

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

WASH interventions and child diarrhea at the interface of climate and socioeconomic position in Bangladesh

Pearl Anne Ante-Testard^{1*}, Francois Rerolle^{1,2}, Anna T. Nguyen³, Sania Ashraf⁴, Sarker Masud Parvez^{4,5}, Abu Mohammed Naser⁶, Tarik Benmarhnia², Mahbubur Rahman⁴, Stephen P. Luby⁷, Jade Benjamin-Chung^{3,8}, Benjamin F. Arnold¹

1 Francis I. Proctor Foundation and Department of Ophthalmology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, United States

2 Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, CA, US

3 Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, United States

4 Environmental Health and WASH, Health System and Population Studies Division, icddr,b, Dhaka 1212, Bangladesh

5 Child Health Research Centre, The University of Queensland, South Brisbane, QLD, Australia

6 Division of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Environmental Health, School of Public Health, University of Memphis

7 Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

8 Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, CA 94158

***Corresponding author:** Pearl Anne Ante-Testard; Francis I. Proctor Foundation and Department of Ophthalmology, University of California, San Francisco, CA, United States; pearl.ante@ucsf.edu.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

38 **Abstract**

39

40 Many diarrhea-causing pathogens are climate-sensitive, and the poorest populations
41 are often most vulnerable to climate-related transmission. Household Water, Sanitation, and
42 Handwashing (WASH) interventions constitute one potential effective strategy to reduce
43 diarrhea among children, especially among low-income households. Here, capitalizing on a
44 cluster randomized trial population (360 clusters, 8,440 measurements among children < 3
45 years) in rural Bangladesh, one of the world's most climate-sensitive regions regarding
46 precipitation regimes, we show that improved WASH substantially reduces diarrhea risk with
47 largest benefits among poorest children and during the monsoon season. We extrapolated
48 trial results to rural Bangladesh regions using high-resolution geospatial layers to identify
49 areas most likely to benefit. We estimated that a similar intervention at scale could prevent
50 734 cases per 1,000 children per month during the seasonal monsoon, with marked
51 heterogeneity by region. The analysis demonstrates how to extend large-scale trials to inform
52 WASH strategies among climate-sensitive and low-income populations.

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65 Introduction

66 Diarrhea is a leading cause of mortality in children under 5 years, accounting for
67 370,000 deaths in children in 2019.¹ Diarrhea-related deaths among children under 5 are
68 highest in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa², and improved Water, Sanitation, and
69 Handwashing (WASH) interventions have been identified as a key strategy to reduce diarrhea
70 morbidity and mortality among young children.^{3,4}

71 The interface between climate-related diarrhea and socioeconomic position may have
72 profound effects on the impact of household WASH interventions in vulnerable populations.
73 Children born in rural Bangladesh experience high rates of diarrhea and experience extreme
74 weather events such as heavy rainfall during the annual monsoon.⁵ Interventions to help
75 reduce inequalities in diarrheal outcomes following extreme weather are crucial and urgent.
76 The WASH Benefits Bangladesh trial demonstrated that improved WASH interventions
77 significantly reduced child diarrhea⁶, with largest reductions in high precipitation periods during
78 the seasonal monsoon.⁷ However, longer term follow-up of the control and sanitation arms
79 further showed sustained reductions in child diarrhea for more than 3 years.⁸ Health benefits
80 from WASH interventions might be difficult to achieve and even sustain among the poorest
81 households. Households with high socioeconomic position may tend to have more time and
82 resources for activities that improve health and sanitation which can reduce diarrhea
83 prevalence such as cleaning their residential compound, washing up before and after cooking,
84 handwashing with soap and clean water, and many others. Moreover, resilience of
85 communities against extreme weather events may depend on their social position in society –
86 wealthier households could provide a built and enabling environment to “bounce back”
87 rapidly.^{9,10}

88 Despite the importance of socioeconomic position in improving health outcomes and
89 population resiliency during seasonal monsoon or any other climate-sensitive events, there is
90 still sparse literature on how socioeconomic position, and the joint interaction between

91 monsoon season and socioeconomic position may modify the effect of WASH interventions
92 on child diarrhea.

93 Here, we conducted a pre-specified secondary analysis of the WASH Benefits
94 Bangladesh trial with a particular focus on the combined WASH intervention's ability to reduce
95 climate-related diarrhea risk among children along a gradient of socioeconomic position.
96 Based on prior results, we hypothesized that diarrhea reductions would be larger during the
97 monsoon but could additionally differ along a socioeconomic gradient — poorer households
98 could benefit less due to lower ability to respond to intervention or could benefit more due to
99 higher background risk and thus more potential to gain from intervention. We then sought to
100 extrapolate the trial results to estimate the potential cases averted under an efficacious WASH
101 intervention in rural Bangladesh by combining effect estimates by key effect modifiers
102 (monsoon, wealth) with national-extent spatial layers and geostatistical models. We generate
103 fine-scale estimates of regions throughout rural Bangladesh most likely to benefit from
104 improved WASH interventions to reduce the climate-related diarrhea burden, accounting for
105 spatial variation in socioeconomic position, geographic setting (excluded urban areas) and
106 population density of children under 3 years. In doing so, we demonstrate how to leverage
107 large-scale, randomized controlled trials to identify populations beyond the trial that could
108 benefit most from interventions to reduce climate-sensitive diseases.

109

110 **Results**

111 **Study population and characteristics**

112 The trial created and randomly allocated 720 clusters and enrolled 5,551 pregnant
113 women in 5,551 compounds to an intervention or control group. In this pre-specified analysis,
114 we focused on the combined WSH, combined WSH + Nutrition (WSH + N) and double-sized
115 control arms to ensure statistical power for effect modification analyses while maintaining a
116 consistent WASH package in the intervention group. There was a total of 360 clusters that

117 were randomly allocated to combined WASH interventions (i.e., WSH and WSH + N; hereafter,
118 WASH intervention) and control groups, with 8,440 diarrhea measurements from children < 3
119 years in surveys 1 and 2 (**Fig 1**). Intervention and control groups were balanced across socio-
120 demographic and household asset-based characteristics (**Table 1**).

