

1 The Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) for Everyone controlled before-and-after (CBA) trial: trial
2 protocol and baseline results

3 **Authors:** Kondwani Chidziwisano^{1,2,3}, Mindy Panulo^{1,2}, Clara MacLeod⁴, Marcella Vignieri⁴, Blessings
4 White¹, Ian Ross⁴, Tracy Morse², Robert Dreibelbis⁴

5 *Corresponding author kchidziwisano@mubas.ac.mw

6 **Affiliations**

7 ¹Centre for Water, Sanitation, Health and Appropriate Technology Development (WASHTED), Malawi
8 University of Business and Applied Sciences, Blantyre, Malawi,

9 ²Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland,

10 ³Department of Public and Environmental Health, Malawi University of Business and Applied Sciences,
11 Blantyre, Malawi

12 ⁴Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United
13 Kingdom

14

15 **Abstract**

16 Community-based behaviour change interventions are a common approach to Water, Sanitation, and
17 Hygiene (WASH). Yet, published evaluations of how these interventions work in district-wide
18 approaches are rare. This study reports the baseline characteristics and study design for a trial
19 assessing the effectiveness of a district-level Community-led Total Sanitation (CLTS) intervention
20 compared to the additional integration of local Care Groups on sanitation coverage and use and
21 hygiene behaviours in Chiradzulu District, Malawi.

22 This study is a controlled before-and-after trial with two treatment arms and a control group. Clusters
23 are rural villages in three Traditional Authorities (TAs). One arm receives CLTS and the Care Group
24 Model, one arm receives CLTS only, and one serves as the control group. The trial is part of the wider
25 WASH for Everyone (W4E) project, led by World Vision Malawi which aims to expand access to WASH
26 services across the entire district by 2025. Study participants were selected from the three TAs.
27 Systematic sampling procedures were used to select 20 households per cluster with a total of 1,400
28 households at both baseline and endline. The primary outcome is sanitation coverage. Secondary
29 outcome measures include sanitation use, safe disposal of child faeces, observed handwashing facility,
30 and Sanitation-related Quality of Life index (SanQoL-5).

31 Baseline results show a no difference for primary and secondary outcomes between arms. We noted
32 low coverage of handwashing facilities with soap and water in all the three arms (i.e., CLTS only = 7%;
33 CLTS and Care Groups = 4%; and control = 10%). Further, there was a slight variation ($p= 0.08$) in
34 handwashing practice and sanitation coverage among the study arms.

35 The baseline observations indicate a balanced distribution of potential demographic confounders in
36 the trial arms. The trial intervention is under implementation. The evaluation report is expected to be
37 published in 2025.

38

39 **Introduction**

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

40 Globally, it is estimated that 3.6 billion people lack access to basic sanitation services and 494 million
41 people practice open defecation (OD), with the highest rates of OD in sub-Saharan Africa. (1).
42 Consequences of OD include faecal contamination of drinking water sources and food, which
43 contribute to a high burden of diarrhoeal diseases and child stunting, adversely impacting health and
44 socio-economic development (2,3). Further, OD and inadequate sanitation disproportionately affect
45 the safety and dignity of women, girls and marginalised groups (3–6), as well as other aspects of quality
46 of life (7). Efforts by governments and other sanitation stakeholders to eliminate OD, such as the
47 provision of subsidised latrines to households combined with hygiene and health education
48 programmes, have failed to make adequate sustained progress (8,9). Behaviour centred interventions
49 have been associated with improved uptake of sanitation interventions, but more information is
50 needed to assess their impact on behavioural outcomes when implemented in combination with one
51 another.

52 Our study focuses on two specific community-led interventions widely used in the WASH sector. The
53 first is Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS), an approach to sanitation behaviour change centred
54 on community-wide behaviour change and community self-enforcement in rural settings (Kar &
55 Chambers, 2008). Introduced in Bangladesh in 2009 and now adopted globally, the major goal of CLTS
56 is to mobilize communities to construct and use latrines to end OD (10). CLTS uses three phases to
57 leverage social and emotional drivers to “trigger” a change in people’s mindsets towards OD (11).
58 Evidence on the efficacy of CLTS is mixed. Certain studies highlight that CLTS only generates significant
59 short-term impact for reducing OD through increased latrine coverage and use (9,12–15). CLTS
60 implementation factors, such as triggering session attendance, number of supportive community
61 leaders, participant’s anticipation to receive an incentive, and the number of follow-up visits, have
62 been reported to significantly influence latrine coverage (16). The second is the Care Group (CG) model
63 which relies on a multiplier effect to reach a high number of households in a community at low-cost
64 through a development of a supportive network of peer-to-peer counselling (17).The CG model is a
65 well-tested programme for the delivery of health interventions in rural communities, historically
66 focusing on maternal and child health (17–20). Twenty-three non-governmental organisations (NGOs)
67 have implemented the CG Model across 27 countries, including Malawi (18,20). Studies have
68 documented the effectiveness of the CG Model in increasing coverage of child survival interventions
69 and reducing under five mortality (19–21). However, despite their clear alignment, studies of the
70 effectiveness of CGs as they relate to WASH interventions are limited.

71 In Malawi, communities struggle to sustain 100% latrine coverage after attainment of Open
72 Defaecation Free (ODF) status (22). This has been attributed to a number of factors, including lack of
73 involvement of marginalized and disadvantaged people, use of low-quality building materials, lack of
74 technical support and improper programme implementation (12,23). To achieve high and sustained
75 latrine coverage and behaviour change, it is essential to address all physical and contextual factors
76 that directly relate to long-term CLTS success. The Government of Malawi adopted CLTS as one of its
77 official approaches for sanitation in 2008 (24). The Government formally adopted the CG model in
78 2011 as an operational framework for the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Strategy (25). However, little is
79 known about how effective the CG model can be in promoting wider community health benefits, such
80 as improved sanitation. Models to promote sustained reductions in open defaecation and improved
81 sanitation outcomes through combination of behaviour centred intervention need to be tested and
82 adopted to support long-term positive health outcomes.

