.9 (0 - 100)	3.0 (0 - 94)
Households with no SUM-detected TSU: N (%)	105 (78.9 %)	44 (43.1 %)	96 (58.5 %)	143 (78.6 %)	113 (81.3 %)	129 (70.1 %)	177 (46%)	145 (47.7 %)	126 (32.6%)	194 (57.2 %)	114 (34.3 %)	106 (29.4 %)	619 (59.6 %)	416 (47.4 %)	457 (41.7%)

Households with < 1 day with TSU per 30 days of monitoring	117 (88.0%)	72 (70.6%)	133 (81.1%)	167 (91.8%)	135 (97.1%)	172 (93.5%)	288 (74.8%)	228 (75%)	273 (70.5%)	293 (86.4%)	274 (82.5%)	307 (85.3%)	865 (83.3%)	709 (80.8%)	885 (80.8%)
--	----------------	---------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	--------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

749

750 Table S6. Traditional stove use (TSU) based on SUMs data from the subset of intervention households with an enrolled non-pregnant
 751 adult woman (40-79 years old) across the full trial.

	Guatemala	India	Peru	Rwanda	Total
# Intervention households with an enrolled non-pregnant adult woman and SUMs monitoring	39	28	62	14	143
Days with stove-use-monitoring per household: median (Q1, Q3)	223.0 (73.0, 526.5)	459.0 (296.2, 531.5)	509.0 (306.8, 538.5)	335.0 (280.0, 464.5)	465.0 (206.0, 533.0)
Proportion of follow-up time monitored by SUMs: median (Q1, Q3)	49.1 (18.8, 96.4)	98.4 (62.4, 99.8)	97.7 (65.2, 99.8)	59.0 (50.8, 86.5)	92.7 (43.9, 99.8)
Percent of monitored days with TSU detected: median (Q1, Q3)	0.3 (0.0, 10.3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.5)	1.3 (0.2, 4.9)	1.0 (0.0, 2.7)	0.4 (0.0, 3.6)
Households with no SUM-detected TSU: N (%)	17 (43.6%)	18 (64.3%)	13 (21.0%)	5 (35.7%)	53 (37.1%)
Avg # days with TSU per 30 days of monitoring	0.1 (0.0, 3.1)	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)	0.4 (0.1, 1.5)	0.3 (0.0, 0.8)	0.1 (0.0, 1.1)
Households with < 1 day with TSU per 30 days of monitoring	24 (61.5%)	27 (96.4%)	42 (67.7%)	12 (85.7%)	105 (73.4%)

752
 753
 754

755 Table S7. Traditional stove use based on SUMs data from intervention households pre-COVID-19 and post-COVID-19.

	Guatemala		India		Peru		Rwanda		Total	
	Pre-COVID	Post-COVID	Pre-COVID	Post-COVID	Pre-COVID	Post-COVID	Pre-COVID	Post-COVID	Pre-COVID	Post-COVID
Total households with valid SUMs data	163	74	184	99	383	258	357	226	1087	657
Days with stove-use-monitoring per household: median (Q1, Q3)	89 (38, 302)	132 (72.2, 220.5)	247.5 (121, 349.2)	196.0 (114.5, 263)	181 (90, 300.5)	218.5 (133.2, 354.8)	292 (192, 399)	162 (89.2, 239.5)	225 (110.5, 350)	188 (108, 279)
Proportion of follow-up time monitored by SUMs	30.5 (11.9, 95.9)	98.5 (94.2, 99.3)	96.8 (44.7, 100)	99.2 (97.5, 99.6)	100 (72.5, 100)	99.2 (65.9, 99.6)	91.4 (71.7, 100)	89.3 (65.3, 99.2)	95.9 (52.4, 100)	98.7 (72.9, 99.5)
Percent of monitored days with TSU detected: median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.9)	0.0 (0.0, 4.2)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.2 (0.0, 2.3)	0.7 (0.0, 5.5)	0.4 (0.0, 1.6)	0.7 (0.0, 3.5)	0.0 (0.0, 1.6)	0.0 (0.0, 3.4)
Households with no SUM-detected TSU: N (%)	106 (65%)	39 (52.7%)	140 (76.1%)	82 (82.8%)	190 (49.6%)	110 (42.6%)	144 (40.3%)	98 (43.4%)	580 (53.4%)	329 (50.1%)
Avg # days with TSU per 30 days of monitoring	0.0 (0.0, 0.3)	0.0 (0.0, 1.3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.1 (0.0, 0.7)	0.2 (0.0, 1.6)	0.1 (0.0, 0.5)	0.2 (0.0, 1.1)	0.0 (0.0, 0.5)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)
Households with < 1 day with TSU per 30 days of monitoring	135 (82.8%)	52 (70.3%)	171 (92.9%)	98 (99%)	303 (79.1%)	175 (67.8%)	315 (88.2%)	164 (72.6%)	924 (85%)	489 (74.4%)

756

757

758 Table S8. Traditional stove use based on SUMs data from intervention households in early-COVID-19 (March 17, 2020 – July 17,
759 2020) and late-COVID-19 (after July 17, 2020) periods.