121 In this study, we used a principal component analysis-derived wealth index^{11,12} and
122 monsoon season as possible effect modifiers of the WASH intervention on child diarrhea. A
123 participant's wealth was mostly defined by asset-based ownership such as land ownership
124 and improved wall material, and access to goods such as electricity (**Table 1, Supplementary**
125 **Table 1**). Monsoon season was defined by the dates with elevated precipitation (May 27 –
126 September 27 in 2014 and April 1 – September 26 in 2015). To gain a better understanding
127 of the climate characteristics during these defined monsoon dates, we used monthly
128 precipitation, maximum temperature and soil moisture data from TerraClimate¹³ to
129 characterize climate conditions during the trial. Monthly means of key climate variables were
130 relatively higher during the monsoon season (**Supplementary Fig. 1**). The distribution of
131 wealth index at baseline as well as the distribution of diarrhea measurements obtained during
132 the monsoon season were similar between control and intervention groups (**Table 2**).

133

134 **Wealth-related inequalities in child diarrhea between control and intervention arms**

135 We measured wealth-related inequalities in child diarrhea between the two arms at the
136 relative and absolute scale by calculating the Relative Index of Inequality (RII) and Slope Index
137 of Inequality (SII), respectively. The RII is the ratio of the predicted outcomes between the
138 wealthiest and poorest populations, while the SII is the difference.¹⁴ There were strong relative
139 and absolute inequalities in child diarrhea favoring wealthier households in the control group
140 (**Fig. 2**). On the relative scale, the poorest participants were 2.2 times (95% Confidence
141 Interval 1.5 to 3.2) more likely to report child diarrhea than the wealthiest participants. On the
142 absolute scale, the poorest households reported 5 percentage points (95% CI 2% to 7%)
143 higher diarrhea prevalence than the wealthiest. However, we found that the WASH

144 intervention reduced these observed inequalities [RII: 1.4, 95% CI (0.8, 2.7); SII: 1 percentage
145 point (95% CI -1% to 4%)].

146

147 **Effects of WASH interventions by socioeconomic position**

148 We assessed the effect of the WASH intervention along a continuous wealth index
149 score and tertiles of the wealth index in pre-specified analyses (**Fig. 3**). There was
150 heterogeneity across asset-based characteristics that make up the wealth index with
151 increasing mean values from the poorest to the wealthiest households (**Supplementary Table**
152 **1**). We observed a wealth gradient of increasing diarrhea prevalence from the wealthiest to
153 the poorest participants in the control group (**Fig. 3**). Reductions in diarrhea due to WASH
154 were largest in the bottom third of the wealth distribution or the poorest wealth tertile (additive
155 interaction p-value=0.07, multiplicative interaction p-value=0.25) – with diarrhea prevalence of
156 8.1% (95% CI 6.4%, 9.8%) in control versus 4.5% (95% CI 3.2%, 5.8%) in WASH [prevalence
157 difference=3.6% (95% CI 1.4%, 5.7%), prevalence ratio=1.8 (95% CI 1.3 to 2.5)].

158

159 **Effect modification by monsoon season**

160 Bangladesh's monsoon integrates several correlated shifts in temperature,
161 precipitation, and soil moisture that co-occur from approximately May through September
162 (**Supplementary Fig. 1**). We thus used monsoon season as a climate-related effect modifier
163 for the trial as a pragmatic measure that combines several correlated variables that could
164 influence diarrhea-pathogen transmission and has a clear, actionable interpretation. The
165 seasonal monsoon was a strong modifier of the efficacy of the WASH intervention on diarrhea,
166 with nearly all diarrhea reduction during the monsoon season (additive interaction p-
167 value=0.0003, multiplicative interaction p-value=0.002). During the monsoon season, diarrhea
168 prevalence among children in the control group was 8.3% (95% CI 6.6%, 10.0%) and among
169 children with improved WASH prevalence was 4.3% (95% CI 3.4%, 5.2%) [prevalence

170 difference=4.0% (95% CI 2.2%, 5.9%), prevalence ratio=1.9 (95% CI 1.5, 2.6)] (**Fig. 4**) which
171 is consistent with a previous in-depth analysis of climate-related effect modifiers.⁷

172

173 **Joint effect modification by socioeconomic position and monsoon season**

174 Reductions in diarrhea due to WASH intervention were largest among the poorest
175 tertile during the monsoon season (diarrhea prevalence of 10.3% (95% CI 7.6%, 13.0%) in
176 control versus 4.6% (95% CI 3.2%, 6.1%) in WASH [prevalence difference=5.7% (95% CI
177 2.7%, 8.6%), prevalence ratio=2.2 (95% CI 1.5, 3.3)], although the joint interaction was not
178 statistically significant at conventional levels due to limited sample sizes within the large
179 number of strata (additive interaction p-value=0.95, multiplicative interaction p-value=0.22)
180 (**Fig. 5**). This pattern was consistent when we estimated diarrhea prevalence and effect
181 estimates along the continuous wealth index using splines (**Supplementary Fig. 2**).

182

183 **Identifying populations throughout rural Bangladesh most likely to benefit from the** 184 **WASH intervention**

185 We combined intervention trial effects estimated by wealth index and monsoon season
186 with national surfaces of wealth¹⁵ and population¹⁶ to extrapolate effects from the trial to a
187 broader population conditional on variables¹⁷ including socioeconomic position, monsoon, age
188 (< 3 years), geographic setting (excluded urban areas) and population density (excluded grid-
189 cells with less than 2 children under 3 years) with a goal of identifying regions of rural
190 Bangladesh that could benefit most from an efficacious WASH to reduce climate-related
191 diarrhea among young children (**Fig. 6**). The national wealth surface generated from WorldPop
192 was based on the 2011 DHS wealth index in Bangladesh and was constructed by taking the
193 principal component of a group of household living standards and characteristics, which is
194 similar to the wealth index we used in the main analysis. The surface was mapped by Bayesian
195 model-based geostatistics (see details in the Methods section) in combination with high
196 resolution gridded spatial covariates and aggregated mobile phone data applied to GPS-

197 located household survey data on poverty.¹⁵ Overall, the projected diarrhea cases prevented
198 during monsoon season by an efficacious WASH intervention was 734 cases per 1,000
199 children < 3 years per month across rural Bangladesh, with marked heterogeneity by district.
200 The populations predicted to benefit most from improved household WASH based on diarrhea
201 cases prevented were in north-central and north-west Bangladesh (**Fig. 6c, 6d**), reflecting
202 larger diarrhea reductions among the poorest households during the monsoon (**Fig. 5c**) and
203 the high density of children living in low socioeconomic position, rural households in that
204 region.

205

206 **Sensitivity analyses**

207 To assess the robustness of the findings when using the wealth index, we conducted
208 a sensitivity analysis using maternal education defined by the years of education. Our results
209 were similar when using maternal education as a measure of socioeconomic position instead
210 of the wealth index, illustrating the close relationship between household wealth and maternal
211 education (**Supplementary Table 2, Supplementary Fig. 3**).