83 This study aims to assess the effectiveness of Community-led Total Sanitation (CLTS) combined with
84 the Care Group model on sanitation coverage and use and hygiene behaviours in Chiradzulu, District,
85 in rural Malawi, compared to CLTS alone or no intervention. The study objectives are to assess: 1) how

86 the two interventions compare to one another for improving sanitation coverage and use, and 2)
87 whether the two interventions are individually more effective than no intervention at all.

88 **Methods and analysis**

89 *Study setting and population*

90 The study is implemented in Chiradzulu District, Malawi (Fig 1). Chiradzulu District is situated in the
91 southern region of Malawi and is sub-divided into 10 administrative regions, or Traditional Authorities
92 (TA). The Malawi 2015/16 Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) indicated that 52% of the population
93 has access to improved sanitation. According to the National Statistical Office (NSO), in 2019, 93%
94 and 10% of the households in Chiradzulu District had access to safe water and improved sanitation
95 facilities, respectively. OD rates in Malawi and Chiradzulu District are 6% and 7%, respectively (26).
96 Given this low level of coverage, Chiradzulu District is the target of a three-year (2021–2024) district-
97 wide water, sanitation and hygiene programme, known as WASH for Everyone (W4E), implemented
98 by World Vision and Water for People, alongside which this trial is embedded.

99 **Figure 1:** Map of Malawi focusing on Chiradzulu district (red), and (b) Map of Chiradzulu district
100 depicting study areas: Red = Treatment 1: TA Chitera – CLTS + Care group arm, Yellow = Treatment 2:
101 TA Ntchemba – CLTS only arm and Green = Control arm: TA Nkalo

102

103 *Study Design*

104 The study design is a controlled before-and-after (CBA) trial with two treatment arms (each with 20
105 villages/clusters) and a control group (30 villages) (Figure 2). CBA intervention designs are a non-
106 randomized approach used to evaluate the impact of interventions (27,28). Advantages and
107 disadvantages of the CBA study designs, also known as non-randomised cluster-controlled trials, have
108 been discussed elsewhere (29).

109 In our study, we selected three TAs (Figure 1) in Chiradzulu District, Malawi. TAs are 4th level
110 administrative units, with average population 34,000 in Chiradzulu (30).-Details on the programme
111 intervention are described below. For our trial, we selected two out of the five TAs scheduled to
112 receive the full W4E intervention during the second year of programme implementation to align with
113 our implementation. Each selected TA was randomly assigned to one of two intervention arms (CLTS
114 or CLTS + care groups). We selected a third TA from the three TAs scheduled to receive the WASH for
115 Everyone intervention in the third year of programme activities (Fig 2). This TA served as the control
116 group for our study. While TAs are the unit of intervention assignment, villages (clusters) are the unit
117 of analysis.

118

119 **Figure 2:** Study CONSORT diagram for a controlled before-and-after trial to assess the effectiveness of
120 two interventions (CLTS only and CLTS and Care Group model) on rural sanitation coverage and use in
121 Chiradzulu District, Malawi.

122 *Description of the intervention*

123 The sanitation intervention included in the W4E programme uses CLTS, in line with the Malawi
124 National Sanitation and Hygiene Strategy (31). As part of the W4E project, relevant district technical
125 officers and community leaders (known natural leaders) implemented CLTS. Trained CLTS facilitators
126 conducted the triggering sessions that include participatory activities, such as walk of shame, shit

127 calculation and community sanitation mapping. The purpose of these activities is to trigger
128 behavioural emotions, such as shame and disgust, so that community members understand the
129 consequences of open defaecation. If successfully implemented, triggering sessions have the potential
130 to stimulate community members to stop open defaecation and adopt improved sanitation practices,
131 including construction and effective use of latrine facilities. For this trial, TA Ntchemba (Treatment Arm
132 2) will receive the standard CLTS intervention (Table 1).

133 TA Chitera (Treatment Arm 1) will receive the standard CLTS intervention with the incorporation of
134 Care Groups (CGs). CG leaders and cluster leaders support intervention delivery and local triggering
135 sessions, specifically by facilitating CG meetings with CG households and conducting household follow-
136 up visits. Care Groups are intended to extend the reach of CLTS behaviour change messaging,
137 providing additional points of contacts with programme households. Care Groups also participate in
138 post-triggering follow-up visits to households to assess sanitation coverage and use.

139
140 In line with CLTS values, the W4E project does not intend to provide any latrine construction or
141 hygiene facility materials or financial subsidies to the households. It is the responsibility of the
142 household owners to support themselves throughout the latrine and hygiene facility construction
143 process.

144 145 *Selection of clusters and households*

146 The primary sampling unit (clusters) for the study are clusters (also called villages) and represent the
147 units of W4E delivery for CLTS. Communities from the three participating TAs were randomly selected
148 from a list of communities obtained from the Chiradzulu District Health Office. Inclusion criteria for
149 the selected communities include that the community is in one of the three selected Traditional
150 Authorities that are part of the study area and have not yet received any exposure to the W4E project.
151 Communities that were exposed to CLTS-related activities in the past 12 months and are outside the
152 area of the three selected TAs are excluded from the study.

153 In early 2023, a list of all clusters in each study TA and their associated number of households was
154 provided by the District Health Office. TA-specific median village size was calculated, and villages
155 categorized as either above or below the TA-specific median. Villages in each TA-specific above and
156 below median list were rank ordered according to a random number generated in Microsoft Excel and
157 villages enrolled sequentially until the necessary number of villages were enrolled. If a cluster could
158 not be located or if the village chief did not provide permission for data collection, the next cluster on
159 the rank order list was enrolled.

160 Households are the secondary sampling unit and individuals living in households in the study area are
161 the primary study population. Among selected communities (T1: n= 20; T2: n= 20; C: n= 30), systematic
162 sampling procedures were followed to select up to 20 households per cluster. In selected households,
163 we identified one adult resident (i.e. 18+ years old) to serve as the primary respondent, preferably the
164 household head. Household samples are taken independently at baseline and endline. While study
165 clusters will remain the same between baseline and endline, different households may be selected
166 between baseline and endline.