	Guatemala		India		Peru		Rwanda		Total	
	Early-COVID	Late-COVID	Early-COVID	Late-COVID	Early-COVID	Late-COVID	Early-COVID	Late-COVID	Early-COVID	Late-COVID
Total households with valid SUMs data	74	35	99	63	258	192	225	146	656	436
Days with stove-use-monitoring per household: median (Q1, Q3)	120.5 (72.2, 122)	118 (71, 196)	122 (114.5, 122)	122 (81, 206.5)	122 (118.2, 122)	146 (69, 279.8)	120 (77, 122)	104 (62, 188)	122 (99, 122)	124 (69.8, 224)
Proportion of follow-up time monitored by SUMs	98.8 (59.2, 100)	98.4 (92.1, 99)	100 (93.9, 100)	98.9 (98.5, 99.4)	100 (96.9, 100)	98.8 (93.5, 99.5)	98.4 (63.1, 100)	83.9 (51.2, 99)	100 (81.1, 100)	98.5 (77, 99.3)
Percent of monitored days with TSU detected: median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 3.4)	0.0 (0.0, 1.9)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 7.4)	0.0 (0.0, 2.7)	0.0 (0.0, 4.2)	0.0 (0.0, 1.5)	0.0 (0.0, 3.7)	0.0 (0.0, 1.5)
Households with no SUM-detected TSU: N (%)	48 (64.9%)	22 (62.9%)	86 (86.9%)	57 (90.5%)	136 (52.7%)	112 (58.3%)	113 (50.2%)	95 (65.1%)	383 (58.4%)	286 (65.6%)
Avg # days with TSU per 30 days of monitoring	0.0 (0.0, 1)	0.0 (0.0, 0.6)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 2.2)	0.0 (0.0, 0.8)	0.0 (0.0, 1.3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.5)	0.0 (0.0, 1.1)	0.0 (0.0, 0.4)
Households with < 1 day with TSU per 30 days of monitoring	55 (74.3%)	29 (82.9%)	96 (97%)	62 (98.4%)	175 (67.8%)	151 (78.6%)	163 (72.4%)	125 (85.6%)	489 (74.5%)	367 (84.2%)

760
761
762

763 Table S9. Percent of intervention participants with observations of traditional stove use during pregnancy (“preg”), post-birth or
 764 infancy (“infcy”), and total across the full trial (“full”), and extent to which traditional stove use was observed per participant.

Study period in relation to the baby’s birth	Guatemala			India			Peru			Rwanda			Total		
	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full	Preg	Infcy	Full
N intervention participants	400	382	400	398	384	398	394	379	394	392	372	392	1584	1517	1584
n (%) of intervention participants who received an observation visit	399 (99.8%)	382 (100%)	399 (99.8%)	396 (99.5%)	384 (100%)	396 (99.5%)	393 (99.8%)	379 (100%)	393 (99.8%)	375 (95.7%)	369 (99.2%)	387 (98.7%)	1563 (98.7%)	1514 (99.8%)	1575 (99.4%)
Median (Q1, Q3) # of observation visits, out of all intervention	17 (13, 21)	49.5 (39, 60)	65 (52, 80)	7 (6, 8)	19 (17, 21)	26 (22, 29)	9 (7, 10)	22 (20, 24)	30 (28, 32)	7 (4, 9)	14 (9, 19)	22 (14, 26)	9 (6, 11)	21 (17, 26)	29 (23, 34)

participants															
n (%) of intervention participants with any observation of traditional stove use (out of those with any observation visit)	71 (18%)	204 (53%)	224 (56%)	3 (0.8%)	2 (0.5%)	5 (1.3%)	112 (29%)	150 (40%)	202 (51%)	85 (23%)	193 (52%)	229 (58%)	271 (17%)	549 (36%)	660 (42%)
Median (Q1, Q3) # of traditional stove use observations per participant, out of those with any TSU observations	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 1)	1.0 (1, 2)	2.0 (1, 3)	2.0 (1, 3)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)	1.0 (1, 2)	2.0 (1, 3)