212 A previous analysis of this trial found that WASH reduced diarrhea most during periods
213 with at least one day of heavy rain in the previous week (>80th percentile rainfall) under a 1-
214 week lag.⁷ We conducted a sensitivity analysis to assess joint effect modification by
215 socioeconomic position and heavy rainfall, which showed overall consistent findings with the
216 main analysis that stratified by wealth and monsoon (**Supplementary Fig. 4**). Although the
217 joint interaction was also not statistically significant (additive interaction p-value=0.15,
218 multiplicative interaction p-value=0.33), we observed largest reductions in child diarrhea
219 among the poorest tertile during heavy rain (diarrhea prevalence of 10.5% (95% CI 7.5%,
220 13.4%) in control versus 4.8% (95% CI 3.3%, 6.4%) in WASH [prevalence difference=5.7%
221 (95% CI 2.1%, 9.2%), prevalence ratio=2.2 (95% CI 1.4, 3.4)] (**Supplementary Fig. 4**).

222 We also projected the diarrhea cases prevented by wealth averaged over the entire
223 year and found that the projected diarrhea prevented due to an efficacious WASH intervention
224 was 339 cases per 1,000 children < 3 years per month, with similar geographic patterns

225 observed as the main analysis that focused on the monsoon period – the areas that benefitted
226 the most were areas in north-central and north-west Bangladesh, though the overall
227 magnitude of effect was smaller when averaged over the entire year (**Supplementary Fig. 5**).

228

229 **Discussion**

230 This pre-specified secondary analysis of a cluster-randomized trial demonstrated
231 socioeconomic inequalities in child diarrhea that were reduced by a household WASH
232 intervention. Improved household WASH reduced child diarrhea most among the poorest
233 children and nearly all reductions in diarrhea risk were during monsoon season, when
234 climatically-driven pathogen transmission lead to diarrhea prevalence doubling in the control
235 group but no commensurate increase among children in the intervention group across all
236 socioeconomic levels. When extrapolating the intervention trial estimates conditional on key
237 effect modifiers, we found that the populations predicted to benefit most from an efficacious
238 household WASH intervention in terms of diarrhea cases prevented during the monsoon were
239 in north-central and north-west Bangladesh — regions with areas of lower socioeconomic
240 position, reflecting larger diarrhea reductions among the poorest households.

241 This study demonstrates how effect estimates from existing randomized trials can be
242 extrapolated beyond the original study population to help inform climate mitigation strategies
243 in vulnerable populations.¹⁸ Randomized controlled trials generate effect estimates with high
244 internal validity but those effects are rarely generalized to a larger target population.¹⁹ The
245 results herein demonstrate how large trials can be reexamined to identify key effect modifiers
246 related to climate-equity and then combined with novel, high resolution data layers to identify
247 populations that would benefit most from climate mitigation strategies. Trials as large and
248 expensive as WASH Benefits Bangladesh may not be repeated for decades, if ever. Innovative
249 extensions of existing cluster randomized trials to inform climate mitigation strategies provide
250 timely evidence in the face of rapid acceleration in climate change, without waiting years or
251 decades to field new trials. A caveat of the approach is that it requires sufficiently large trials

252 with enough relevant variation in key effect modifiers to estimate reliable effects among crucial
253 subgroups (here: wealth and season). Another caveat is that effects projected from efficacy
254 trials assume the intervention could be implemented at a very high level with high uptake at
255 even larger scale, a strong assumption given the challenge of translating trial interventions to
256 real-world programs.²⁰ Despite these caveats, identifying populations most likely to benefit
257 from improved WASH using a climate-sensitive, equity lens (**Fig. 6**) should still be informative
258 for public health programs.

259 This study provides evidence of the importance of assessing the interface between
260 socioeconomic position and climate with inequalities and climate change being two of the main
261 barriers in WASH.²¹ Our results show that among children in the control group disparities
262 existed by socioeconomic position and monsoon season and that the WASH intervention
263 reduced or even nullified existing disparities. Although the joint interaction between wealth and
264 monsoon season was not statistically significant at conventional levels, we observed that the
265 poorest tertile still had higher diarrhea prevalence than the wealthiest tertile in the control
266 group during the monsoon season. The resilience, adaptation mechanism, and access to
267 healthcare may be different for the poor and the wealthy when it comes to mitigating higher
268 diarrhea risk during monsoon season. Poorer households were found to be less resilient when
269 faced with unexpected events such as natural calamities and pandemics.^{9,10} It is possible that
270 without an intervention such as WASH, the poorest may be unable to adapt to and show
271 resiliency from the impacts of diarrhea during monsoon season compared to wealthier
272 households, especially as such inequalities may be exacerbated in the context of climate
273 change.

274 Identifying and targeting the most vulnerable populations is a crucial step in leveraging
275 the benefits of WASH and in reaching the populations that need these interventions the most.
276 A systematic mapping study found that most WASH interventions lacked social inclusion or
277 intersectional considerations in their intervention designs.²² This could be a current gap for
278 many WASH trials and this study is one of the efforts to addressing it. Although our findings
279 show that the WASH intervention reduced disparities by socioeconomic position and monsoon

280 season, consciously incorporating a social equity lens in the design and planning of future
281 trials and programs is paramount. Without careful attention to equity from planning to
282 implementation, it is possible that these interventions may unintentionally generate or widen
283 inequalities between different groups (i.e., so-called intervention-generated inequalities).^{23–25}
284 This may happen when careful attention is not given to individuals with lower socioeconomic
285 position and people with higher socioeconomic position benefit at an accelerated rate from an
286 intervention. This could also be a potential explanation why the middle wealth tertile is lagging
287 behind the wealthiest and poorest tertiles (**Fig. 3**) – not enough attention is given to this group
288 in comparison to the other two groups at the extreme ends of the wealth gradient. Interventions
289 that are delivered similarly to all recipients may result to differential outcomes because the
290 poorer or less educated individuals are less able to access, understand and engage with the
291 intervention.²⁵ This shows that implementing WASH that does not generate inequalities would
292 require a tailored approach.²⁶ Members of our team have previously assessed equity in the
293 WASH Benefits Bangladesh interventions with respect to measures of adherence²⁷ and others
294 have assessed barriers and inequalities in effective WASH practices in the African setting.^{21,28}
295 These previous studies have demonstrated improved equity in WASH practices and this
296 present analysis demonstrates that those improvements in equity carry forward to
297 improvements in equity in child diarrhea.