167 *Data collection*

168 Baseline, mid-line and end-line data collection

169 A baseline survey was conducted between April and May 2023, before W4E Year 2 implementation in
170 Treatment TAs 1 and 2. An endline survey will be conducted before W4E Year 3 implementation in the
171 control TA, with data collection scheduled for March -and April 2024. A structured questionnaire with

172 closed-ended questions with pre-coded responses on mobile device on KOBO collect platform will be
173 used to collect data on household membership, wealth index, sanitation and hygiene facilities, and
174 child health. Further, the enumerators will conduct spot checks and record hygiene proxy measures,
175 such as presence and state of a latrine, presence, location, and type of handwashing facility (including
176 the availability of soap and water). The interviews will be conducted in Chichewa, the local language
177 of Chiradzulu District. Chichewa-speaking enumerators with extensive training and expertise will
178 administer the structured questionnaire.

179 To confirm availability of WASH infrastructure and hygiene practices, we will conduct structured
180 observations in 350 randomly selected randomly selected households (i.e., 100 households from each
181 treatment arm and 150 households from the control group) among the recruited 1,400 households.
182 Specifically, the observations are intended to capture practices pertaining to presence of latrine and
183 handwashing facility with soap, handwashing practice at critical times (i.e. before eating, before food
184 preparation, after changing child nappy and after latrine use) and child faeces disposal. One observer
185 will be placed at each selected household. As behaviours of interest mostly occur in the morning hours
186 to noon (32), our observations will last four hours from 8:00am to 12:00 noon.

187 *Data management*

188 Data collected using mobile devices will be uploaded directly online to KOBO daily. Only the PI, co-
189 investigators, and study personnel with authorised access will have access to the online data. At the
190 end of the data collection, the full dataset will be uploaded into STATA v18 (Stata Corp, College Station,
191 TX) for analysis. Although no identifiable information will be recorded during the surveys, study
192 personnel will review the final database and permanently delete any identifiable information
193 inadvertently collected during surveys. All data is stored on encrypted, password-protected servers.

194 *Study outcomes and data analysis*

195 Statistical analysis will be carried out at the individual or household levels with appropriate adjustment
196 for clustering within villages (and within households for individual-level outcomes). Data will be
197 analysed according to the TA / intervention assignment irrespective of whether the intervention was
198 taken up fully, partly or not at all. Since this is an effectiveness study, only an intention-to-treat dataset
199 will be maintained.

200 The primary estimates of the effectiveness of the intervention on primary and secondary outcomes
201 will be based on a difference-in-difference analysis and models adjusted for design variables alone
202 (TA, village population above or below TA-specific median); a fixed effect for village size (above or
203 below the median) will be included in the model. All models will include a dummy variable for
204 treatment arm (CLTS, CLTS+ or control) and data collection round (baseline and endline) as well as the
205 interaction term of those two variables.

206 To account for clustering of observation, hierarchical mixed-effects models will be used for all analysis.
207 For household-level outcomes or outcomes where there is only one respondent per household, mixed
208 effects models will account for clustering by including a random effect at the village level. For
209 outcomes with multiple respondents or data points per household (specifically sanitation use, and
210 hand washing behaviour), an additional random effect will be added at the household-level.

211 All analysis of primary and secondary outcomes will be based on the difference-in-difference
212 approach. The regression coefficient of the interaction term between treatment arm and data
213 collection round will be used as the primary effect measure. For binary outcomes measure, we will

214 use melogit with robust standard errors and regression coefficients exponentiated to estimate an
215 Odds Ratio. For continuous outcomes, we will use meglm, with identity link and gaussian family.

216 *Analysis of primary outcomes*

217 Primary outcome (presence of a sanitation facility) will be analysed using hierarchical mixed effects
218 logistic regression with robust VCE. The results will be presented with 95% confidence intervals.
219 Household specific presence of a sanitation facility is a binary household indicator based on observed
220 latrine that the household reports as completed. Analyses will report on Odds Ratios (OR) and 95%
221 confidence interval of each treatment arm compared to the control as well as the CLTS alone
222 compared to CLTS+.

223 *Analysis of secondary outcomes*

224 1. Sanitation use: sanitation use is an individual-level binary indicator based on reported location last
225 time each member of the household used a latrine.

226 2. Safe disposal of child faeces: will be analysed as a mixed effect model (household, village, and
227 cluster) of observed household disposal site of last defaecation for all children under the age of
228 five years.

229 3. Basic sanitation coverage: is a household-level indicator based on presence of an observed
230 sanitation facility that meets JMP criteria for basic sanitation facilities, specifically an improved
231 sanitation type.

232 4. Sanitation-related Quality of Life (SanQoL-5): SanQoL-5 index is an individual-level variable
233 reported by only one participant per household. It is a continuous variable (0 – 1) based on the
234 weighted score of responses to five questions on a 3-level frequency scale (33).

235 5. Latrine quality: latrine quality is a composite index based on observed and reported
236 characteristics of household latrines [8]. Specific indicators that will be used include binary
237 indicators for the following:

238 a. Hygiene:

239 i. excreta hygienically contained (observed)

240 ii. whether facility leaks or overflows waste at any time of the year (reported)

241 b. Accessibility:

242 i. whether everyone in the household able to access and use the toilet at all times of the
243 day and night (observed and reported)

244 ii. toilet facility easily accessible even to young children, elderly, and disabled people
245 (reported)

246 c. Sustainability:

247 i. whether sanitation facility has durable pit lining or is connected to septic tank (observed
248 and reported)

249 ii. whether pit latrine or septic tank has ever been emptied (reported)

250 d. Use:

251 i. pit not full (observed)

252 ii. child faeces go into latrine or no children living on plot (observed and reported)

253 Items will be combined using principal components analysis (PCA) and iteratively refined using
254 standard approaches to index development. Outcomes will be analyzed as a continuous variable based
255 on PCA score.

256 6. Basic handwashing facility: presence of a handwashing where both soap and water are available
257 is a household-level binary variable. This will be analyzed in two ways: a) both observed and
258 reported HWF with both soap and water available at the time of data collection and b) observed
259 HWF with soap and water.

