

1 **A pilot pre-post trial with and without subsidy to promote safe**
2 **backyard poultry-raising practices to prevent exposure to poultry and**
3 **poultry feces in rural Bangladesh**

4
5 Authors: Laura H. Kwong^{1*}, Jesmin Sultana², Elizabeth D. Thomas³, Mohammad Rofi Uddin², Shifat
6 Khan², Ireen Sultana Shanta⁴, Nadia Ali Rimi⁴, Md. Mahbubur Rahman², Peter J. Winch³, Tarique Md.
7 Nurul Huda^{2,5}

8
9 Affiliations:

10 ¹ Division of Environmental Health Sciences, School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley;
11 Berkeley, California, United States of America

12 ² Environmental Health and WASH, Health System and Population Studies Division, icddr,b; Dhaka,
13 Bangladesh

14 ³ Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; Baltimore,
15 Maryland, United States of America

16 ⁴ Programme for Emerging Infections, Infectious Disease Division, icddr,b; Dhaka, Bangladesh

17 ⁵ Department of Public Health, College of Applied Medical Sciences, Qassim University; Buraydah, Saudi
18 Arabia

19
20
21 *Corresponding author: Laura H. Kwong, 2121 Berkeley Way West – Floor 5, Berkeley, California, USA
22 94601
23 Email: lakwong@berkeley.edu

24
25
26 **Declaration of conflicts of interest:** The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest related to this
27 work to disclose.

28
29 Words: 7002

30 Abstract (Words 298)

31 **Background:**

32 Backyard poultry-raising is common in rural Bangladeshi households. Raising poultry contributes to fecal
33 contamination of the domestic environment, increasing children's exposure to enteric pathogens,
34 including *Campylobacter*, which has been associated with child stunting.

35

36 **Objective:**

37 To investigate the effectiveness of a behavior change communication and counseling intervention to
38 encourage households to confine poultry outside of the household dwelling in a shed at night and
39 improve poultry feces management.

40

41 **Methods:**

42 We conducted a two-arm pre-post pilot study. Households in both arms received the behavior change
43 communication and counseling intervention. Households in the subsidy arm also received ~23 USD for
44 the construction of a poultry shed for nighttime housing. We administered a household survey and spot-
45 check before and after intervention implementation among 37 subsidy and 42 non-subsidy households.

46

47 **Results:**

48 At endline, 58% of all households had a poultry shed (87% of subsidy and 33% of non-subsidy
49 households) and the percentage of households confining all poultry outside the house the previous
50 night was significantly higher at endline (33%) compared to baseline (2.5%) (prevalence difference [PD]:
51 30 percentage points [pp]; 95% CI: [19, 41]). Additionally, more households had no visible poultry feces
52 piles inside the house compared to baseline (PD: 26pp 95% CI: [12, 41]), but there were no significant
53 differences in the number of poultry feces piles in the courtyard or veranda.

54

55 **Discussion:**

56 Our intervention effectively encouraged households to confine poultry outside of household dwellings
57 at night and to maintain an indoor living space free of poultry feces. Households were willing and able to
58 construct a shed even without a subsidy. Households that received a subsidy were more likely to
59 construct a shed. Future studies should assess if housing all poultry outside the household dwelling
60 reduces children's exposure to poultry feces enough to mitigate health risks associated with poultry
61 ownership.

62

63 **Keywords**

64 backyard poultry; household hygiene; One Health; intervention trial

65 Introduction (955 words)

66 Backyard poultry raising is common across the globe (Birhanu et al. 2023). In Bangladesh, 80% of rural
67 households raise backyard poultry, where poultry is the primary source of animal protein for households
68 (Dolberg 2007) and income for women (Sultana et al. 2012). In this setting, humans live near poultry: in
69 one study among poultry-raising households, 98% reported poultry scavenging in the yard, 93% said
70 poultry roam freely inside homes during the day, and 37% reported children touching, carrying, or
71 playing with poultry in the past two weeks (Shanta et al. 2017). Many households keep poultry inside at
72 night and confine poultry only intermittently during the day (Passarelli et al. 2021; Lowe et al. 2022;
73 Headey and Hirvonen 2016).

74
75 Close contact with poultry may have public health implications. Children can be exposed to zoonotic
76 pathogens through contact with poultry or poultry feces (Matilla et al. 2018; Penakalapati et al. 2017;
77 Headey et al. 2017). Findings from observational studies suggest that free-roaming poultry in the
78 domestic environment and housing poultry inside the household dwelling at night have been associated
79 with poor child health outcomes such as stunting and environmental enteropathy (Headey and Hirvonen
80 2016; Kaur, Graham, and Eisenberg 2017; George et al. 2015). A cross-sectional study analyzing
81 demographic and health surveys from 30 countries found that ownership of livestock and poultry
82 increased the risk of all-cause mortality (Kaur, Graham, and Eisenberg 2017; Zambrano et al. 2014).

83
84 Close contact with poultry and poultry feces increases the risk of *Campylobacter*, *Salmonella* (Zambrano
85 et al. 2014), *Cryptosporidium* infections (Moore et al. 2016), as well as avian influenza (Sultana et al.
86 2012). *Campylobacter* infections, caused primarily by consumption of contaminated water and
87 unpasteurized milk, exposure to poultry and wild birds, and person-to-person transmission, are one of
88 the most common bacterial causes of gastroenteritis among children worldwide (Kaakoush et al. 2015).
89 In low-income countries, *Campylobacter* is endemic; the multi-country MAL-ED study estimated that
90 85% of children had been infected by *Campylobacter* in their first year of life (Amour et al. 2016) and
91 that *Campylobacter* was responsible for 12.1 episodes of diarrhea per 100 child-years, despite
92 *Campylobacter* infections often being asymptomatic (Platts-Mills et al. 2018). In the Global Enteric
93 Multicenter Study, *Campylobacter* was a leading pathogen associated with moderate-to-severe diarrhea
94 among children <5 years old in South Asia (Kotloff et al. 2013). *Campylobacter* spp. infections have been
95 associated with poor linear growth, increased intestinal permeability, increased intestinal and systemic
96 inflammation, and Guillan-Barre Syndrome (Amour et al. 2016; Nyati and Nyati 2013). *Campylobacter*
97 infections are more common among children living with poultry compared to children not living with
98 animals (Zambrano et al. 2014). In Egypt, children from households with one or more poultry positive for
99 *Campylobacter jejuni* were found to have 3.9 times higher odds of being infected with *C. jejuni*
100 compared to those without any positive birds (El-Tras et al. 2015). These studies suggest that confining
101 poultry to separate them from children could improve child health.

102

103 Confining poultry in improved poultry sheds could also improve poultry health compared to non-
104 confinement or typical in-home confinement arrangements. There is no single definition for an
105 improved poultry shed, but generally they are defined as being outside, having multiple compartments,
106 and natural ventilation (Lambrecht, Waid, et al. 2023). Housing poultry of different types and ages to
107 avoid competition over food and reduces stress that can cause pecking out other birds feathers and
108 cannibalism (Food and Agriculture Organization 2004). Adequate ventilation improves air quality inside
109 the shed by reducing the concentration of particulate matter, pathogens, and gases such as ammonia,
110 all of which can harm poultry health and diminish productivity (Li et al. 2020; Al-Kerwi et al. 2022).
111 Ventilation can prevent the shed from becoming too hot or humid, which can easily cause death among
112 poultry due to their lack of sweat glands and compensate for high animal density (Weaver 2002). There
113 are several ways that elevating a poultry shed off the ground can benefit poultry health (Food and
114 Agriculture Organization 2004). Firstly, elevation can protect poultry (and their eggs and feed) from
115 snakes and burrowing predators such as rodents. An elevated floor can also prevent water from runoff
116 or flooding or high moisture from clay soil from entering the shed and causing the growth of pathogens
117 or mold in bedding or the floor of the coops; moist coops can also wet feathers and are also more likely
118 to cause frostbite in the winter. Air can circulate under an elevated coop, allowing for cooler
119 temperatures in the summer. In settings where poultry are confined in fenced-in runs when not inside
120 the coop, the area under the coop can add to the size of the run and function as an area of the run that
121 is shaded and protected from the rain. Some improved sheds also provide a perch, as perches allow
122 birds to separate from each other, reducing stress and aggression and improving welfare and production
123 efficiency (Bist et al. 2023).

124
125 Given the potential health risks associated with poultry, interventions encouraging poultry production
126 may generate greater net health benefits if participants also receive training in hygienic poultry
127 management practices, particularly the reduction of children’s physical exposure to poultry and their
128 feces. However, there is limited research on interventions to prevent exposure to poultry and poultry
129 feces. Little is known about the types of confinement structures and behaviors that could effectively
130 separate children from poultry and poultry feces and are feasible and acceptable in low-income settings
131 (Oberhelman et al. 2006). As such, we aimed to develop a poultry and poultry feces management
132 intervention to separate young children from poultry feces in backyard poultry-raising households in
133 rural Bangladesh and understand the influence of these interventions on young children’s exposure to
134 poultry and poultry feces.