298 Our analysis had some limitations. We relied on a caregiver-reported outcome which
299 might have been subject to social desirability bias and courtesy bias that may lead to
300 underreporting of the outcome and misclassification. However, findings from Luby et al.
301 showed no evidence of misclassification after a negative control analysis.⁶ Additional evidence
302 that these findings were not primarily influenced by courtesy bias is the lower prevalence of
303 identified enteropathogens in the intervention households based on a previous analysis.²⁹ We
304 also used the wealth index as our measure of socioeconomic position. While it is a reliable
305 measure of wealth in the Global South, it can only represent relative wealth within a
306 population³⁰ – in this case rural Bangladesh, which may limit comparisons across populations.
307 For this reason, we conducted a sensitivity analysis using a continuous measure of maternal

308 education that showed consistent findings with the wealth index. Another limitation was that
309 the trial was conducted only in areas that were not prone to being heavily flooded during
310 seasonal monsoon which might have underestimated or overestimated the effects of WASH
311 on diarrhea during the monsoon season in more flood prone areas. Moreover, although we
312 have conditioned on some variables and key effect modifiers when extrapolating the trial
313 estimates, it is possible that we have unmeasured confounding in the target population where
314 we extrapolated the study trial effects to and may have missed other potential effect modifiers
315 that are important. A final limitation is that diarrhea prevalence was overall quite low in the
316 study, as low as 4% in the intervention group, which could have limited the study's inference
317 of effect modification if there was not enough diarrhea to have an effect on in some data
318 stratum (**Fig 5**). As a corollary, effect size could also vary less in areas with higher diarrhea
319 prevalence.

320 Despite the limitations, this study had several strengths. This study provides additional
321 knowledge on the effects of WASH on child diarrhea and provides an example on how to
322 extrapolate trial estimates to a broader population at the interface of climate and
323 socioeconomic position – making it possible to identify vulnerable populations that would
324 benefit the most from these interventions. This study is also a randomized controlled trial which
325 offers high internal validity. We also made sure that our intervention group satisfy the
326 consistency assumption in causal inference³¹, in addition to the assumptions of
327 exchangeability and positivity that randomized controlled trials provide.

328 In conclusion, we highlight the capacity of WASH Benefits intervention to improve
329 population resilience to climate-related diarrhea – by reducing the wealth disparity in diarrhea,
330 with largest reductions in diarrhea amongst the poorest children during the monsoon season.
331 The study demonstrates how to assess equity of intervention effects and extrapolate effects
332 from trials to help target programs to populations who would benefit most.

333

334 **Methods**

335 **Study Data**

336 We conducted a secondary analysis of the WASH Benefits Bangladesh cluster
337 randomized controlled trial. The study design and rationale³² and the primary outcomes⁶ of
338 this trial have been previously published.

339 Children aged less than 3 years at enrollment living in the compound were eligible for
340 the caregiver-reported diarrhea. The analysis focused on index children in the birth cohort,
341 and other children living within the same compound that were younger than 3 years at the time
342 of study enrollment. Children with missing outcome data were excluded. Our analysis only
343 focused on survey rounds 1 and 2 (2014 and 2015, respectively).

344 The trial was conducted in rural communities in Gazipur, Kishoreganj, Mymensingh and
345 Tangail districts. These districts are in central rural Bangladesh where the main source of
346 livelihood of the population is agriculture. The trial enrolled pregnant women that were
347 identified during the community-based surveys who were expected to deliver in the 6 months
348 following enrollment.

349 Compounds were enrolled within 720 geographically pair-matched clusters with eight
350 clusters per matched block. Within a matched block, the trial randomly allocated eight clusters
351 to receive: improved water (W), improved sanitation (S), improved handwashing (H), improved
352 nutrition (N), combined WSH, combined WSH + N, and a double-sized control arm. This study
353 focused on children enrolled in control clusters and clusters that received the combined WSH
354 intervention. Within each geographically pair-matched block, the present analysis included
355 four clusters: 2 controls, 1 WSH, and 1 WSH + N. The combined WSH clusters were compared
356 with the control clusters.

357 Participants and the data collectors were not masked to intervention assignment due
358 to the nature of the interventions. However, the data collection and intervention teams were
359 different individuals. The results were unmasked after the primary outcome analyses were
360 completed.

361 **Intervention group definition**

362 We focused on the combined WSH, combined WSH + N and double-sized control arms
363 to ensure statistical power. The intervention arm included the combined WSH and combined
364 WSH + N arms. We excluded single arms to ensure a consistent WASH package in the
365 intervention group.³¹ We found no evidence for any added benefit of combined WSH + N with
366 respect to combined WSH in diarrhea.⁶

367

368 **Outcome**

369 The outcome of interest was the caregiver-reported diarrhea in the past 7 days among
370 children enrolled in the trial. We defined diarrhea as having at least three or more episodes of
371 loose or watery stools in 24 hours or the latest one stool with blood based on caregiver-
372 reported symptoms in the past 7 days. This variable was binary – 0 as non-event and 1 as
373 having the event.

374

375 **Defining the effect modifiers**

376 *Socioeconomic Position*

377 The wealth index was the main socioeconomic position indicator to measure wealth. It
378 is an asset-based composite measure of wealth based on a set of household assets and
379 characteristics. In constructing the wealth index, we used a principal component analysis of
380 asset-based variables measured for all participants at enrollment (**Supplementary Table 1**).¹¹
381 We excluded all WASH-related variables as recommended by UNICEF.¹² We excluded asset-
382 based variables with near-to-zero variation and high levels of missingness (at least 10%).^{33,34}
383 Missing values for continuous variables were replaced by the mean¹¹, and for missing factor
384 levels, another level was created. We used continuous wealth index scores in the GAMs and

385 three quantiles (i.e., tertiles) to average over more observations to improve statistical power
386 in the effect modification analyses. We have pre-specified tertiles compared to quintiles or
387 quartiles after a review of the number of children that would be analyzed in each subgroup
388 without consideration of the outcome or effect. Tertiles ensured that there was adequate
389 statistical power when conducting the subgroup analyses, while still allowing for us to assess
390 a pattern from lower to higher socioeconomic position. For the continuous wealth index scores,
391 we specifically used the relative wealth rank of the participants in the cumulative distribution
392 of the wealth index score which is a continuous variable ranging from 0 to 1.

393 *Monsoon season*

394 We defined monsoon season dates using weekly precipitation data from the Multi-
395 Source Weighted-Ensemble Precipitation from the GloH20³⁵ matched to the study cohort.^{7,36}
396 Monsoon season was marked by the weeks with elevated precipitation and persistent rainfall,
397 where the rolling 5-day average was above 10 millimeter (May 27 – September 27 in 2014
398 and April 1 – September 26 in 2015) based on previous analyses of the trial.^{7,36} Meanwhile,
399 dry season included other weeks. This was a binary variable – 0 was coded for the dry season
400 and 1 for the monsoon season. We calculated the monthly mean of key climate variables
401 during the trial to characterize the monsoon versus dry seasons in the study.