260 7. Handwashing behaviour: A binary outcome measure based on structured observation data.
261 Structured observation data will be used to identify all pre-defined hand hygiene opportunities
262 (e.g., before food preparation, before eating, before feeding child, after using a latrine, after
263 cleaning a child, and after being in contact with an animal) and associated hand hygiene (0 = no
264 hand hygiene or hand hygiene with water only; 1 = hands washed with soap). Analysis will be
265 conducted at the event-level with adjustment for repeated observations within the same
266 household.

267 Adjustment for covariates

268 Results will present two sets of outcome measure. First, we will report on all outcome measures
269 adjusted for design variables (village above or below TA-specific median) and models also adjusted for
270 a priori defined covariates and design variables. We will explore differences between the design-
271 adjusted and covariate-adjusted models but will consider the covariate adjusted models as the
272 primary effect estimates.

273 Covariates have been selected based on hypothesized relationships that could confound the
274 relationship between intervention exposure and primary and secondary outcome measures.

275 At the respondent level, gender and primary education (less than vs completed primary) will be
276 included. While the following covariates will be included at household-level: household size,
277 household economic status based on PCA of household assets, any member of the household
278 experiencing a disability as defined by the Washington Group (any functional disability for a member
279 of the household greater than two on the functional disability assessment) and household reports a
280 water source that is located on site or on plot (34). At the community-level, we will look at village
281 having an improved road as reported by Village Chief at time of baseline enrolment. Improved road is
282 used as a proxy measure of village accessibility to both the intervention and markets.

283 Missing data

284 It is likely that some missing outcome data will be encountered, especially of individual-level self-
285 reported outcomes. The patterns of missingness of variables will be tabulated to describe and
286 compare the extent of missingness of any affected variable between study arms. No adjustment will
287 be made for missing data.

288 Outliers

289 Unusual values and potential outliers will be flagged and queried. Unlikely values will be dropped and
290 treated as missing data in the main analysis. A sensitivity analysis will be conducted which includes
291 potential outliers (but not unlikely values).

292 Multiple comparisons

293 The number of primary outcomes that will be tested for significant differences between arms is small;
294 thus, no formal adjustment for multiple comparisons will be made.

295 *Ethics*

296 The study protocol, which includes data collection tools, participant information sheets and consent
297 forms, have been approved by the National Commission for Science and Technology (P01/23/718) in
298 Malawi. Further, consent was obtained from the Chiradzulu District Council and community leaders.
299 Informed written consent was obtained from all study participants recruited into the study prior to
300 data collection. The study was registered with clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05808218).

301 **Results**

302 *Baseline data*

303

304 Table 2 presents the demographic details of the 1,400 survey respondents across the three TAs. Four
305 hundred respondents were sampled from Treatment TA 1, 400 from Treatment TA 2, and 600 from
306 the control TA. Baseline characteristics were distributed evenly between the trial arms. Across the
307 three TAs, most survey respondents were female (83%), had at least some primary education (67%),
308 and were married (68%). The median household size was four members. Approximately half (49%) of
309 households had a child under the age of five. Households were equally distributed across wealth
310 quintiles, with approximately 20% of households in each of the five quintiles across the three TAs. Six
311 percent of households had at least one member living with a disability.

312

313

314 **Table 2.** Description of baseline respondent characteristics.

Category	Total	Control (Nkalo)	T1 (Chitera)	T2 (Ntchema)
Household survey	N= 1,400	n= 600	n= 400	n= 400
Gender (% female)	83%	85% *	79% ***	85%
Median age	40	39	39	40
Education				
None	9%	7% *	8% ***	9%
Less than primary	3%	4% *	2% ***	2%
Completed primary	67%	68% *	61% ***	72%
Secondary	21%	20% *	27% ***	17%
Vocational	0%	1% *	1% ***	0%
University	0%	0% *	1% ***	0%
Marital status				
Single	6%	6% *	8%	5%
Married	68%	67% *	71%	69%
Separated or divorced	15%	17% *	12%	13%
Widow	11%	10% *	9%	13%
Median household size	4	5	4	5
Presence of children under five years	49%	45%	53%	50%
Wealth quintile				
1	20%	19%	20%	22%
2	20%	19%	18%	24%
3	20%	23%	18%	18%
4	20%	21%	20%	19%
5	20%	19%	25%	18%
At least one household member living with a disability	6%	6%	5%	6%

315 * p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test for Chitera vs Nkalo

316 ** p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test Ntchema vs Nkalo

317 *** p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test Chitera vs Ntchema

318

319 At baseline, most households (78%) had an unimproved sanitation facility as defined by JMP (e.g., a
320 pit latrine without a slab). Specifically, most households (76%) had a pit or twin pit latrine without slab
321 and in yard or plot (68%). The median number of households amongst those sharing one latrine was
322 3. Ninety four percent of households reported all household members using a sanitation facility for
323 the last defaecation event. Among the households with a sanitation facility, almost all (98%) reported
324 that they regularly use their sanitation facility. The mean sanitation quality of life (SanQoL) is 0.62.
325 Most households used an improved water source as defined by JMP (98%) (Table 3). More specifically,
326 most households (94%) used a borehole as their main water source. Twenty-five minutes was the
327 median round-trip time to collect water.

328

329 Over half of respondents (56%) had access to a handwashing station, either observed or reported
330 (Table 3). However, only 7% of households had a handwashing facility with reported soap and water

331 available within the household and 6% with observed soap and water available at the handwashing
332 facility.
333

334 **Table 3.** Description of outcomes at baseline.