135 Materials and Methods (Words 2364)

136 Setting

137 We conducted the study in the Fulbaria sub-district of Mymensingh district in north-central Bangladesh.
138 We selected Mymensingh based on its proximity to Dhaka, and prior findings that approximately half of
139 the poultry-raising households in this area house poultry inside their household dwelling at night.

140 Fulbaria is typical of rural sub-districts in Bangladesh; it contains 13 unions, each with several villages. In
141 each village, there are compounds of two to eight related households, clustered around a central
142 courtyard but the poultry are typically owned by the households.

143 Study Design

144 We conducted a two-phase study to explore how to reduce children's exposure to poultry and poultry
145 feces in rural Bangladesh. In Phase I, we conducted formative research to identify and refine existing
146 local strategies that could separate children from poultry feces and develop new technologies. The
147 formative research, which included transect walks across all districts in Bangladesh, qualitative
148 interviews, and trial of improved practices, are described in a forthcoming manuscript. Based on the
149 findings of Phase I, we then designed a neighborhood-based behavior change and counseling
150 intervention to promote nighttime confinement of poultry outside the house and improve poultry feces
151 management. In Phase II, we conducted a two-arm pilot pre-post trial to investigate the effectiveness of
152 this intervention, with and without monetary support, to encourage backyard poultry-raising
153 households to 1) confine all poultry outside the household living space at night, specifically by keeping
154 them overnight in an improved poultry shed outdoors; 2) wash hands with soap and water after contact
155 with poultry, poultry products, and poultry feces; 3) remove poultry feces immediately; and 4) dispose
156 of poultry feces in a specific pit. Households in both arms received the behavior change communication
157 and counseling intervention. One arm additionally received a monetary subsidy of 2000 BDT (USD ~23)
158 for the labor and/or material costs associated with constructing a poultry shed. The subsidy arm allowed
159 us to assess households' need for financial support to build a poultry shed.

160 Selection of study households and participants

161 We compared the socio-demographic characteristics (e.g., literacy rate, household ownership,
162 population density, male-to-female ratio, sanitation coverage, safe drinking water provision at the
163 household level, and electricity supply) of 13 unions in the Fulbaria sub-district and excluded six because
164 they were urban, hilly, or outliers in terms of the aforementioned characteristics. From the seven
165 eligible unions, we used a random number generator to randomly select two unions; unions were
166 considered as the unit of randomization because they are large enough to reduce the likelihood that
167 participants in the non-subsidy union would learn about the subsidy offered in the subsidy union. From
168 each selected union, we selected one village based on convenience, poultry raising practices, and
169 distance from the Fulbaria sub-district center. In each village, trained enumerators identified the
170 village's center and then went door-to-door in a clockwise direction from the center to identify
171 compounds in which 1) each of the households had at least one adult chicken (at least two months old),
172 2) at least one household housed poultry inside their dwelling at night, and 3) at least one household
173 had a child 6-59 months old. Enumerators visited 13-21 compounds, totaling 35-62 households, to list
174 30-38 eligible households per village. They prepared a hand-drawn map with landmarks of the village,
175 the relative position of the compounds, the number of households in each compound, and the presence
176 of poultry and children in those households. Using the maps, the study team selected neighboring
177 compounds to each other to create a supportive environment for adopting recommended behaviors and

178 creating new poultry-raising norms. We excluded compounds with households that engaged in
179 commercial poultry farming (50+ birds) and compounds with a single household not adjacent to other
180 compounds. In each village, we enrolled 7-8 compounds with a total of 19-21 households. The primary
181 poultry-raiser was defined as the household member who owned and cared for the poultry and was the
182 primary decision-maker for the poultry. In rural Bangladesh, primary poultry-raisers are most often
183 female (Shanta et al. 2017). Study investigators used a random number generator to randomly allocate
184 each village to the subsidy or non-subsidy intervention arm. The household enrollment process was
185 completed in February 2020.

186 Sample size

187 We enrolled 80 households in this pilot study. Prior pilot studies in similar settings suggest that the
188 inclusion of 50 households per arm allows for exploring trends in behavioral uptake (Desai et al. 2015;
189 Oberhelman et al. 2006). Due to budgetary constraints, we were limited to 40 households per arm.

190 Masking

191 Intervention delivery and data collection were conducted by separate teams. Data collection staff were
192 not told whether the village had been assigned to the subsidy or non-subsidy arm.

193 Intervention design and delivery

194 Based on the formative research findings, we developed an intervention approach called Neighborhood-
195 based Environmental Assessment and Planning (NEAP). NEAP is a novel participatory approach that
196 incorporates principles of household-based assessments and an ecological model approach to
197 behavioral determinants, considering contextual, psychosocial, and technological factors at multiple
198 levels (societal, community, household, individual and habitual) likely to influence behavioral outcomes
199 in the development of intervention content and delivery (Dreibelbis et al. 2013; Thomas 2021). We also
200 took guidance from research on self-assessment of health hazards in the domestic environment, which
201 can be a helpful tool for both identifying hazards and possible solutions (Tomita et al. 2014; Morgan et
202 al. 2005). Intervention activities included a community engagement meeting, training carpenters on the
203 construction of improved sheds, group meetings and household visits with the primary poultry raisers,
204 and engagement meetings with male household members (Table 1). This pilot study promoted four key
205 behavioral recommendations: 1) confine all poultry out of the household dwelling at night; 2) wash
206 hands with soap and water after contact with poultry, poultry products, or poultry feces; 3) remove
207 poultry feces as soon as you see them; and 4) dispose of poultry feces in a specific site away from
208 children's reach.

209 Each behavioral recommendation was introduced over the course of six group meetings with the
210 primary poultry raisers. We developed three illustrative posters for each behavioral recommendation
211 that served as visual aids during group meetings (Figure S1). The first poster depicted illustrations of
212 common behaviors with negative consequences. In the second poster, photographs of target behaviors

213 with a positive outcome were shown. Prior research has found that in rural Bangladesh, participants
214 responded more positively to illustrations of negative behaviors and photographs of recommended
215 behaviors (Hossain et al. 2020). The final poster presented an enabling technology to facilitate the
216 adoption of target behaviors. The enabling technologies were an improved poultry shed (which we
217 define as an outdoor shed that has multiple compartments, allows for cross-ventilation, and is elevated
218 from the ground), a handwashing station (a bucket with lid and tap, and basin to catch water), a soapy
219 water bottle (a plastic bottle filled with water mixed with detergent powder), and a hoe or spade (for
220 poultry feces removal). A scale model of the improved shed was presented during the meetings. In
221 addition to the behavior-specific posters, an overview poster with illustrations of all four key behavioral
222 recommendations was provided to households at the first group meeting (Figure 1). We asked
223 participants to sign the poster and display them in their homes as a sign of their commitment to the
224 behaviors. Finally, to track their progress toward each recommended behavior, participants were
225 provided with a progress book with illustrations or photographs of small doable actions to take to
226 achieve each behavior.

227 We recruited community hygiene promoters (CHPs) (four women and two men) from the study site to
228 facilitate group meetings and household visits. CHPs were >18 years old and had at least eight years of
229 formal education. CHPs received rigorous training and were supervised by project staff. We also trained
230 local carpenters from each study village to introduce them to the project, explain the characteristics of
231 an improved shed, and describe the anticipated role of carpenters in the project.

232 In each of the two villages, we separated study households into three groups (6-8 primary poultry
233 raisers each). CHPs led sessions for each group every other week and called or visited each participant
234 the day before the meeting to remind them to attend. CHPs conducted group meetings in a convenient
235 place for the households (e.g., courtyard, off-compound location, living room, or veranda). Following the
236 group meeting, they conducted individual household visits in each study household. During household
237 visits, CHPs recorded the household's progress and challenges toward adopting the previous group
238 meeting's recommended behaviors, in a separate pictorial progress book, similar to those given to
239 participants. During household visits, CHPs also shared possible solutions to any difficulties reported.
240 Female CHPs led all group meetings and household visits with poultry raisers, all of whom were women.

241 Male CHPs conducted two engagement meetings with male members of the study households. During
242 these meetings, CHPs provided an overview of the project's behavioral recommendations, highlighted
243 the important contributions of poultry-raising to the household, and emphasized the critical role that
244 men play in achieving the goal of having both healthy children and healthy poultry.

245 Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we delayed implementation of intervention activities until September
246 2020. At outdoor group meetings, CHPs and participants wore face masks, and individuals stayed 1 m
247 from each other whenever possible. Before each meeting, both as part of the intervention and to follow
248 COVID-19 handwashing recommendations, CHPs and participants washed their hands using the
249 promoted handwashing station and soapy water bottle.

250 Data collection

251 **Primary and secondary outcomes:** The primary outcome of this study was the percentage of households
252 confining poultry outside the household dwelling at night. We defined the household dwelling as the
253 structure where household members usually sleep. The secondary outcomes of the study were the
254 number of poultry feces in the household dwelling and courtyard, access to and/or ownership of an
255 improved night shed, ownership of a specific pit or trash pile for disposing of poultry feces, access to a
256 handwashing station with soap and water, and self-reported handwashing behavior with soap.