402

403 **Geospatial layers**

404 WorldPop provides a high-resolution map of the total number of people per grid-cell at
405 a 1-kilometer resolution in Bangladesh in 2014.¹⁶ We estimated the total number of children
406 under 3 years by first getting the proportion of those under 14 years (0.31 based on the World
407 Bank)³⁷ and then multiplying it by 0.21 (or $\frac{3}{14}$).

408 The wealth index layer was also obtained from WorldPop. Specifically, we obtained
409 the 2011 estimates of the mean Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) wealth index score
410 per grid square. It is based on a Bayesian model-based geostatistics in combination with high

411 resolution gridded spatial covariates and aggregated mobile phone data applied to GPS-
412 located household survey data on poverty from the DHS Program.¹⁵

413 The urban and rural layer was obtained from the Global Human Settlement.³⁸ We used
414 this layer to mask the non-urban areas from the analysis. The shapefiles were obtained from
415 GADM.³⁹

416

417 **Statistical analyses**

418 The analysis was by intention-to-treat. First, we conducted descriptive statistics of the
419 baseline characteristics of the children's mothers and asset-based household assets. We then
420 conducted descriptive statistics of the effect modifiers used in the analyses – wealth index (at
421 baseline) and monsoon season (surveys 1 and 2).

422 Second, we measured socioeconomic inequalities in child diarrhea by calculating the
423 Relative Index of Inequality (RII) and Slope Index of Inequality (SII) to measure inequalities at
424 the relative and absolute scales, respectively.⁴⁰ These are regression-based indicators
425 commonly used to measure inequalities.

426 Third, we estimated the effects of WASH interventions by socioeconomic position,
427 monsoon season and jointly by socioeconomic position and monsoon. The general approach
428 that we used to estimate the absolute and relative effects of combined WASH on diarrhea is
429 using generalized linear model (GLM) and modified Poisson regression with robust variance⁴¹,
430 respectively. We fitted a GLM using a binomial family with identity link and a modified Poisson
431 using a Poisson family with log link to estimate the association between combined WASH
432 intervention and child diarrhea, with wealth tertiles and monsoon season as effect modifiers.
433 We estimated the robust standard errors to account for clustering for the GLM and generalized
434 estimating equation for the modified Poisson. We estimated the 95% confidence intervals of
435 the effect estimates using a linear combination of regression coefficients.

436 In assessing the effect of WASH on diarrhea by the continuous wealth score, we fitted
437 a generalized additive model (GAM) to capture any non-linear relationships⁴² between
438 continuous wealth index and child diarrhea. We used a non-parametric smoother, specifically
439 the penalized cubic regression spline to avoid overfitting⁴³ and fit using the restricted maximum
440 likelihood.⁴⁴ Block-level random effects were included in the model to account for clustering of
441 observations at the block level (which was the level of pair-matched randomization). This
442 model allowed for the relationship between socioeconomic position and diarrhea to vary by
443 control and combined WASH group. We fitted GAM⁴⁵ using a gaussian family with identity link
444 to estimate the prevalence difference, and using a binomial family with log link to estimate the
445 prevalence ratio together with their 95% confidence intervals using the tidymv package.⁴⁶

446 Fourth, we assessed the effect modification of WASH by socioeconomic position,
447 monsoon season and jointly by socioeconomic position and monsoon season. We primarily
448 assessed effect modification on the additive scale which is a measure that is more relevant in
449 public health.⁴⁷ We additionally assessed effect modification on the multiplicative scale. We
450 assessed effect modification by comparing the models with and without the interaction term
451 through a Wald-type F test to test for statistical significance (**Supplementary Text 1**).

452 **Projecting impact of an efficacious WASH intervention across Bangladesh to estimate** 453 **preventable burden**

454 Lastly, we projected diarrhea cases for children under 3 years prevented by the WASH
455 intervention conditional on socioeconomic position, monsoon, age (< 3 years), geographic
456 setting (excluded urban areas) and population density (grid-cells with less than or equal to 2
457 children below 3 years were excluded) throughout rural Bangladesh by combining intervention
458 trial effects from splines estimated across a wealth gradient during the monsoon season with
459 national surfaces of wealth and population. We projected effect estimates by continuous
460 wealth rank, age and limited our inference to only rural areas and populations that were similar
461 as the WASH Benefits study population. We projected diarrhea cases prevented per month
462 per grid-cell at a 1-kilometer resolution in rural Bangladesh using this formula:

463 $diarrheapreventedbyWASH = childrenunder3y \times PD(control - WASH)_{i,monsoon.rural} \times 4 weeks,$

464

465 where PD is the diarrhea prevalence difference between control and WASH and i is the wealth
466 rank based on the continuous wealth index scores. We multiplied the estimate by 4 weeks to
467 calculate the diarrhea prevalence prevented per month since diarrhea was measured in the
468 past 7-day period.

469 We then aggregated the grid-cell estimates at the district level to estimate the
470 diarrhea cases prevented per 1,000 children under 3 years per month in each district (i.e.,
471 *zilas*) whilst excluding estimates from urban areas. We defined urban areas based on the
472 Global Human Settlement.³⁸ We aggregated grid-cell level standard errors estimated from the
473 GAM model within each administrative district to calculate the district-level 95% CI.

474

475 **Sensitivity analysis**

476 We conducted a sensitivity analysis using maternal education instead of wealth index
477 as a measure of socioeconomic position to estimate diarrhea prevalence, prevalence ratio and
478 prevalence difference. We also used precipitation data from the Global Unified Gauge-Based
479 Analysis of Daily Precipitation dataset.⁴⁸ We created binary variables of rainfall (no heavy rain
480 versus heavy rain) under 1-week lag which indicates whether there was at least one day in
481 the prior week where total precipitation was above the 80th percentile of all daily totals of
482 precipitation. We considered this indicator based on a previous analysis of the trial that
483 demonstrated strong associations between this indicator and the effect of the WASH
484 intervention on child diarrhea.⁷ We assessed the joint effect modification between
485 socioeconomic position and rainfall by comparing the models with and without the interaction
486 term through a Wald-type F test. We also projected the diarrhea cases prevented for children
487 under 3 years throughout rural Bangladesh by wealth averaged over the entire year by
488 combining trial estimates from the GAM that captured non-linear patterns.