Category	Total	Control (Nkalo)	T1 (Chitera)	T2 (Ntchema)
Household survey	N= 1,400	n= 600	n= 400	n= 400
Improved water source (JMP)	98%	98%	97%	98%
At least basic drinking water (JMP)	70%	78% * **	63%	65%
Report treated water at least once a day	63%	57% * **	64%	70%
Sanitation (JMP)				
At least basic	7%	4% * **	11% ***	7%
Limited	11%	9% * **	16% ***	8%
Unimproved	78%	81% * **	70% ***	83%
No facility	4%	6% * **	4% ***	2%
Number of households sharing one latrine (amongst those sharing), Median (IQR)	2 (2, 3)	2 (2, 3)	3 (2, 3)	2 (2, 3)
All members of the household (aged ≥5) reported using latrine for last defecation	96%	94% * **	97%	98%
SanQoL-5 index, mean (SD)	.62 (0.25)	.59 (0.26)	.64 (0.26)	.64 (0.24)
Reported child faeces disposal (n= 715)				
Safe disposal		90%	88%	90%
Unsafe disposal		10%	12%	10%
Handwashing station available (reported or observed)				
Basic (handwashing facility with soap and water)	7%	10% *	4% ***	8%
Limited	49%	52%	42%	52%
No handwashing facility	44%	39% *	54% ***	41%

335 * p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test for T1 vs Control

336 ** p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test T2 vs Control

337 *** p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test T1 vs T2

338

339 Three hundred and thirty hand hygiene structured observations were conducted in Treatment TA 1,
340 295 in Treatment TA 2, and 474 in the control TA (Table 4). The median number of observed hand
341 hygiene opportunities per household was three. Most households did not practice hand hygiene or
342 wash hands with water at specific hand hygiene junctures (e.g., after using the toilet, before food
343 preparation, before eating, before feeding child, and after being in contact with an animal) (Table 4).
344 A total of 73 child faeces disposal structured observations were conducted across the three TAs, with
345 26 in T1, 18 in T2, and 29 in the control. Approximately half of households safely disposed of child
346 faeces (i.e., put or rinsed the faeces in the latrine) in the three TAs (Table 4).
347

348 **Table 4.** Hand hygiene and child faeces disposal structured observations.

Category	Total	Nkalo	Chitera	Ntchemba
Hand hygiene structured opportunities	N= 1,099	n= 474	n= 330	n= 295
Proportion handwashing with soap and water	3%	3%	5% ***	2%
Proportion handwashing with water only	46%	49%	39% ***	50%
Proportion handwashing with other materials (i.e. ash)	0%	0%	0% ***	0%
Proportion no handwashing	51%	50%	56% ***	48%
Child faeces disposal structured observations	N= 73	n= 29	n= 26	n= 18
Safe disposal	49%	45%	54%	50%
Unsafe disposal	51%	55%	46%	50%

349 * p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test for T1 vs Control

350 ** p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test T2 vs Control

351 *** p < 0.05 for chi square or anova test T1 vs T2

352

353 Discussion

354 This paper presents the study protocol and baseline findings of a community-based intervention
 355 promoting the integration of the CG model into the CLTS approach, given that CLTS alone is reportedly
 356 not effective enough to ensure sustained uptake of sanitation and hygiene behaviours. Studies have
 357 shown the effectiveness of using the CG model in promoting community health interventions, mainly
 358 nutrition programmes (20,35–38). However, few have been conducted which integrate CLTS and the
 359 CG model. To address this gap, we developed an innovative intervention approach that integrates the
 360 CG model into the standard CLTS approach. The CG model is community-level government-recognised
 361 approach that can potentially support the already existing informal - natural leaders in the delivery of
 362 CLTS, both pre- and post-ODF status attainment. This would strengthen CLTS sustainability since care
 363 group members are trained to continuously monitor a specific group of households post-ODF
 364 attainment, while natural leaders would only follow households up to community's attainment of ODF
 365 status (9,13,39,40).

366 *Baseline survey results*

367 Our baseline results indicate that the study is conducted in a rural area where literacy level is
 368 moderate and the quality of housing relatively poor. Some households had no latrines, while
 369 traditional unimproved latrines (e.g., pit latrines without slab), which are prone to collapsing during
 370 rainy season, were common. Relatively high sanitation coverage in the communities indicates the
 371 short-term success of CLTS, however, other TAs in Chiradzulu district reverted to OD after attainment
 372 of ODF status. Thus, the district provided a suitable environment for this study to assess alternative
 373 approaches for promoting sustainable sanitation interventions.

374 Handwashing with soap is low in low- and middle-income countries, including Malawi (41–45). Similar
 375 findings were observed in our baseline results. Access to easy to use and effective handwashing
 376 facilities was limited among the study population as most households did not have a dedicated
 377 handwashing facility. Observations at critical times indicated a challenge with soap availability for
 378 hand washing. As such, nearly half of the study participants did not use soap during handwashing.

379 *Comparison of baseline characteristics among trial arms*

380 The baseline results indicate some imbalance between trial arms on self-reported water treatment
381 practices. Treatment of household water was more frequently reported among the control group
382 compared to the treatment groups. A possible explanation for the imbalance could be that
383 immediately before baseline data collection, other non-governmental organisations promoted the use
384 of safe water through the drilling of boreholes and installation of chlorine dispensers in all the water
385 points in the control communities. This included the installation of chlorine dispensers in both
386 treatment groups, although a similar trend was not observed in responses. In terms of sanitation, we
387 observed that the control arm had the highest coverage of latrines without a slab, while more latrines
388 with a slab were observed in T2. We could not find an explanation for this difference and expect it to
389 be by chance.

390 This study has several limitations. Structured observations were used to collect the data. This
391 approach has limitations as the presence of the observer can influence the behaviour of the person
392 under observation (46). To minimise bias, study participants were not informed about the observed
393 hygiene behaviours, though they were generally informed about the purpose of the study.
394 Nonetheless, structured observations remain the gold standard for measuring hygiene behaviours
395 (47,48). Treatment arms and the control were purposively selected based on the presence of care
396 groups and CLTS programme for the treatment arms rather than random assignment. The control arm
397 was selected based on the absence of care groups and CLTS. Systematic random sampling was used
398 to select study households in each arm.

399 **Conclusion**

400 We highlight the study design and baseline results from an ongoing BCA trial implemented in rural
401 households in Chiradzulu District, Malawi. The study, implemented within a district-wide WASH
402 programme, assesses the effectiveness of CLTS alone against CLTS combined with the CG model for
403 improving sanitation coverage and sustained uptake. The baseline observations indicate a balanced
404 distribution of potential demographic confounders in the trial arms with a slight variation on some
405 WASH proxy measures. We expect to publish the trial findings in early 2025.