257 **Quantitative assessment:** We conducted a baseline and endline quantitative assessment in all
258 households. The baseline assessment was completed after enrollment in February 2020. The endline
259 quantitative assessment was conducted from January to February 2021, after three months of
260 intervention implementation (mid-September to mid-December 2020). During baseline and endline
261 quantitative assessments, a team of two enumerators (one male and one female) not involved in
262 intervention delivery conducted spot-checks followed by a survey in all study households. The
263 enumerators recorded the data with the CommCare platform on tablet computers.

264 **Spot-check:** Trained enumerators visited different locations in the household and compound (e.g.,
265 household dwelling, courtyard, veranda, and other places) to record signs of poultry (e.g., feathers) and
266 to count visible poultry feces piles. Enumerators counted each pile of poultry feces in each location up
267 to 25 piles and recorded a categorical “>25 piles” if more than 25 piles were present. Enumerators also
268 recorded the presence of different types of poultry housing (e.g., shed, shelter, bamboo cage, corral,
269 and other confinement strategies). We define a “shed” as a poultry confinement structure that is house-
270 like with features that include walls, roof, and door (Thomas 2021). The structure may or may not be
271 independent of other structures, but it must either be a) on the veranda, in the courtyard, or off the
272 compound, or b) transportable to the veranda, courtyard, or off the compound. A “shelter” is a poultry
273 confinement structure that involves built or put-together components that may or may not be joined
274 together. “Simple shelters” cannot be moved outside the house and may have walls, a door, or a roof,
275 but these are not required (Thomas 2021). A bamboo cage is a movable structure placed over poultry to
276 confine them temporarily. Structural elements (e.g., windows) and signs of use (e.g., poultry feces piles)
277 were recorded. Enumerators also observed handwashing stations, poultry feces disposal sites, and the
278 presence of free-roaming poultry in the households. We recorded the availability of water, soap or
279 handwashing agents, and pour devices at the handwashing station.

280 **Survey:** Enumerators administered a structured survey to the primary poultry-raiser in each enrolled
281 household. The survey included questions on demographics and socioeconomic status (baseline only),
282 poultry-raising practices (day and nighttime poultry confinement, the involvement of other household
283 members in poultry-raising, and decision-making related to poultry and poultry products), poultry
284 health, and children’s observed exposure to poultry and poultry feces. We also asked about psychosocial
285 factors likely to influence poultry-raising practices (e.g., risk perceptions and social cohesion), and
286 information on preferences for poultry housing and available resources and anticipated challenges for
287 building improved poultry sheds.

288 **Process monitoring and documentation:** We documented intervention activities throughout
289 implementation (Table S1). For each group meeting and household visit, CHPs recorded meeting
290 attendance, duration, and challenges related to intervention delivery in a semi-structured daily record
291 form. Also, icddr,b supervisors observed at least one fortnightly group meeting and two household visits
292 facilitated by each CHP to assess performance, recording their observations in the supervisor monitoring
293 form.

294 Data analysis

295 We summarized socio-demographic characteristics and animal ownership across the intervention arms
296 at baseline. Although villages were randomized to receive the intervention with or without monetary
297 support, there were only two villages per arm, so we analyzed the study with difference-in-difference
298 analysis. To assess the impact of the intervention, we assessed the change in primary and secondary
299 outcomes from baseline to endline for both study arms combined. We also compared the changes in
300 primary and secondary outcomes from baseline to endline between non-subsidy and subsidy arms. We
301 conducted all analyses according to the randomized intervention arm at enrollment (intention-to-treat)
302 without considering session attendance. We also analyzed results considering whether or not the
303 household had a poultry shed at the endline to assess the association between ownership of a poultry
304 shed and poultry management practices. Analysis was conducted using Stata-13.

305 Ethical consideration

306 The protocol (PR-18087) for this study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of icddr,b; the
307 IRB concluded that approval for research involving animals was not required. The enumerators collected
308 informed written consent from the primary poultry-raiser in the study household at enrollment. This
309 trial did not assess any health outcomes and was therefore not registered as a clinical trial.

310 Results (1081 words)

311 In February 2020, the study team enrolled 80 households from four villages of two unions in the Fulbaria
312 sub-district of Mymensingh district. At the endline visit (January-February 2021), one household had
313 migrated out of the study area, resulting in endline data collection for 79 households (Figure 1). At
314 baseline, most characteristics of primary poultry-raisers and their households were similar across the
315 two arms (Table 1). All the primary poultry raisers were female. In the non-subsidy arm, access to an
316 improved latrine and ownership of a smartphone was more common, and ownership of bulls/milk
317 cows/buffaloes, a television, and a mobile phone were less common, than in the subsidy arm.

318 Seventy percent (n=56) of primary poultry raisers attended all six meetings, and 93% (n=74) attended at
319 least four meetings. At the male engagement meetings, attendance at the first meeting was 89% in the
320 subsidy arm and 85% in the non-subsidy arm but dropped to 76% in the subsidy arm and 39% in the

321 non-subsidy arm for the second male meeting. The intervention did not result in any adverse or
322 unintended effects in either group.

323 Confinement of poultry outside at night

324 At baseline, 2.5% of households reported confining all of their poultry outside their living space at night.
325 An unimproved shed was present in 17% of households and no household had an improved shed. The
326 intervention increased the percentage of households confining all of their poultry outside at night,
327 access to any shed, and access to an improved shed. The percentage of households that reported
328 confining all poultry outside the house the previous night was significantly higher at endline compared
329 to baseline (prevalence difference (PD): 30 percentage points [pp] [19, 41]) (Table 2). The increase
330 occurred in both study arms (non-subsidy arm PD: 25pp [11, 38]; subsidy arm PD: 36 pp [19, 54]) (Table
331 3). The difference between arms was not statistically significant (DID: 12pp [-10, 34]) (Table 3). The
332 percentage of households that had any type of poultry shed (improved or not) was also higher at
333 endline than baseline (PD: 50pp [40, 62]); most of the new sheds were improved sheds (PD: 58pp [47,
334 69]) (Table 2). While the increase in access to improved sheds occurred in both study arms (non-subsidy
335 arm PD: 33pp [19, 48]; subsidy arm PD: 87pp [75, 98]), the increase was higher in this subsidy arm (DID:
336 53pp [35, 72]) (Table 3). Among the households with any poultry shed, 48% of households confined all
337 of their poultry outside the house at night compared to 0% among those who did not have access to a
338 shed (PD: 48pp [28, 68]); among households with access to improved poultry shed, 53% of households
339 confined all of their poultry outside the house at night compared to 3% those without an improved shed
340 (PD: 50 pp [32, 69]) (Table 4).

341 The 47% of households that had an improved poultry shed but did not confine all of their poultry
342 outside the house at night stated that they were concerned about predators (18/47, 38%) and theft
343 (23/47, 49%). The types of poultry they kept inside were egg laying hens (n=11), adult chickens (n=9),
344 chicks (n=8), ducklings (n=6), and adult ducks (n=3).

345 Sheds were an average of 15 steps (SD: 7) from the front door of the household. Among 25 households
346 that had an improved poultry shed and children under 5, nine of those reported seeing their children
347 entering into the shed at least once within the previous month and another nine reported observing
348 children entering the shed at least once within the past two months.

349 Handwashing

350 Most primary poultry raisers (77%) reported handwashing with soap after defecation, but handwashing
351 before eating, after handling poultry feces, and after handling other animal feces was practiced by about
352 only one-fifth of primary poultry raisers (Table 2). Fewer than 10% of respondents said they washed
353 hands with soap after cleaning child feces, after feeding poultry / handling poultry or poultry products,
354 or before preparing or serving food.

355 The intervention did not impact the presence of handwashing infrastructure but did increase
356 handwashing with soap at some key times. There was no statistically significant difference in the
357 percentage of study households observed to have access to a handwashing station with soap and water
358 at baseline and endline (PD: 10pp [-4.7, 25]), but the increase among subsidy households was marginally
359 significant (PD: 22pp [-0.04, 43]) (Table 2; Table 3). The percentage of primary poultry-raisers that
360 reported washing their hands with soap after handling poultry or other animal feces was less than 20%
361 at baseline and increased at endline to 65% after handling poultry feces (PD: 51pp [37, 64]) and 34%
362 after handling other animal feces (PD:15pp [4.5, 26]) (Table 2). Reported handwashing after feeding
363 poultry/ handling poultry or poultry products also increased from less than <5% to nearly 50% (PD: 43pp
364 [32, 55]) and before preparing food (PD: 54pp [43, 66]). Reported handwashing before eating was 21%
365 at baseline and 48% at endline (PD: 28pp [14, 42]). The percentage of primary poultry-raisers who
366 reported washing their hands after feeding/handling poultry or poultry products increased more in the
367 subsidy arm than in the non-subsidy arm (DID: 26pp [3, 48]) (Table 3).

368 Poultry feces presence and disposal

369 At baseline, just over half of households had no uncontained feces (feces outside of the poultry
370 confinement structure) observed inside the house, while 42% had 1-25 piles of feces and the remainder
371 had >25 piles. Verandas were more contaminated, with 58% having 1-25 piles of feces and 8% having
372 >25 piles of feces at baseline. No courtyards were observed without feces: 15% had 1-25 piles of feces
373 and 86% had >25 piles of uncontained feces (Table 2).