489

490

491 **Ethics and Inclusion**

492 The protocol of the original study was approved by the Ethical Review Committee at
493 the International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh (PR-11063), the
494 Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of California, Berkeley
495 (2011-09-3652), the Institutional Review Board at Stanford University (25863) and at the
496 University of California, San Francisco (22-36722).

497

498 **Data Availability**

499 The pre-analysis plan and de-identified data are available through the Open Science
500 Framework (OSF, <https://osf.io/xwndg/>).⁴⁹

501

502 **Code Availability**

503 All analyses were conducted in R (version 4.2.1 “Funny Looking Kid”). Analysis scripts
504 are available in the OSF (<https://osf.io/xwndg/>).⁴⁹

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517 **References**

- 518 1. World Health Organization. Diarrhoea. [https://www.who.int/health-](https://www.who.int/health-topics/diarrhoea#tab=tab_1)
519 [topics/diarrhoea#tab=tab_1](https://www.who.int/health-topics/diarrhoea#tab=tab_1) (2023).
- 520 2. UNICEF. Diarrhoea. <https://data.unicef.org/topic/child-health/diarrhoeal-disease/> (2022).
- 521 3. Wolf, J. *et al.* Effectiveness of interventions to improve drinking water, sanitation, and
522 handwashing with soap on risk of diarrhoeal disease in children in low-income and
523 middle-income settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet* **400**, 48–59
524 (2022).
- 525 4. Sharma Waddington, H., Masset, E., Bick, S. & Cairncross, S. Impact on childhood
526 mortality of interventions to improve drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) to
527 households: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS Med.* **20**, e1004215 (2023).
- 528 5. Dimitrova, A., Gershunov, A., Levy, M. C. & Benmarhnia, T. Uncovering social and
529 environmental factors that increase the burden of climate-sensitive diarrheal infections
530 on children. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **120**, e2119409120 (2023).
- 531 6. Luby, S. P. *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional
532 interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster randomised
533 controlled trial. *Lancet Glob. Health* **6**, e302–e315 (2018).
- 534 7. Nguyen, A. T. *et al.* *Influence of temperature and precipitation on the effectiveness of*
535 *water, sanitation, and handwashing interventions against childhood diarrheal disease in*
536 *rural Bangladesh: a re-analysis of a randomized control trial.*
537 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2022.09.25.22280229> (2022)
538 doi:10.1101/2022.09.25.22280229.
- 539 8. Contreras, J. D. *et al.* Evaluation of an on-site sanitation intervention against childhood
540 diarrhea and acute respiratory infection 1 to 3.5 years after implementation: Extended
541 follow-up of a cluster-randomized controlled trial in rural Bangladesh. *PLOS Med.* **19**,
542 e1004041 (2022).

- 543 9. Bakic, H. & Ajdukovic, D. Resilience after natural disasters: the process of harnessing
544 resources in communities differentially exposed to a flood. *Eur. J. Psychotraumatology*
545 **12**, 1891733 (2021).
- 546 10. Ur Rahman, I., Jian, D., Junrong, L. & Shafi, M. Socio-economic status, resilience, and
547 vulnerability of households under COVID-19: Case of village-level data in Sichuan
548 province. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0249270 (2021).
- 549 11. Rutstein, S. Steps to constructing the new DHS Wealth Index. (2016).
- 550 12. Martel, P. Review of options for reporting water, sanitation and hygiene coverage by
551 wealth quintile. (2016).
- 552 13. Abatzoglou, J. T., Dobrowski, S. Z., Parks, S. A. & Hegewisch, K. C. TerraClimate, a
553 high-resolution global dataset of monthly climate and climatic water balance from 1958–
554 2015. *Sci. Data* **5**, 170191 (2018).
- 555 14. Moreno-Betancur, M., Latouche, A., Menvielle, G., Kunst, A. E. & Rey, G. Relative Index
556 of Inequality and Slope Index of Inequality: A Structured Regression Framework for
557 Estimation. *Epidemiology* **26**, 518–527 (2015).
- 558 15. Steele, J. E. *et al.* Mapping poverty using mobile phone and satellite data. *J. R. Soc.*
559 *Interface* **14**, 20160690 (2017).
- 560 16. WorldPop. Global 1km Population Individual countries. (2020)
561 doi:10.5258/SOTON/WP00670.
- 562 17. Degtiar, I. & Rose, S. A Review of Generalizability and Transportability. *Annu. Rev. Stat.*
563 *Its Appl.* **10**, 501–524 (2023).
- 564 18. Dahabreh, I. J. & Hernán, M. A. Extending inferences from a randomized trial to a target
565 population. *Eur. J. Epidemiol.* **34**, 719–722 (2019).
- 566 19. Hariton, E. & Locascio, J. J. Randomised controlled trials - the gold standard for
567 effectiveness research: Study design: randomised controlled trials. *BJOG Int. J. Obstet.*
568 *Gynaecol.* **125**, 1716–1716 (2018).
- 569 20. Chen, H. T. The bottom-up approach to integrative validity: A new perspective for
570 program evaluation. *Eval. Program Plann.* **33**, 205–214 (2010).

- 571 21. Tseole, N. P., Mindu, T., Kalinda, C. & Chimbari, M. J. Barriers and facilitators to Water,
572 Sanitation and Hygiene (WaSH) practices in Southern Africa: A scoping review. *PLOS*
573 *ONE* **17**, e0271726 (2022).
- 574 22. Macura, B. *et al.* Systematic mapping of gender equality and social inclusion in WASH
575 interventions: knowledge clusters and gaps. *BMJ Glob. Health* **8**, e010850 (2023).
- 576 23. Lorenc, T., Petticrew, M., Welch, V. & Tugwell, P. What types of interventions generate
577 inequalities? Evidence from systematic reviews: Table 1. *J. Epidemiol. Community*
578 *Health* **67**, 190–193 (2013).
- 579 24. Maden, M. *et al.* Toward a theory-led metaframework for considering socioeconomic
580 health inequalities within systematic reviews. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* **104**, 84–94 (2018).
- 581 25. White, M., Adams, J. & Heywood, P. How and why do interventions that increase health
582 overall widen inequalities within populations? in *Social inequality and public health* (ed.
583 Babones, S. J.) 64–81 (Policy Press, 2009).
584 doi:10.1332/policypress/9781847423207.003.0005.
- 585 26. Haque, S. S. & Freeman, M. C. The Applications of Implementation Science in Water,
586 Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) Research and Practice. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **129**,
587 065002 (2021).
- 588 27. Parvez, S. M. *et al.* Achieving equitable uptake of handwashing and sanitation by
589 addressing both supply and demand-based constraints: findings from a randomized
590 controlled trial in rural Bangladesh. *Int. J. Equity Health* **20**, 16 (2021).
- 591 28. Wada, O. Z., Olawade, D. B., Oladeji, E. O., Amusa, A. O. & Oloruntoba, E. O. School
592 water, sanitation, and hygiene inequalities: a bane of sustainable development goal six
593 in Nigeria. *Can. J. Public Health.* **113**, 622–635 (2022).
- 594 29. Grembi, J. A. *et al.* Effect of Water, Sanitation, Handwashing, and Nutrition Interventions
595 on Enteropathogens in Children 14 Months Old: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial
596 in Rural Bangladesh. *J. Infect. Dis.* **227**, 434–447 (2023).