Median (Q1, Q3) % of observations with TSU observed (among those with any TSU observations)	6.5% (4.5, 11.1)	2.5% (1.9, 4.1)	2.1% (1.5, 3.7)	14.3% (14.3, 16.7)	8.4% (4.3, 12.5)	3.7% (3.4, 3.7)	14.3% (11.1, 26.1)	8.3% (4.8, 14.3)	6.5% (3.3, 11.5)	16.7% (12.5, 28.6)	9.1% (5.9, 14.3)	7.1% (4.3, 11.8)	12.5% (9.1, 25.0)	5.4% (3.3, 11.1)	4.5% (3.0, 9.1)
---	------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------	------------------	-----------------

765
766

767 Table S10. Observations of traditional stove use in intervention households missing SUMs data.

	Guatemala	India	Peru	Rwanda	Total
# Intervention households who received LPG stove	400	398	394	392	1584
# intervention households with no SUMs monitoring during pregnancy	269 (67%)	216 (54%)	9 (2%)	53 (14%)	547 (35%)
Of those with no SUM in pregnancy, n (%) who received any observation visit during pregnancy	268 (99.6%)	216 (100%)	8 (89%)	39 (74%)	531 (97%)
Median (Q1, Q3) number of observation visits conducted during pregnancy among those with no SUMs and >=1 observation visit completed	16 (13, 20)	7 (5, 8)	5.5 (2.5, 9)	2 (1, 5)	10 (6, 16)
Median (Q1, Q3) # of observations of TSU among those with no SUMs and >=1 observation visit completed	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)
# Intervention households followed post-birth	382	384	379	372	1517
# intervention households with no SUMs monitoring post-birth	280 (73%)	245 (64%)	75 (20%)	40 (11%)	640 (42%)
Of those with no SUM post-birth, n (%) who received any observation visit post-birth	280 (100%)	245 (100%)	75 (100%)	39 (98%)	639 (99.8%)
Median (Q1, Q3) number of observation visits conducted among those with no SUMs and >=1 observation visit completed	49 (39, 61)	19 (17, 21)	20 (18, 22)	4 (3, 8)	22 (18, 47)
Median (Q1, Q3) observations of TSU among those with no SUMs and >=1 observation visit completed	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 0)

768

769

770 Table S11. Percent of intervention and control participants who ever moved during the trial, including use of biomass by
 771 intervention participants during moves and use of clean fuels by control participants during moves.

	Guatemala		India		Peru		Rwanda		Total	
	Intvn	Cntrl	Intvn	Cntrl	Intvn	Cntrl	Intvn	Cntrl	Intvn	Cntrl
n	400	400	398	399	394	402	392	404	1584	1605
# (%) households that ever moved	65 (16%)	77 (19%)	96 (24%)	98 (25%)	116 (29%)	131 (33%)	71 (18%)	60 (15%)	348 (22%)	366 (23%)
# (%) Intervention participants who moved to house where biomass is used at all	13 (3%)	---	52 (13%)	---	10 (3%)	---	4 (1%)	---	79 (5%)	---
Median (Q1, Q3) days spent by intervention participants in house where biomass is used at all	104 (83, 121)	---	153 (86.5, 223.5)	---	86.5 (26, 168)	---	94 (64, 122)	---	136 (71, 215)	---
# (%) Control participants who moved to house where clean fuel is used exclusively	---	2 (0.5%)	---	7 (2%)	---	42 (10%)	---	0	---	51 (3%)
Median (Q1, Q3) days spent by control participants in house where clean fuel is used exclusively	---	506 (471, 540)	---	147 (18, 309)	---	136 (84, 220)	---	0	---	141 (79, 246)

772
 773 The most frequent reasons for moves included visiting the mother's or mother-in-law's house, moving to a new personal residence,
 774 and moving to a seasonal residence. Visiting the mother's or mother-in-law's house was the most common reason for moves in
 775 Guatemala, India, and Peru, while moving to a new personal residence was most common in Rwanda. Reasons were similar between
 776 intervention and control participants. Across countries, control participants who moved to a house where clean fuel was used
 777 exclusively spent a median (Q1, Q3) of 141 (79, 246) days in the new or temporary home. Intervention participants who moved to a
 778 home where biomass is used at all spent a median (Q1, Q3) of 136 (71, 215) days in the new or temporary home, but only 29%
 779 (n=23) reported being the primary cook in that home.