374 The percentage of households that had no uncontained feces inside the household dwelling increased
375 from 54% at baseline to 81% at the endline (PD: 26pp [12, 41]) (Table 2). However, the presence of
376 uncontained feces in the courtyard and veranda remained the same.

377 At baseline, 47% of households used poultry feces as a fertilizer while 35% threw them in the bush, 18%
378 threw them in a drain or ditch, and 20% disposed of them in a specific place such as a trash pile. The
379 percentage of households that disposed of poultry feces in a trash pile or pit increased substantially
380 after the intervention (PD: 44pp [31, 58%]) (Table 2). The increase was higher among subsidy vs. non-
381 subsidy households (DID: 34pp [8, 59%]) (Table 3).

382 Discussion (2602 words)

383 Based on extensive formative research, we developed and pilot tested an intervention to encourage
384 backyard poultry-raising households to confine poultry outside of the household dwelling in an
385 improved shed at night and improve poultry feces management practices. The Neighborhood-based
386 Environmental Assessment and Planning (NEAP) approach used for this intervention was successful at
387 encouraging poultry-raising households to build (improved and unimproved) poultry sheds, confine
388 poultry outside of the household dwelling at night, and maintain an indoor living space free of poultry
389 feces. Both households that did and did not receive a monetary subsidy constructed improved sheds.
390 The effectiveness of the NEAP intervention may stem from its social mobilization component, which has

391 also been effective at changing latrine construction and open defecation behaviors in Community-Led
392 Total Sanitation (CLTS) programs (Venkataramanan et al. 2018; Pickering et al. 2015).

393 Construction and use of improved poultry sheds

394 At baseline, housing poultry in a shed overnight was uncommon, with only one-fifth of households
395 having sheds and only 2.5% confining all poultry outside at night. The intervention increased the
396 percentage of households with a poultry shed by a notable 50 percentage points. Factors that may have
397 facilitated this high uptake could have been neighborhood commitment and check-ins with study staff
398 to help brainstorm solutions to problems at part of NEAP, training on shed construction provided to
399 local carpenters, sessions for men that emphasized the importance of their engagement for child and
400 poultry health, and the subsidy that some households received. Few other studies have encouraged
401 households to construct their own sheds. One study in Ethiopia required farmers to agree to incurring
402 the cost of providing the 25 chicks they received through the intervention with a “night shelter, daytime
403 enclosure or partitions”. Nine and 18 months after the intervention, “enclosed coop” ownership was
404 higher in the intervention arms than the control arm by 15 percentage points (Passarelli et al. 2021). In
405 addition to the promise made when accepting the intervention, households may have been motivated
406 by needing space for the 25 chickens they received and could not accommodate within their house or
407 calculating that an enclosed coop would provide a high return on investment if it protected the high-
408 value chickens. Another study, in rural Bangladesh, implemented a homestead food production
409 intervention in which one component was providing households with partial reimbursement for the cost
410 of a constructed, improved poultry shed (Wendt et al. 2019; Lambrecht, Waid, et al. 2023). Post
411 intervention, 77% of women in the intervention group owned a shed compared to 28% in the control
412 group. In the intervention group, 68% of all women owned an improved shed and among poultry
413 owners 75% used the shed for poultry.

414
415 Even when households have a shed, they may not use it to confine all of their poultry. At the endline of
416 our study, even when 67% of households had a poultry shed, 52% of them still kept at least some of
417 their poultry inside their household dwelling at night, saying that their homes provided better
418 protection from predators, weather, and theft. Other studies have also found that even if households
419 have an outdoor confinement structure, they may still choose to keep some or all of their poultry inside
420 the house at night for similar reasons. One study in rural Ethiopia found that 84% of households had
421 outdoor poultry housing, but 63% of households kept their chickens in the house the previous night;
422 poultry raisers shared that they selected their confinement location to protect chickens from predators
423 and theft or hurting or being hurt by children or larger livestock (Passarelli et al. 2021). Some also
424 mentioned confining their poultry to prevent chickens from wandering off and destroying neighbors’
425 crops or land. In rural Western Uganda, 41% of households were observed to have some form of poultry
426 housing (a fenced in area, walled enclosure with roof that fully contain poultry, or walled enclosure with
427 roof that poultry can enter and exit freely, all presumably outside, or basket) (Lowe et al. 2022).
428 However, 85% of these households reported keeping at least some poultry inside the house at night,
429 and among households that had no enclosures, 77% kept poultry inside the house at night. In our study,
430 the proportion of households that reported recent predation of chickens was 18% at endline. To address

431 this, sheds could better protect against predators, cold, and theft through stronger materials / smaller
432 openings, improved insulation, and a lock. Behavior change communication may also be required to
433 convince households that these improved sheds would address their concerns.

434 Impact of subsidy on shed construction

435 Our study suggests that subsidies may not be necessary for rural Bangladeshi households to construct
436 poultry sheds. While over >80% of households that received a 23 USD subsidy constructed an improved
437 shed, one-third of households that did not receive a subsidy also constructed an improved shed during
438 the 3-month study period. One reason that more non-subsidy households did not construct sheds during
439 the study may be that the study duration was too short for them to save up sufficient funds or
440 accumulate enough leftover material from other building projects (such as replacing the roof,
441 constructing a shed, or repairing a latrine) to construct the shed. Studies that follow-up with households
442 6 or 12 months after the intervention may be better positioned to assess the impact of the intervention
443 on households that do not receive a subsidy. Another issue to consider is the availability of trained
444 carpenters who can build sheds. In our study, we found that households used both study-trained
445 carpenters and carpenters not trained by our study. Even in 38% of the households the shed was built by
446 a household member or someone who lives in the same compound. This suggests that finding someone
447 to build the shed may not be difficult in these settings.

448 Subsidies, when appropriately and accurately targeted and implemented, have the potential to increase
449 equity in sanitation access and use. Past attempts to subsidize sanitation hardware have distorted
450 sanitation markets and created perverse incentives among beneficiaries while primarily benefitting
451 wealthier households and failing to create sustained hardware use (Jenkins and Sugden 2006; Robinson
452 and Gnilo 2016). In addition, the expectation of a subsidy was noted as a constraint to unsubsidized
453 latrine construction in 15% of CLTS interventions (Venkataramanan et al. 2018). However, behavior
454 change promotion with a monetary subsidy has been more effective in increasing latrine coverage (or
455 attenuating declines in latrine use) than behavior change alone (Cameron et al. 2021; Guiteras,
456 Levinsohn, and Mobarak 2015; Garn et al. 2017), so identifying how to most cost-effectively implement
457 subsidy programs and evaluating their effect is useful. Some subsidy approaches, such as vouchers and
458 rebates to cover full or partial costs, can be used to deliver subsidies that stimulate both demand and
459 supply, at least in the short term (Cameron et al. 2021; Guiteras, Levinsohn, and Mobarak 2015; Kohlitz
460 and Iyer 2021). While subsidy validity periods can strongly impact subsidy uptake, vouchers can
461 effectively support households in overcoming liquidity constraints (Kohlitz and Iyer 2021). The optimal
462 amount of the subsidy, which minimizes the implementer's cost and maximizes uptake, is not clear and
463 likely differs for each household, depending on the total cost of the hardware, the household's financial
464 status, and the household's willingness to pay (Peletz et al. 2017). Appropriately targeting subsidies is
465 difficult as different classification methods identify different households as "poor" (Pu et al. 2024).
466 Additionally, households that would benefit from financial subsidies may also need other types of
467 support (such as gender and inclusion initiatives) to harness the long-term benefits of sanitation and
468 other programs (Chambers 1983).

469 **Poultry feces presence and disposal**

470 Following the intervention, over 80% of households had no uncontained feces observed inside the
471 house compared to 54% at baseline. The presence of feces inside the house was not associated with the
472 confinement of all poultry outside the house at night or with access to a shed. Even in households where
473 poultry were confined at night in a shed outside, they still roamed freely during the day. The
474 intervention also had no impact on the presence of uncontained feces on the veranda or in the
475 courtyard, suggesting that improvement of conditions inside the house was associated with the
476 recommendation to pick up feces immediately after they are seen. Since this task requires substantial
477 attention and time from the primary poultry raiser, it makes sense that she might choose to focus her
478 efforts only on the inside of the house.

479 The studies in Ethiopia and Uganda suggest that poultry housing is associated with a lower prevalence
480 and/or count of (presumably, uncontained) feces inside the house or outside in domestic spaces, but
481 details on where feces were observed are insufficient to identify why this difference may have been
482 observed. In Ethiopia, enclosed poultry housing was associated with 1.83 times the odds of having no
483 feces observed outside the enclosure; poultry housing that was 1 to <4 meters from the house was also
484 associated with 1.56 times the odds of no observed feces (Passarelli et al. 2021). In Uganda, 50% of
485 households with an enclosure had no feces observed outside the enclosure compared to 39% of
486 households that had no enclosure (Lowe et al. 2022). Conversely, of the 84% of households that had
487 free-roaming poultry, 62% had observed poultry feces compared to 29% of households that had no free-
488 roaming poultry; it is unclear if these differences are statistically significant.