406 **Author's contributions**

407 The trial was designed by RD, KC and TM. Sample size estimates and randomization procedures were
408 guided by MV. The trial is coordinated by KC with input from RD, TM, IR, MP and CM. Baseline survey
409 activities were coordinated by MP and BW. Analysis of baseline survey data was performed by CM. KC
410 and RD drafted the manuscript. All co-authors contributed critically to the manuscript and approved
411 the final version.

412 **Funding statement**

413 This work was supported by World Vision US grant number WVSOW34730.

414 **Competing interest statement**

415 All authors declare no competing interests.

416 **References**

- 417 1. UNICEF and WHO. Progress on Household Drinking Water , Sanitation and hygiene 2000-2022:
418 special focus gender. 2023. 1–4 p.

- 419 2. Khanna T, Das M. Why gender matters in the solution towards safe sanitation? Reflections from
420 rural India. *Global Public Health*. 2016;11(10):1185–201.
- 421 3. Vyas S, Kov P, Smets S, Spears D. Disease externalities and net nutrition: Evidence from changes
422 in sanitation and child height in Cambodia, 2005–2010. *Economics and Human Biology*.
423 2016;23:235–45.
- 424 4. Cha S, Jung S, Abera T, Beyene ET, Schmidt WP, Ross I, et al. Performance of Pit Latrines and
425 Their Herd Protection Against Diarrhea: A Longitudinal Cohort Study in Rural Ethiopia. *Global*
426 *Health: Science and Practice* [Internet]. 2024 Jun 27 [cited 2024 Sep 23];12(3). Available from:
427 <https://www.ghspjournal.org/content/12/3/e2200541>
- 428 5. Jadhav A, Weitzman A, Smith-Greenaway E. Household sanitation facilities and women’s risk of
429 non-partner sexual violence in India. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16(1):1–10.
- 430 6. Kayser GL, Rao N, Jose R, Raj A. Water, sanitation and hygiene: Measuring gender equality and
431 empowerment. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2019;97(6):438–40.
- 432 7. Ross I, Cumming O, Dreifelbis R, Adriano Z, Nala R, Greco G. How does sanitation influence
433 people’s quality of life? Qualitative research in low-income areas of Maputo, Mozambique.
434 *Social Science & Medicine*. 2021 Mar 1;272:113709.
- 435 8. Harter M, Lilje J, Mosler HJ. Role of Implementation Factors for the Success of Community-Led
436 Total Sanitation on Latrine Coverage. A Case Study from Rural Ghana. *Environmental Science*
437 *and Technology*. 2019;53(9):5466–72.
- 438 9. Venkataramanan V, Crocker J, Karon A, Bartram J. Community-led total sanitation: A mixed-
439 methods systematic review of evidence and its quality. *Environmental Health Perspectives*.
440 2018;126(2).
- 441 10. USAID. An Examination of CLTS’s Contributions toward Universal Sanitation. 2018;(April):1–88.
- 442 11. Kar K, Street U, Nw L, Chambers R. Total Sanitation with. Vol. 44.
- 443 12. Abebe TA. Open defecation-free slippage and its associated factors in Ethiopia : a systematic
444 review. 2020;1–15.
- 445 13. Crocker J, Saywell D, Bartram J. Sustainability of community-led total sanitation outcomes:
446 Evidence from Ethiopia and Ghana. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*.
447 2017;220(3):551–7.
- 448 14. USAID. An Examination of CLTS’s Contributions toward Universal Sanitation. 2018;(April):1–88.
- 449 15. Pickering AJ, Djebbari H, Lopez C, Coulibaly M, Alzua ML. Effect of a community-led sanitation
450 intervention on child diarrhoea and child growth in rural Mali: A cluster-randomised controlled
451 trial. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2015;3(11):e701–11.
- 452 16. Harter M, Inauen J, Mosler HJ. How does Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) promote latrine
453 construction, and can it be improved? A cluster-randomized controlled trial in Ghana. *Social*
454 *Science and Medicine*. 2020;245(November 2019):112705.

- 455 17. Pieterse P, Matthews A, Walsh A, Chirwa E. Exploring how and why Care Groups work to
456 improve infant feeding practices in low-and middle-income countries: A realist review protocol.
457 Systematic Reviews. 2020;9(1):1–7.
- 458 18. Gladstone MJ, Chandna J, Kandawasvika G, Ntozini R, Majo FD, Tavengwa N V., et al.
459 Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene (Wash) and
460 improved complementary feeding on early neurodevelopment among children born to hiv-
461 negative mothers in rural zimbabwe: Sub study of a cluster-randomized trial. PLoS Medicine.
462 2019;16(3):1–25.
- 463 19. Panulo M, Chidziwisano K, Beattie TK, Tilley E, Kambala C, Morse T. Process Evaluation of “The
464 Hygienic Family” Intervention: A Community-Based Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Project in
465 Rural Malawi. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2022;19(11).
- 466 20. Perry H, Morrow M, Borger S, Weiss J, DeCoster M, Davis T, et al. Care Groups I: An innovative
467 community-based strategy for improving maternal, neonatal, and child health in resource-
468 constrained settings. Global Health Science and Practice. 2015;3(3):358–69.
- 469 21. Morse T, Tilley E, Chidziwisano K, Malolo R, Musaya J. Health outcomes of an integrated
470 behaviour-centred water, sanitation, hygiene and food safety intervention—a randomised before
471 and after trial. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020;17(8):1–
472 19.
- 473 22. Survey H. Malawi. 2015;
- 474 23. Davies K, Panulo M, MacLeod C, Wilbur J, Morse T, Chidziwisano K, et al. Inclusion of persons
475 living with disabilities in a district-wide sanitation programme: A cross-sectional study in rural
476 Malawi. PLOS Global Public Health. 2024 Aug 29;4(8):e0003005.
- 477 24. Maulit IA, Kang M. Effects of program and institutional design on district-level CLTS
478 management in Malawi. The Future of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene in Low-Income Countries:
479 Innovation, Adaptation and Engagement in a Changing World - Proceedings of the 35th WEDC
480 International Conference. 2011;0–4.
- 481 25. Government of Malawi. National Community Health Strategy 2017- 2022. 2017;(July 2017):1–
482 86.
- 483 26. National Statistical Office. MALAWI POPULATION AND HOUSING CENSUS REPORT-2018 2018
484 Malawi Population and Housing Main Report. 2019;(May).
- 485 27. Kolahi AA, Rastegarpour A, Sohrabi MR. The impact of an urban sewerage system on childhood
486 diarrhoea in Tehran, Iran: a concurrent control field trial. Transactions of the Royal Society of
487 Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2009;103(5):500–5.
- 488 28. Nasser R. On the input-degradedness and input-equivalence between channels. IEEE
489 International Symposium on Information Theory - Proceedings. 2017. 2453–2457 p.
- 490 29. Share Consortium. Evaluating the health impact of urban WASH programmes: an affordable
491 approach for enhancing effectiveness. 2011;1–32.
- 492 30. Malawi National Statistical office. Malawi integrated household survey - Household Socio-
493 Economic Characteristics Report. Malawi National Statistical office; 2017.