- 597 30. Howe, L. D. *et al.* Measuring socio-economic position for epidemiological studies in low-
598 and middle-income countries: a methods of measurement in epidemiology paper. *Int. J.*
599 *Epidemiol.* **41**, 871–886 (2012).
- 600 31. Rehkopf, D. H., Glymour, M. M. & Osypuk, T. L. The Consistency Assumption for Causal
601 Inference in Social Epidemiology: When a Rose Is Not a Rose. *Curr. Epidemiol. Rep.* **3**,
602 63–71 (2016).
- 603 32. Arnold, B. F. *et al.* Cluster-randomised controlled trials of individual and combined water,
604 sanitation, hygiene and nutritional interventions in rural Bangladesh and Kenya: the
605 WASH Benefits study design and rationale. *BMJ Open* **3**, e003476 (2013).
- 606 33. Bennett, D. A. How can I deal with missing data in my study? *Aust. N. Z. J. Public Health*
607 **25**, 464–469 (2001).
- 608 34. Dong, Y. & Peng, C.-Y. J. Principled missing data methods for researchers. *SpringerPlus*
609 **2**, 222 (2013).
- 610 35. Beck, H. E. *et al.* MSWEP V2 Global 3-Hourly 0.1° Precipitation: Methodology and
611 Quantitative Assessment. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **100**, 473–500 (2019).
- 612 36. Grembi, J. A. *et al.* Influence of climatic and environmental risk factors on child diarrhea
613 and enteropathogen infection and predictions under climate change in rural Bangladesh.
614 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2022.09.26.22280367> (2022)
615 doi:10.1101/2022.09.26.22280367.
- 616 37. World Bank. Population ages 0-14 (% of total population) - Bangladesh.
617 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.0014.TO.ZS?locations=BD&view=chart>
618 (2022).
- 619 38. European Commission. GHSL - Global Human Settlement Layer.
620 <https://ghsl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>.
- 621 39. GADM. GADM maps and data. <https://gadm.org/index.html>.
- 622 40. Moreno-Betancur, M., Latouche, A., Menvielle, G., Kunst, A. E. & Rey, G. Relative Index
623 of Inequality and Slope Index of Inequality: A Structured Regression Framework for
624 Estimation. *Epidemiology* **26**, 518–527 (2015).

- 625 41. Zou, G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary
626 Data. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **159**, 702–706 (2004).
- 627 42. Young, R. L., Weinberg, J., Vieira, V., Ozonoff, A. & Webster, T. F. Generalized additive
628 models and inflated type I error rates of smoother significance tests. *Comput. Stat. Data*
629 *Anal.* **55**, 366–374 (2011).
- 630 43. Perperoglou, A., Sauerbrei, W., Abrahamowicz, M. & Schmid, M. A review of spline
631 function procedures in R. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* **19**, 46 (2019).
- 632 44. Wood, S. N. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood
633 estimation of semiparametric generalized linear models: Estimation of Semiparametric
634 Generalized Linear Models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **73**, 3–36 (2011).
- 635 45. Ruppert, D., Wand, M. P. & Carroll, R. J. *Semiparametric Regression*. (Cambridge
636 University Press, 2003). doi:10.1017/CBO9780511755453.
- 637 46. Coretta, S., van Rij, J. & Wieling, M. Tidy Model Visualisation for Generalised Additive
638 Models. (2023).
- 639 47. VanderWeele, T. J. & Knol, M. J. A Tutorial on Interaction. *Epidemiol. Methods* **3**, (2014).
- 640 48. Xie, P. *et al.* A Gauge-Based Analysis of Daily Precipitation over East Asia. *J.*
641 *Hydrometeorol.* **8**, 607–626 (2007).
- 642 49. Ante-Testard, P. A. & Arnold, B. WASH interventions and child diarrhea at the interface of
643 climate and socioeconomic position in Bangladesh: source data and code. (2022)
644 doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/XWNDG.
- 645
- 646
- 647
- 648
- 649
- 650
- 651

652 **Acknowledgments**

653 This study was funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to the University of California,
654 Berkeley (OPPGD759, Principal Investigator: John M. Colford Jr., MD, PhD) and the National
655 Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (R01-AI166671, Principal Investigator: Benjamin
656 F. Arnold, PhD).

657

658 **Author Contributions**

659 P.A.A.-T. and B.F.A. developed and drafted the analysis plan with input from A.T.N., S.A.,
660 S.M.P., A.M.N., T.B., M.R., S.P.L. and J.B.-C. P.A.A.-T. conducted the analysis with input and
661 guidance from B.F.A. P.A.A.-T. constructed the tables and figures with input from F.R. and
662 B.F.A. F.R. and A.T.N. provided support in the collection of the map layer and climatic
663 variables, respectively. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results. P.A.A.-T.
664 wrote the initial draft of the manuscript with input and conceptual guidance from B.F.A. All
665 authors contributed to the subsequent revisions. All authors read and approved the
666 manuscript.

667

668 **Competing Interests**

669 The authors declare no competing interests.




Fig. 1: Study Participant Flow. Summary of clusters enrolled and randomized to combined Water, Sanitation, Handwashing (WSH) and Nutrition (WSH+N) versus control in the WASH Benefits Bangladesh trial. Intervention groups randomized to single WASH and nutrition interventions were not included in this pre-specified, subgroup analysis. No clusters dropped out of the trial, and follow-up summarizes study compounds over the two-year study period.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of control and WASH intervention groups included in this analysis of the WASH Benefits Bangladesh trial. The intervention group includes children born into clusters that received a combined Water, Sanitation, and Handwashing (WSH) intervention either alone or in combination with nutritional supplementation (WSH + N), with details in Methods.