489 We encouraged primary poultry raisers to thoroughly scrape animal feces off the ground using a garden
490 hoe with the hope that this would reduce fecal contamination of the underlying and nearby soil. We did
491 not recommend the use of a modified hoe developed specifically for the purposes of animal feces
492 removal (Sultana et al. 2013), but even this modified hoe had low uptake when implemented as part of
493 a multi-component water, sanitation, and hygiene intervention in rural Bangladesh (Parvez et al. 2018).

494 The percentage of households that had a specific pit for disposing of poultry feces away from the
495 children's reach increased 44 percentage points from baseline to endline. If used consistently, disposing
496 of feces in such a pit may reduce children's exposure to poultry feces. However, heavy monsoon rains
497 could flood a feces disposal pit, compost pile, or trash pile or spread fecal across the domestic
498 environment. Fecal matter leaking out of or overflowing from disposal locations into the domestic
499 environment could explain the increased rates of environmental contamination and diarrhea observed
500 following heavy rains (Niven et al. 2023; Nguyen et al. 2024; Mertens et al. 2024). On-site feces
501 containment approaches that are resilient to the weather and climate-sensitive include elevated pit
502 latrines or septic tanks, latrines, twin pit latrines with urine diversion, composting toilets, urine-diverting
503 dry toilets, elevated movable plastic drums, constructed wetland systems, and conventional flush toilets
504 with a biogas system (Borges Pedro et al. 2020). However, these would not allow for beneficial uses of
505 poultry feces, such as fertilizer and fish feed.

506 Potential for health impact

507 While we did not collect data on the prevalence or incidence of diarrhea or other health outcomes, we
508 hypothesize that children had reduced exposure to poultry feces and associated *Campylobacter*. While
509 the intervention did not change the percentage of households that had uncontained feces in the
510 courtyard or veranda, it substantially increased the percentage of households that had no uncontained
511 feces inside the household dwelling. Given that young children in rural Bangladesh are inside about half
512 of their waking hours (Kwong et al. 2016), this reduction in daytime (and nighttime) indoor exposure
513 could result in long-term health improvements if the behavior change was sustained. However, it is also
514 possible that increased confinement had no effect on child health. In a randomized controlled trial in
515 Ethiopia that distributed genetically improved chickens and basic husbandry guidance, households in
516 intervention villages were more likely than households in control villages to have a chicken coop, have a
517 coop separated from the house, and have a coop where chickens were confined at both 9 and 18
518 months after the intervention. However, the intervention had no impact on the 2-week prevalence of
519 diarrhea, vomiting, fever, or anthropometry at endline (Passarelli et al. 2020). Similarly, in a study
520 conducted in Bangladesh, a homestead food production program with poultry and food hygiene
521 intervention improved ownership of poultry sheds and post intervention among poultry owners, 75%
522 used the shed for poultry, but the intervention had no impact on 1-week diarrhea prevalence
523 (Lambrecht, Waid, et al. 2023; Lambrecht, Müller-Hauser, et al. 2023). Additionally, it is possible that
524 corralling the chickens contributed to worse health outcomes despite the reduced presence of feces
525 indoors because children could have been exposed to a high density of confined feces if they entered
526 the shed. While the average distance from the house to the shed was 15 steps (approximately 10 m) in
527 our study, 36% of respondents reported observing their <5-year-old children entering the shed at least
528 once in the past month. In a randomized controlled trial in peri-urban Peru, households corralling
529 chickens doubled the incidence of *Campylobacter*-associated diarrhea and in households with >20
530 chickens, the incidence increased by seven-fold (Oberhelman et al. 2006). The authors speculate these
531 adverse health outcomes were because sheds were built on household verandas, making it easy for
532 children to frequently enter the shed, and household members that cleaned the sheds may not have
533 adequately washed their hands afterwards given water scarcity in the community. Given the range of
534 these findings, further research on the impact of poultry housing variations on children's exposure to
535 *Campylobacter* and diarrheal outcomes is needed to establish the contexts in which corralling is most
536 beneficial and to determine factors affecting the sustainability of behavior change and outdoor coops.

537 Limitations

538 A primary limitation of this pilot study is that it did not have a control group. As such, the trends we
539 observed could have been due to changes over time rather than the intervention. However, given that
540 there were only 3 months between intervention and follow-up, we do not expect to see such large
541 prevalence differences due to time trends alone. While we conducted spot-checks to gather data on the
542 presence of poultry confinement structures, soap and water at handwashing stations, and feces disposal
543 locations, we relied on self-reported handwashing and feces disposal behaviors, and past studies have
544 shown that people tend to over-report behaviors that correspond to the prescriptive norm (Contzen, De

545 Pasquale, and Mosler 2015). Following the baseline survey and prior to initiation of the intervention,
546 Bangladesh imposed nationwide lockdowns due to COVID-19; these lockdowns produced considerable
547 economic hardship (Shahadat, Siddiquee, and Faruk 2020). An even greater percentage of households
548 may construct improved poultry sheds in non-pandemic contexts. In addition, budget constraints limited
549 both the sample size and duration of follow-up, constraining our ability to infer causal mechanisms and
550 assess sustainability.

551 Conclusion

552 The Neighborhood-based Environmental Assessment and Planning (NEAP) intervention successfully
553 encouraged poultry-raising households to construct poultry sheds, confine poultry outside of the
554 household dwelling at night, limit poultry feces from indoor living spaces, and wash hands at key times.
555 Both households that did and did not receive a monetary subsidy constructed improved sheds. While
556 almost all courtyards still had uncontained feces from poultry scavenging for food during the day,
557 children's overall exposure to poultry feces may have been reduced by the cleaner indoor environment
558 and increased handwashing with soap. Future research could assess if this intervention and approach is
559 able to create sustained use of poultry night sheds, handwashing at key times, and cleaning of indoor
560 spaces. If so, further work could assess the impact of the intervention on clinical and subclinical
561 *Campylobacter* infections and linear growth among young children.

562 Acknowledgments

563 The authors thank all the study participants for their cooperation during the study. The authors
564 acknowledge the contribution of the community hygiene promoters during the intervention delivery
565 and enumerators during the baseline and end line surveys. icddr,b is grateful to the Governments of
566 Bangladesh and Canada for providing core support.

567 This research was supported by USAID funding through WASHPaLS (USAID contract AID-OAA-I-14-
568 00068/AID-OAA-TO-16-0016). This study was made possible by the support of the American People
569 through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this
570 manuscript are the sole responsibility of authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the
571 United States Government. The funders played no part in study design, data analysis, or publication of
572 peer-reviewed results. The funder did require a final report and some of the content of this manuscript
573 is similar to that presented in the final report (USAID and International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease
574 Research, Bangladesh 2021); all content has been used with permission.

575 References

- 576 Al-Kerwi, Mohammad Mahdi Saleh, Omar Mardenli, Mohammed Rasoul Mahdi Jasim, and Moustafa Abed
577 Al-Majeed. 2022. "Effects of Harmful Gases Emitted from Poultry Houses on Productive and
578 Health Performance." *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 1060 (1): 012082.
579 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1060/1/012082>.
- 580 Amour, Caroline, Jean Gratz, Estomih Mduma, Erling Svensen, Elizabeth T. Rogawski, Monica McGrath,
581 Jessica C. Seidman, et al. 2016. "Epidemiology and Impact of *Campylobacter* Infection in Children
582 in 8 Low-Resource Settings: Results From the MAL-ED Study." *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, August,
583 ciw542. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciw542>.
- 584 Birhanu, Mulugeta Y, Richard Osei-Amponsah, Frederick Yeboah Obese, and Taddelle Dessie. 2023.
585 "Smallholder Poultry Production in the Context of Increasing Global Food Prices: Roles in Poverty
586 Reduction and Food Security." *Animal Frontiers* 13 (1): 17–25.
587 <https://doi.org/10.1093/af/vfac069>.
- 588 Bist, Ramesh Bahadur, Sachin Subedi, Lilong Chai, Prafulla Regmi, Casey W. Ritz, Woo Kyun Kim, and Xiao
589 Yang. 2023. "Effects of Perching on Poultry Welfare and Production: A Review." *Poultry* 2 (2):
590 134–57. <https://doi.org/10.3390/poultry2020013>.
- 591 Borges Pedro, João Paulo, Cássio Augusto Da Silva Oliveira, Sonaly Cristina Rezende Borges De Lima, and
592 Marcos Von Sperling. 2020. "A Review of Sanitation Technologies for Flood-Prone Areas." *Journal*
593 *of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development* 10 (3): 397–412.
594 <https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2020.019>.
- 595 Cameron, Lisa, Paulo Santos, Milan Thomas, and Jeff Albert. 2021. "Sanitation, Financial Incentives and
596 Health Spillovers: A Cluster Randomised Trial." *Journal of Health Economics* 77 (May):102456.
597 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2021.102456>.
- 598 Chambers, Robert. 1983. *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. London: Routledge.
599 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835815>.
- 600 Contzen, Nadja, Sandra De Pasquale, and Hans-Joachim Mosler. 2015. "Over-Reporting in Handwashing
601 Self-Reports: Potential Explanatory Factors and Alternative Measurements." Edited by John Conly.
602 *PLOS ONE* 10 (8): e0136445. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0136445>.
- 603 Desai, Amy, Laura E. Smith, Mduduzi N. N. Mbuya, Ancikaria Chigumira, Dadirai Fundira, Naume V.
604 Tavengwa, Thokozile R. Malaba, Florence D. Majo, Jean H. Humphrey, and Rebecca J. Stoltzfus.
605 2015. "The SHINE Trial Infant Feeding Intervention: Pilot Study of Effects on Maternal Learning
606 and Infant Diet Quality in Rural Zimbabwe." *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 61 (suppl 7): S710–15.
607 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/civ846>.
- 608 Dolberg, Frands. 2007. "Poultry Production for Livelihood Improvement and Poverty Alleviation." In
609 *Poultry in the 21st Century: Avian Influenza and Beyond*. FAO Animal Production and Health
610 Proceedings. Bangkok.
- 611 Dreibelbis, Robert, Peter J. Winch, Elli Leontsini, Kristyna RS Hulland, Pavani K. Ram, Leanne Unicomb, and
612 Stephen P. Luby. 2013. "The Integrated Behavioural Model for Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene: A
613 Systematic Review of Behavioural Models and a Framework for Designing and Evaluating
614 Behaviour Change Interventions in Infrastructure-Restricted Settings." *BMC Public Health* 13 (1):
615 1015. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-13-1015>.
- 616 El-Tras, W. F., H. R. Holt, A. A. Tayel, and N. N. El-Kady. 2015. "*Campylobacter* Infections in Children
617 Exposed to Infected Backyard Poultry in Egypt." *Epidemiology and Infection* 143 (2): 308–15.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095026881400096X>.
- 619 Food and Agriculture Organization. 2004. "Small-Scale Poultry Production." Rome: Food and Agriculture
620 Organization. <https://www.fao.org/4/y5169e/y5169e00.htm#Contents>.