- 494 31. Government of the Rubluc of Malawi. National Sanitation Foundation and Hygiene Strategy.
495 Ministry of Health and Population. 2018;21(10):88.
- 496 32. Chidziwisano K, Tilley E, Malolo R, Kumwenda S, Musaya J, Morse T. Risk Factors Associated with
497 Feeding Children under 2 Years in Rural Malawi—A Formative Study. *International Journal of*
498 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019 Jan;16(12):2146.
- 499 33. Ross I, Greco G, Opondo C, Adriano Z, Nala R, Brown J, et al. Measuring and valuing broader
500 impacts in public health: Development of a sanitation-related quality of life instrument in
501 Maputo, Mozambique. *Health Economics*. 2022;31(3):466–80.
- 502 34. Loeb M. Development of Disability Measures for Surveys: The Washington Group Extended Set
503 on Functioning. In: Altman BM, editor. *International Measurement of Disability: Purpose,*
504 *Method and Application* [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2016 [cited 2024
505 Oct 11]. p. 97–122. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28498-9_7
- 506 35. Komakech JJ, Emerson SR, Cole KL, Walters CN, Rakotomanana H, Kabahenda MK, et al. Care
507 groups in an integrated nutrition education intervention improved infant growth among South
508 Sudanese refugees in Uganda’s West Nile post-emergency settlements: A cluster randomized
509 trial. *PLoS ONE*. 2024;19(3 March):1–23.
- 510 36. Weiss J, Makonnen R, Sula D. Shifting management of a community volunteer system for
511 improved child health outcomes: Results from an operations research study in Burundi. *BMC*
512 *Health Services Research*. 2015;15(Suppl 1):1–9.
- 513 37. Nair N, Tripathy P, Sachdev HS, Pradhan H, Bhattacharyya S, Gope R, et al. Effect of participatory
514 women’s groups and counselling through home visits on children’s linear growth in rural eastern
515 India (CARING trial): a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Global Health*.
516 2017;5(10):e1004–16.
- 517 38. Pieterse P, Walsh A, Chirwa E, Chikalipo M, Msowoya C, Mambulasa J, et al. Evaluating the role
518 that Care Groups play in providing breastfeeding and infant feeding support at community level:
519 a qualitative study in Dedza district in Malawi. *HRB Open Research*. 2023;6(May):44.
- 520 39. Kouassi HAA, Andrianisa H, Bologo-Traore M, Sossou S, Ymele Saapi SS, Ahossouhe MS, et al.
521 Review of the slippage factors from open defecation-free (ODF) status towards open defecation
522 (OD) after the Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) approach implementation. *International*
523 *Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*. 2023 Mar 22;250:114160.
- 524 40. Cavill S, Chambers R, Vernon N. Frontiers of CLTS: Innovations and Insights-Making Sanitation
525 and Hygiene Safer: Reducing Vulnerabilities to Violence. *CLTS Knowledge Hub*. 2015;(04):19.
- 526 41. Moffa M, Cronk R, Fleming L, Tidwell JB. Measuring household hygiene access and handwashing
527 behaviors: Findings from 14 low- and middle-income countries. *International Journal of Hygiene*
528 *and Environmental Health*. 2021;237(June):113810.
- 529 42. Wolf J, Johnston R, Freeman MC, Ram PK, Slaymaker T, Laurenz E, et al. Handwashing with soap
530 after potential faecal contact: Global, regional and country estimates. *International Journal of*
531 *Epidemiology*. 2019;48(4):1204–18.
- 532 43. Kumar S, Loughnan L, Luyendijk R, Hernandez O, Weinger M, Arnold F, et al. Handwashing in 51
533 countries: Analysis of proxy measures of handwashing behavior in multiple indicator cluster

- 534 surveys and demographic and health surveys, 2010-2013. American Journal of Tropical Medicine
535 and Hygiene. 2017;97(2):447–59.
- 536 44. Moon J, Choi JW, Oh J, Kim K. Risk factors of diarrhea of children under five in Malawi: based on
537 Malawi Demographic and Health Survey 2015–2016. Journal of Global Health Science.
538 2019;1(2):1–13.
- 539 45. Kalumbi LR, Thaulo C, Macpherson EE, Morse T. Perspectives and practices on water, sanitation,
540 and hygiene from a fishing community along lake malombe, Southern Malawi. International
541 Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020;17(18):1–17.
- 542 46. Ram PK, Halder AK, Granger SP, Jones T, Hall P, Hitchcock D, et al. Is Structured Observation a
543 Valid Technique to Measure Handwashing Behavior? Use of Acceleration Sensors Embedded in
544 Soap to Assess Reactivity to Structured Observation. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine
545 and Hygiene. 2010 Nov 5;83(5):1070–6.
- 546 47. Jeanes A, Coen PG, Gould DJ, Drey NS. Validity of hand hygiene compliance measurement by
547 observation: A systematic review. American Journal of Infection Control. 2019;47(3):313–22.
- 548 48. Schmidt WP, Lewis HE, Greenland K, Curtis V. Comparison of structured observation and
549 pictorial 24 h recall of household activities to measure the prevalence of handwashing with soap
550 in the community. International Journal of Environmental Health Research. 2019;29(1):71–81.
- 551

Supplementary materials

Table A1. Description of baseline respondent characteristics.