Baseline characteristics	Control (N=773)	Intervention (N=835)
Mother's characteristics		
Mother's age in years (Mean, SD)	23.5 (4.80)	24.1 (5.03)
Observations per household and compound		
Mean number of persons per household	4.85 (2.55)	4.90 (2.37)
Mean number of persons per compound	14.6 (6.65)	15.5 (7.42)
Asset-based characteristics included in the construction of the wealth index		
Land owned in acres (Mean, SD)	0.125 (0.184)	0.119 (0.154)
Improved wall material (wood, brick, thin)	557 (72.1 %)	624 (74.7)
Improved floor material (wood concrete)	74 (9.6%)	67 (8.0%)
Household has electricity	430 (55.6%)	465 (55.7%)
Household has refrigerator	53 (6.9%)	55 (6.6%)
Household has bicycle	203 (26.3%)	237 (28.4%)
Household has motorcycle	52 (6.7%)	47 (5.6%)
Household has sewing machine	41 (5.3%)	45 (5.4%)
Has black and white or colored TV	188 (24.3%)	193 (23.1)
Has one or more wardrobe	113 (14.6%)	118 (14.1%)
Has one or more table	536 (69.3%)	598 (71.6%)
Has one or more chair	560 (72.4%)	576 (69.0%)
Has one or more khat (type of bed)	455 (58.9%)	499 (59.8%)
Has one or more chouki (type of chair)	602 (77.9%)	649 (77.7%)
Has one or more mobile	650 (84.1%)	688 (82.4%)
Asset-based characteristics not included in the construction of the wealth index		
Primary water source: shallow tubewell	550 (71.2%)	633 (75.8%)
Store drinking water	381 (49.3%)	381 (45.6%)
Reported treating water today/tomorrow	4 (0.5%)	0 (0%)
Own their latrine	330 (42.7%)	346 (41.4%)
Latrine has concrete slab	692 (89.5%)	723 (86.6%)
Latrine has functional water seal	168 (21.7%)	156 (18.7%)
No visible feces on floor of latrine	327 (42.3%)	315 (37.7%)
Has a potty for defecation	54 (7.0%)	60 (7.2%)
Primary handwashing location has water/soap	146 (18.9%)	163 (19.5%)
Household has radio	34 (4.4%)	29 (3.5%)
Has one or more clock	249 (32.2%)	275 (32.9%)

Table 2. Summary of effect modifiers by intervention group. Wealth scores were derived using a principal component analysis. Monsoon season was defined as the weeks with elevated precipitation (May 27 – September 27, 2014, and April 1 – September 26, 2015) which were based on weekly precipitation data matched to the study cohort. Dry season included the other dates.

Effect modifier (baseline)	Control (N=773)	WASH (N=835)
Wealth scores (Median, Q1 to Q3)	1.29 (0.76 to 1.88)	1.34 (0.76 to 1.88)
Effect modifier (surveys 1 and 2)		
Season: Dry	2182 (54.3%)	2409 (54.5%)
Monsoon	1840 (45.7%)	2009 (45.5%)




Fig. 2: Relative Index of Inequality and Slope Index of Inequality between the control and intervention groups. RII (y-axis) and SII (x-axis) are the two major measures in epidemiological studies for quantification of inequalities in relative and absolute scales, respectively. These are regression-based indicators which use all subgroups compared to a pairwise comparison that ignores other groups. To estimate these indices, we first ranked the individuals from poorest (rank=0) to wealthiest (rank=1) in the cumulative distribution of the wealth index. We used the modified Poisson regression with robust variance and a log link. We calculated the RII as the ratio of the value at the bottom of the socioeconomic position (intercept) to the value at the top (intercept + slope). Meanwhile, the SII is the difference between the value at the bottom of the socioeconomic position (intercept) and the value at the top (intercept + slope). RII=1 and SII=0 indicate no inequality. RII>1 and SII>0 indicate inequality disfavoring the poorest (i.e., child diarrhea is more concentrated among the poorest participants). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.




Fig. 3: Effect of WASH interventions by socioeconomic position. Left panels show estimates using a continuous wealth score. Right panels show estimates using tertiles of wealth index, a pre-specified grouping of the continuous score. Sample sizes by group and wealth category are reported in Table 2. **A:** Diarrhea prevalence along the wealth distribution and wealth tertiles for children < 3 years in the control and intervention groups. **B:** Prevalence ratio of child diarrhea along the wealth distribution and wealth tertiles between the control and intervention groups. The Y-axis is on a log scale. **C:** Prevalence difference of child diarrhea along the wealth distribution and wealth tertiles between the control and intervention groups. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.




Fig. 4: Effect of WASH interventions by monsoon season. **A:** Diarrhea prevalence during the dry and monsoon seasons in the control and intervention groups. Monsoon season was defined as weeks with elevated precipitation (May 27 – September 27, 2014, and April 1 – September 26, 2015). These dates were based on weekly precipitation data matched to the study cohort. Sample sizes by group and season are reported in Table 2. Dry season were the other dates. **B:** Prevalence ratio of child diarrhea between the dry and monsoon seasons in the control and intervention groups. The Y-axis is on a log scale. **C:** Prevalence difference of child diarrhea between the dry and monsoon seasons in the control and intervention groups. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.




Fig. 5: Effect of WASH intervention jointly by socioeconomic position and monsoon season. **A:** Diarrhea prevalence along the tertiles of wealth index between the dry and monsoon seasons in the control and intervention groups. **B:** Prevalence ratio of child diarrhea along the tertiles of wealth index between the dry and monsoon seasons in the control and intervention groups. The Y-axis is on a log scale. **C:** Prevalence difference of child diarrhea along the tertiles of wealth index between the dry and monsoon seasons in the control and intervention groups. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.




Fig. 6: Diarrhea cases prevented by a combined WASH intervention along a continuous wealth gradient during the seasonal monsoon per grid-cell at a 1-kilometer resolution and per district in rural Bangladesh. A: WASH Benefits Study clusters that were included in the analysis (n=360) and gridded population density of children < 3 years estimated from WorldPop. **B:** Distribution of relative wealth rank based on the Demographic and Health Surveys wealth index with Bayesian model-based geostatistics and high resolution gridded spatial covariates and aggregated phone data per grid-cell at 1-km resolution estimated from WorldPop. **C:** The projected diarrhea cases prevented by combined WASH by wealth during monsoon season per month per grid-cell at 1-km resolution. Masked urban areas defined by the Global Human Settlement and grid-cells with less than 2 children < 3 years. **D:** The projected diarrhea cases prevented by combined WASH per 1000 children under 3 years per month in panel C aggregated for each administrative district. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.