- 621 Garn, Joshua V., Gloria D. Sclar, Matthew C. Freeman, Gauthami Penakalapati, Kelly T. Alexander, Patrick
622 Brooks, Eva A. Rehfuess, Sophie Boisson, Kate O. Medlicott, and Thomas F. Clasen. 2017. "The
623 Impact of Sanitation Interventions on Latrine Coverage and Latrine Use: A Systematic Review and
624 Meta-Analysis." *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* 220 (2): 329–40.
625 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2016.10.001>.
- 626 George, Christine Marie, Lauren Oldja, Gwenyth O. Lee, Shwapon Biswas, Jamie Perin, Gwenyth O. Lee,
627 Margaret Kosek, et al. 2015. "Geophagy Is Associated with Environmental Enteropathy and
628 Stunting in Children in Rural Bangladesh." *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*
629 92 (6): 1117–24. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.14-0672>.
- 630 Guiteras, Raymond, James Levinsohn, and Ahmed Mushfiq Mobarak. 2015. "Encouraging Sanitation
631 Investment in the Developing World: A Cluster-Randomized Trial." *Science* 348 (6237): 903–6.
632 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa0491>.
- 633 Headey, Derek, and Kalle Hirvonen. 2016. "Is Exposure to Poultry Harmful to Child Nutrition? An
634 Observational Analysis for Rural Ethiopia." Edited by Jacobus van Wouwe. *PLOS ONE* 11 (8):
635 e0160590. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0160590>.
- 636 Headey, Derek, Phuong Nguyen, Sunny Kim, Rahul Rawat, Marie Ruel, and Purnima Menon. 2017. "Is
637 Exposure to Animal Feces Harmful to Child Nutrition and Health Outcomes? A Multicountry
638 Observational Analysis." *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 96 (4): 961–69.
639 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.16-0270>.
- 640 Hossain, Khobair, Sharon Hwang, Md. Mahbubur Rahman, and Elli Leontsini. 2020. "Developing a
641 Household Environmental Assessment and Planning (HEAP) Tool for Hygienic Behavior Change."
642 In *15th Asian Conference on Diarrhoeal Disease and Nutrition (ASCODD 2020)*. Dhaka,
643 Bangladesh.
- 644 Jenkins, Marion W., and Steven Sugden. 2006. "Rethinking Sanitation – Lessons and Innovation for
645 Sustainability and Success in the New Millennium." Occasional Paper. Human Development
646 Report. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- 647 Kaakoush, Nadeem O., Natalia Castaño-Rodríguez, Hazel M. Mitchell, and Si Ming Man. 2015. "Global
648 Epidemiology of Campylobacter Infection." *Clinical Microbiology Reviews* 28 (3): 687–720.
649 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00006-15>.
- 650 Kaur, Maneet, Jay P. Graham, and Joseph N. S. Eisenberg. 2017. "Livestock Ownership among Rural
651 Households and Child Morbidity and Mortality: An Analysis of Demographic Health Survey Data
652 from 30 Sub-Saharan African Countries (2005–2015)." *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine
653 and Hygiene*, January, 16–0664. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.16-0664>.
- 654 Kohlitz, Jeremy, and Ruhil Iyer. 2021. "Rural Sanitation and Climate Change: Putting Ideas into Practice."
655 The Sanitation Learning Hub, Institute of Development Studies.
656 <https://doi.org/10.19088/SLH.2021.002>.
- 657 Kotloff, Karen L., James P. Nataro, William C. Blackwelder, Dilruba Nasrin, Tamer H. Farag, Sandra
658 Panchalingam, Yukun Wu, et al. 2013. "Burden and Aetiology of Diarrhoeal Disease in Infants and
659 Young Children in Developing Countries (the Global Enteric Multicenter Study, GEMS): A
660 Prospective, Case-Control Study." *The Lancet* 382 (9888): 209–22.
661 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)60844-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60844-2).
- 662 Kwong, Laura H., Ayse Ercumen, Amy Pickering, Leanne Unicomb, Jennifer Davis, and Stephen Luby. 2016.
663 "Hand- and Object-Mouthing of Rural Bangladeshi Children 3–18 Months Old." *International
664 Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 13 (6): 563.
665 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13060563>.
- 666 Lambrecht, Nathalie J, Anna A Müller-Hauser, Shafinaz Sobhan, Wolf-Peter Schmidt, Tarique Md Nurul
667 Huda, Jillian L Waid, Amanda S Wendt, Abdul Kader, and Sabine Gabrysch. 2023. "Effect of a
668 Homestead Food Production Program on the Prevalence of Diarrhea and Acute Respiratory

- 669 Infection in Children in Sylhet, Bangladesh: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial.” *The American*
670 *Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 109 (4): 945–56. [https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.23-](https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.23-0152)
671 0152.
- 672 Lambrecht, Nathalie J., Jillian L. Waid, Amanda S. Wendt, Shafinaz Sobhan, Abdul Kader, and Sabine
673 Gabrysch. 2023. “Impact of a Homestead Food Production Program on Poultry Rearing and Egg
674 Consumption: A Cluster-randomized Controlled Trial in Bangladesh.” *Maternal & Child Nutrition*
675 19 (3): e13505. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13505>.
- 676 Li, Meng, Xiuli Wei, Youzhi Li, Tao Feng, Linlin Jiang, Hongwei Zhu, Xin Yu, et al. 2020. “PM2.5 in Poultry
677 Houses Synergizes with *Pseudomonas Aeruginosa* to Aggravate Lung Inflammation in Mice
678 through the NF- κ B Pathway.” *Journal of Veterinary Science* 21 (3): e46.
679 <https://doi.org/10.4142/jvs.2020.21.e46>.
- 680 Lowe, Jeremy, Ayse Ercumen, Chris Prottas, and Angela R. Harris. 2022. “Exploring the Determinants and
681 Indicators of Poultry Feces Management Behaviors in Rural Western Uganda.” *Science of The*
682 *Total Environment* 834 (August):155202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155202>.
- 683 Matilla, Francisco, Yael Velleman, Wendy Harrison, and Mandy Nevel. 2018. “Animal Influence on Water,
684 Sanitation and Hygiene Measures for Zoonosis Control at the Household Level: A Systematic
685 Literature Review.” Edited by Claudia Munoz-Zanzi. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 12 (7):
686 e0006619. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006619>.
- 687 Mertens, Andrew, Benjamin F Arnold, Jade Benjamin-Chung, Alexandria B Boehm, Joe Brown, Drew
688 Capone, Thomas Clasen, et al. 2024. “Is Detection of Enteropathogens and Human or Animal
689 Faecal Markers in the Environment Associated with Subsequent Child Enteric Infections and
690 Growth: An Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis.” *The Lancet Global Health* 12 (3): e433–44.
691 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(23\)00563-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00563-6).
- 692 Moore, Catrin E., Kristin Elwin, Nget Phot, Chanthou Seng, Saroeun Mao, Kuong Suy, Varun Kumar, et al.
693 2016. “Molecular Characterization of *Cryptosporidium* Species and *Giardia Duodenalis* from
694 Symptomatic Cambodian Children.” Edited by James S McCarthy. *PLOS Neglected Tropical*
695 *Diseases* 10 (7): e0004822. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0004822>.
- 696 Morgan, Robert O., Carolee A. DeVito, Judy A. Stevens, Christine M. Branche, Beth A. Virnig, Phyllis A.
697 Wingo, and Richard W. Sattin. 2005. “A Self-Assessment Tool Was Reliable in Identifying Hazards
698 in the Homes of Elders.” *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 58 (12): 1252.e1-1252.e21.
699 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2005.04.001>.
- 700 Nguyen, Anna T., Jessica A. Grembi, Marie Riviere, Gabriella Barratt Heitmann, William D. Hutson, Tejas S.
701 Athni, Arusha Patil, et al. 2024. “Influence of Temperature and Precipitation on the Effectiveness
702 of Water, Sanitation, and Handwashing Interventions against Childhood Diarrheal Disease in Rural
703 Bangladesh: A Reanalysis of the WASH Benefits Bangladesh Trial.” *Environmental Health*
704 *Perspectives* 132 (4): 047006. <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP13807>.
- 705 Niven, Caitlin, Mahfuza Islam, Anna Nguyen, Andrew Mertens, Amy J. Pickering, Laura H. Kwong, Mahfuja
706 Alam, et al. 2023. “Effects of Weather Extremes on Fecal Contamination along Pathogen
707 Transmission Pathways in Rural Bangladeshi Households.”
708 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.27.23300582>.
- 709 Nyati, Kishan Kumar, and Roopanshi Nyati. 2013. “Role of *Campylobacter Jejuni* Infection in the
710 Pathogenesis of Guillain-Barré Syndrome: An Update.” *BioMed Research International* 2013:1–13.
711 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/852195>.
- 712 Oberhelman, Richard A., Robert H. Gilman, Patricia Sheen, Julianna Cordova, Mirko Zimic, Lilia Cabrera,
713 Rina Meza, and Juan Perez. 2006. “An Intervention-Control Study of Corraling of Free-Ranging
714 Chickens to Control *Campylobacter* Infections among Children in a Peruvian Periurban
715 Shantytown.” *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 74 (6): 1054–59.