Variable	Total N= 1,400		Nkalo (control) N = 600		Chitera (T1) N= 400		Ntchema (T2) N= 400	
	n	%	n	(%)	n	%	n	%
Gender	1,167	83%	510	85% *	317	79% ***	340	85%
Median respondent age	1,400	40	600	39	400	39	400	40
Education								
None	107	9%	44	7% *	30	8% ***	33	9%
Less than primary	43	3%	25	4% *	9	2% ***	9	2%
Completed primary	940	67%	405	68% *	246	61% ***	289	72%
Secondary	296	21%	119	20% *	110	27% ***	67	17%
Vocational	6	0%	2	1% *	3	1% ***	1	0%
University	8	1%	5	0% *	2	1% ***	1	0%
Marital status								
Single	85	6%	33	6% *	33	8%	19	5%
Married	958	68%	37	67% *	20	71%	15	69%
Separated or divorced	208	15%	103	17% *	48	12%	57	13%
Widowed	149	11%	62	10% *	37	9%	50	13%
Median household size	1,400	4	600	5	400	4	400	5
Presence of children under five years	171	49%	68 / 150	45%	53 / 100	53%	50 / 100	50%
Wealth quintile								
1	281	20%	115	19%	80	20%	86	22%
2	279	20%	114	19%	71	18%	94	24%
3	280	20%	135	23%	72	18%	73	18%
4	280	20%	123	21%	81	20%	76	19%
5	280	20%	113	19%	96	24%	71	18%

At least one household member living with a disability	72	5%	31	6%	18	5%	23	6%
---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----


Table A2. Description of outcomes at baseline.

Variable	Total		Nkalo (control)		Chitera (T1)		Ntchema (T2)	
	n / N	%	n / N	%	n / N	%	n / N	%
Improved water source (JMP)	1,364 / 1,395	98%	587 / 598	98%	384 / 397	97%	393	98%
At least basic drinking water (JMP)	980 / 1,395	70%	466 / 598	78% * **	253 / 397	63%	261 / 400	65%
Report treated water at least once a day	876 / 1,400	63%	342 / 600	57% * **	255 / 400	64%	279 / 400	70%
Sanitation (JMP)								
At least basic	97 / 1,400	7%	26 / 600	4% * **	43 / 400	11% ***	28 / 400	7%
Limited	149 / 1,400	11%	55 / 600	9% * **	64 / 400	16% ***	30 / 400	8%
Unimproved	1,094 / 1,400	78%	483 / 600	81% * **	278 / 400	70% ***	333 / 400	83%
No facility	60 / 1,400	4%	36 / 600	6% * **	15 / 400	4% ***	9 / 400	2%
Number of households sharing one latrine (amongst those sharing), Median (IQR)	825	2 (2, 3)	396	2 (2, 3)	203	3 (2, 3)	226	2 (2, 3)
All members of the household (aged ≥5) reported using latrine for last defecation	5,183 / 5,386	96%	2,201 / 2,338	94%	1,480 / 1,520	97% ***	1,502 / 1,528	98%
SanQoL-5 index, mean (SD)	1,400	0.62 (0.25)	600	0.59 (0.26)	400	0.64 (0.26)	400	.64 (0.24)
Reported child faeces disposal								
Safe disposal	641 / 715	90%	263 / 291	90%	184 / 209	88%	194 / 215	90%
Unsafe disposal	74 / 715	10%	28 / 291	10%	25 / 209	12%	21 / 215	10%
Handwashing station available (reported or observed)								

Basic (HWF with soap and water)	104	7%	59 / 600	10% *	15 / 400	4% ***	30 / 400	8%
Limited	683	49%	309 / 600	52%	168 / 400	42%	206 / 400	52%
No handwashing facility	613	44%	232 / 600	39% *	217 / 400	54% ***	164 / 400	41%

Table A3. Hand hygiene and child faeces disposal structured observations.

Variable	Total		Nkalo (control)		Chitera (T1)		Ntchema (T2)	
	n / N	%	n / N	%	n / N	%	n / N	%
Hand hygiene structured opportunities								
Proportion handwashing with soap and water	36 / 1,099	3%	12 / 474	3%	17 / 330	5%	7 / 295	2%
Proportion handwashing with water only	505 / 1,099	46%	231 / 474	49%	128 / 330	39%	146 / 295	50%
Proportion handwashing with other materials (i.e. ash)	2 / 1,099	0%	0 / 474	0%	1 / 330	0%	1 / 295	0%
Proportion no handwashing	556 / 1,099	51%	231 / 474	50%	184 / 330	56%	141 / 295	48%
Child faeces disposal structured observations								
Safe disposal	36 / 73	49%	13 / 29	45%	14 / 26	54%	9 / 18	50%
Unsafe disposal	37 / 73	51%	16 / 29	55%	12 / 26	46%	9 / 18	50%



Figure

Study Design	<p align="center">The WASH for Everyone Trial</p> <p align="center">A controlled before-and-after study to assess the effects of CLTS and CLTS + Care Groups on sanitation and hygiene behaviours</p>		
Selection	<p align="center">T1 (TA Chitera) 20 clusters (villages) randomly selected</p>	<p align="center">T2 (TA Ntchema) 20 clusters (villages randomly selected</p>	<p align="center">Control (TA Nkalo) 30 clusters (villages) randomly selected</p>
Allocation	<p align="center">T1 receives CLTS +CG intervention</p>	<p align="center">T2 receives CLTS only intervention</p>	<p align="center">Control receives standard W4E intervention after study period</p>
Baseline (May/June 2023)	<p align="center">400 HH 20 randomly selected per cluster</p>	<p align="center">400 HH 20 randomly selected per cluster</p>	<p align="center">600 HH 30 randomly selected per cluster</p>
Endline (Mar/Apr 24)	<p align="center">400 HH 20 randomly selected per cluster</p>	<p align="center">400 HH 20 randomly selected per cluster</p>	<p align="center">600 HH 20 randomly selected per cluster</p>
Analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Difference-in-difference analysis comparing CLTS / CLTS + CG to Control 2. Difference-in-difference analysis comparing CLTS to CLTS + CG 		

Figure