- 716 Parvez, Sarker Masud, Rashidul Azad, Mahbubur Rahman, Leanne Unicomb, Pavani K. Ram, Abu Mohd
717 Naser, Christine P. Stewart, et al. 2018. "Achieving Optimal Technology and Behavioral Uptake of
718 Single and Combined Interventions of Water, Sanitation Hygiene and Nutrition, in an Efficacy Trial
719 (WASH Benefits) in Rural Bangladesh." *Trials* 19 (December). [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-018-2710-8)
720 018-2710-8.
- 721 Passarelli, Simone, Ramya Ambikapathi, Nilupa S Gunaratna, Isabel Madzorera, Chelsey R Canavan,
722 Abdallah R Noor, Amare Worku, et al. 2020. "A Chicken Production Intervention and Additional
723 Nutrition Behavior Change Component Increased Child Growth in Ethiopia: A Cluster-Randomized
724 Trial." *The Journal of Nutrition* 150 (10): 2806–17. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxaa181>.
- 725 Passarelli, Simone, Ramya Ambikapathi, Nilupa S. Gunaratna, Isabel Madzorera, Chelsey R. Canavan,
726 Ramadhani Abdallah Noor, Dagmawit Tewahido, et al. 2021. "The Role of Chicken Management
727 Practices in Children's Exposure to Environmental Contamination: A Mixed-Methods Analysis."
728 *BMC Public Health* 21 (1): 1097. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-11025-y>.
- 729 Peletz, Rachel, Alicea Cock-Esteb, Dorothea Ysenburg, Salim Haji, Ranjiv Khush, and Pascaline Dupas.
730 2017. "Supply and Demand for Improved Sanitation: Results from Randomized Pricing
731 Experiments in Rural Tanzania." *Environmental Science & Technology* 51 (12): 7138–47.
732 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b03846>.
- 733 Penakalapati, Gauthami, Jenna Swarthout, Miranda J. Delahoy, Lydia McAliley, Breanna Wodnik, Karen
734 Levy, and Matthew C. Freeman. 2017. "Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A
735 Systematic Review and Proposed Research Priorities." *Environmental Science & Technology* 51
736 (20): 11537–52. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b02811>.
- 737 Pickering, Amy J, Habiba Djebbari, Carolina Lopez, Massa Coulibaly, and Maria Laura Alzua. 2015. "Effect
738 of a Community-Led Sanitation Intervention on Child Diarrhoea and Child Growth in Rural Mali: A
739 Cluster-Randomised Controlled Trial." *The Lancet Global Health* 3 (11): e701–11.
740 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(15\)00144-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(15)00144-8).
- 741 Platts-Mills, James A, Jie Liu, Elizabeth T Rogawski, Furqan Kabir, Paphavee Lertsethtakarn, Mery Siguas,
742 Shaila S Khan, et al. 2018. "Use of Quantitative Molecular Diagnostic Methods to Assess the
743 Aetiology, Burden, and Clinical Characteristics of Diarrhoea in Children in Low-Resource Settings:
744 A Reanalysis of the MAL-ED Cohort Study." *The Lancet Global Health* 6 (12): e1309–18.
745 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(18\)30349-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30349-8).
- 746 Pu, Christine J., Eric F. Lambin, Ian Kusimakwe, Lenny Gichia, Assefa Seme, Easmon Otupiri, and Jennifer
747 Davis. 2024. "How Poverty Is Measured Impacts Who Gets Classified as Impoverished."
748 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121 (7): e2316730121.
749 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2316730121>.
- 750 Robinson, Andrew, and Michael Gnilo. 2016. "Chapter 9: Beyond ODF: A Phased Approach to Rural
751 Sanitation Development." In *Sustainable Sanitation for All: Experiences, Challenges, and*
752 *Innovations*, edited by Petra Bongartz, Naomi Vernon, and John Fox, 155. PRACTICAL ACTION
753 PUBLISHING. <https://doi.org/10.3362/9781780449272>.
- 754 Shahadat, Muhammad, Hossain Siddiquee, and Avinno Faruk. 2020. "COVID-19's Impact on the
755 Bangladesh Economy." 59. Macroeconomics Series. BRAC Institute of Governance & Development.
- 756 Shanta, I. S., Md. A. Hasnat, N. Zeidner, E. S. Gurley, E. Azziz-Baumgartner, M. A. Y. Sharker, K. Hossain, et
757 al. 2017. "Raising Backyard Poultry in Rural Bangladesh: Financial and Nutritional Benefits, but
758 Persistent Risky Practices." *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases* 64 (5): 1454–64.
759 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.12536>.
- 760 Sultana, Rebeca, Utpal K. Mondal, Nadia Ali Rimi, Leanne Unicomb, Peter J. Winch, Nazmun Nahar, and
761 Stephen P. Luby. 2013. "An Improved Tool for Household Faeces Management in Rural
762 Bangladeshi Communities." *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 18 (7): 854–60.
763 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.12103>.

- 764 Sultana, Rebeca, Nazmun Nahar, Nadia Rimi, Shamim Azad, Md. Saiful Islam, Emily Gurley, and Stephen
765 Luby. 2012. "Backyard Poultry Raising in Bangladesh: A Valued Resource for the Villagers and a
766 Setting for Zoonotic Transmission of Avian Influenza. A Qualitative Study." *Rural and Remote*
767 *Health*, September. <https://doi.org/10.22605/RRH1927>.
- 768 Thomas, Elizabeth. "Hens, housing, and hygiene: formative research in rural Bangladesh for interventions
769 to separate young children from poultry and poultry feces". Johns Hopkins University; 2021.
- 770 Tomita, Machiko R., Sumandee Saharan, Sheela Rajendran, Susan M. Nochajski, and Jo A. Schweitzer.
771 2014. "Psychometrics of the Home Safety Self-Assessment Tool (HSSAT) to Prevent Falls in
772 Community-Dwelling Older Adults." *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 68 (6): 711–
773 18. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2014.010801>.
- 774 USAID and International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh. 2021. "Household Problem-
775 Solving to Reduce Children's Exposure to Poultry Feces. Phase II Final Report." Washington, D.C.:
776 Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Partnerships and Learning for Sustainability (WASHPaLS) Project.
- 777 Venkataramanan, Vidya, Jonny Crocker, Andrew Karon, and Jamie Bartram. 2018. "Community-Led Total
778 Sanitation: A Mixed-Methods Systematic Review of Evidence and Its Quality." *Environmental*
779 *Health Perspectives* 126 (2): 026001. <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP1965>.
- 780 Weaver, William D. 2002. "Poultry Housing." In *Commercial Chicken Meat and Egg Production*, edited by
781 Donald D. Bell and William D. Weaver, 101–11. Boston, MA: Springer US.
782 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-0811-3_8.
- 783 Wendt, Amanda S, Thalia M Sparling, Jillian L Waid, Anna A Mueller, and Sabine Gabrysch. 2019. "Food
784 and Agricultural Approaches to Reducing Malnutrition (FAARM): Protocol for a Cluster-
785 Randomised Controlled Trial to Evaluate the Impact of a Homestead Food Production Programme
786 on Undernutrition in Rural Bangladesh." *BMJ Open* 9 (7): e031037.
787 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031037>.
- 788 Zambrano, Laura D., Karen Levy, Neia P. Menezes, and Matthew C. Freeman. 2014. "Human Diarrhea
789 Infections Associated with Domestic Animal Husbandry: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis."
790 *Transactions of The Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 108 (6): 313–25.
791 <https://doi.org/10.1093/trstmh/tru056>.

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800 Table 1: Characteristics of the study population at baseline (February 2020)

Indicators	Non-subsidy arm (n = 42) % or Mean ± SD	Subsidy arm (n = 38) % or Mean ± SD	Total (n = 80) % or Mean ± SD
Status of the respondent			
Female	100%	100%	100%
Has child 6-59 months of age	50%	58%	54%
Average number of individuals in the household	4.0 ± 1.4	4.3 ± 1.4	4.1 ± 1.4
Average number of households in the compound	3.9 ± 1.6	3.0 ± 1.1	3.5 ± 1.4
Survey respondent's mean age (years)	37 ± 14	35 ± 12	36 ± 13
Survey respondent's formal education (years)			
No formal education	43%	42%	43%
1-5 years	36%	34%	35%
6-10 years	19%	24%	21%
More than 10 years	2.4%	0%	1.3%
Primary occupation of the main earning member of the household (top 6)			
Day/unskilled laborer (domestic, agricultural, or migrant work within the country)	33%	26%	30%
Work on own farm or as a sharecropper	24%	24%	24%
Rickshaw/Van puller/Boat driver	21%	5.3%	14%
Skilled worker other than carpenter/carpenter (long term contracted laborer)	0%	18%	8.8%
Business owner	9.5%	7.9%	8.8%
Carpenter/carpenter	2.4%	7.9%	5.0%
Has access to an improved latrine ^a	67%	55%	61%
Household assets			
Has electricity (including solar)	100%	95%	98%
Television (functional)	4.8%	21%	13%
Refrigerator (functional)	2.4%	7.9%	5.0%
Mobile phone	88%	95%	91%
Smartphone	36%	16%	26%
Household poultry ownership			
Chickens (any age)	100%	100%	100%
Average number of chickens (any age) per household	8.8 ± 7.0	8.5 ± 7.9	8.6 ± 7.4
Healthy ^b adult chickens (>2 months age)	86%	92%	89%
Sick ^c adult chickens (>2 months age)	0%	5.3%	2.5%
Egg-laying chickens	50%	55%	53%
Healthy chicks (<2 months age)	64%	50%	58%
Sick chicks (<2 months age)	14%	11%	13%
Ducks (any age)	21%	63%	41%
Average number of ducks (any age) per household	0.48 ± 1.1	3.0 ± 3.8	1.7 ± 3.0

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

Household ruminant ownership

Pigeons	0%	11%	5%
Bulls/milk cows/buffaloes	26%	61%	43%
Goats/sheep	29%	34%	31%

^a Improved toilet according to JMP: Flush or pour-flush to - piped sewer system, septic tank, pit toilet, ventilated improved pit (VIP) toilet, pit toilet with slab, composting toilet, pit latrine with slab, no bucket and/or hanging toilet

^b Self-reported by the respondent: Poultry (adult chicken/chick/adult duck/duckling) with no sign symptom of a disease

^c Self-reported by the respondent: Poultry (adult chicken/chick/adult duck/duckling) with sign symptom of a disease (e.g., fever, convulsion, pox, diarrhea, vomiting)

802 Table 2: Impacts of the Neighborhood-based Environmental Assessment and Planning
 803 intervention to reduce the prevalence of poultry sleeping indoors at night and reduce the
 804 presence of poultry fecal matter in the household environment

Indicators	Baseline (n = 79) % (n)	Endline (n = 79) % (n)	Prevalence difference (baseline to endline) pp (95% CI)
Percent of households reported confined all poultry outside the living space at night	n = 79 2.5%	n = 77 33%	30pp (19, 41)
Poultry housing			
Percent of households that had any shed	17%	67%	50pp (40, 62)
Percent of households with access to an improved ^a shed located in courtyard	0	58% (46)	58pp (47, 69)
Percent of households with ownership of an improved shed ^b located in courtyard	0	54% (43)	54pp (43, 66)
Percent of households has access to handwashing station with water and soap/soapy water	35%	46%	10pp (-4.7, 25)
Percent of primary poultry raisers reported washing hands with soap and water after the following events			
After defecation	77%	66%	-10pp (-23, 2.4)
After cleaning child feces	9.0%	11%	2.5pp (-6.1, 11)
Before eating	21%	48%	28pp (14, 42)
Before serving food	0%	3.8%	3.8pp (-0.44, 8.0)
Before preparing food	5.1%	60%	54pp (43, 66)
After handling poultry feces	14%	65%	51pp (37, 64)
After feeding poultry/ handling poultry or poultry products	1.3%	44%	43pp (32, 55)
After handling other animal feces	19%	34%	15pp (4.5, 26)
Uncontained poultry feces piles observed inside the household dwelling			
No feces pile	n = 79 54%	n = 78 81%	26pp (12, 41)
1-25 feces piles	42%	17%	-25pp (-40, -11)
>25 feces piles	3.8%	2.7%	-1.2pp (-6.8, 4.3)
Uncontained poultry feces piles observed in the veranda			
No feces pile	n = 60 33%	n = 61 39%	6.0pp (-11, 23)
1-25 feces piles	58%	54%	-4.2pp (-21, 13)
>25 feces pile	8.3%	6.6%	-1.8pp (-5.1, 1.5)
Uncontained poultry feces piles observed in the courtyard ^c			
No feces pile	n = 79 0	n = 77 1.3%	1.3pp (-1.2, 3.8)
1-25 feces piles	15%	13%	-2.2pp (-12, 7.9)
>25 feces pile	85%	86%	0.90pp (-9.5, 11)
Poultry feces disposal sites (spot-check confirmed)			
Specific place	20%	65%	44pp (31, 58)

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

Used as a fertilizer in crop field or garden	47%	20%	-27pp (-39, -15)
Bush or jungle	35%	6.3%	-29pp (-41, -17)
Drain or ditch	18%	3.8%	-14pp (-23, -4.8)
Area beyond the courtyard	1.3%	7.6%	6.3pp (-0.13, 13)
Water bodies (pond/lake)	0%	1.3%	1.3pp (-1.2, 3.8)

805 ^a An outdoor, multi-compartment poultry night-shed with cross-ventilation that is elevated off the ground

806 ^b Three households had access to an improved shed which were owned by other households of the same
807 compound

808 ^c During endline, in two households of the non-subsidy arm, the enumerators could not access the courtyard to
809 observe and count the poultry feces

810 Table 3: Impacts of the Neighborhood-based Environmental Assessment and Planning intervention to reduce the prevalence of
 811 poultry sleeping indoors at night and reduce the presence of poultry fecal matter in the household environment, by study arm

Indicators	Baseline (%)		Endline (%)		Prevalence Difference (baseline to endline)		Effect size (difference-in-differences) pp (95% CI)
	Non-subsidy (n = 42) ^a	Subsidy (n = 37)	Non-subsidy (n = 42)	Subsidy (n = 37)	Non-subsidy pp (95% CI)	Subsidy pp (95% CI)	
Percent of households reported confined all poultry outside the living space at night	2.4%	2.6%	27%	39%	25pp (11, 33)	36pp (19, 54)	12pp (-10, 34)
Poultry housing			n = 41	n = 36			
Percent of households that had any shed	36%	41%	48%	89%	12pp (9.3, 33)	49pp (30, 68)	37pp (8.0, 66)
Percent of households that had an improved shed ^b in the courtyard	0	0	33%	87%	33pp (19, 48)	87pp (75, 98)	53pp (35, 72)
Percent of households with ownership of an improved shed ^c located in courtyard	0	0	29%	84%	29pp (15, 42)	84pp (72, 96)	55pp (37, 74)
Percent of households has access to handwashing station with water and soap/soapy water	41%	30%	41%	51%	0.0 (-20, 20)	22pp (-0.04, 43)	22pp (-7.7, 51)
Percent of primary poultry raisers reported washing hands with soap and water after the following events	n = 42	n = 36					
After defecation	83%	69%	79%	51%	-4.8pp (-18, 8.5)	-16pp (-38, 5.9)	-12pp (-37, 14)
After cleaning child feces	12%	5.6%	12%	11%	0.0 (-13, 13)	5.4pp (-5.2, 16)	5.4pp (-12, 22)
Before eating	26%	14%	55%	41%	29pp (8.2, 49)	27pp (7.4, 47)	-1.5pp (-30, 27)
Before serving food	0	0	2.4%	5.4%	2.4pp (-2.3, 7.1)	5.4pp (-2.0, 13)	3.0pp (-5.5, 12)
Before preparing food	7.1%	2.8%	67%	51%	60pp (43, 76)	49pp (32, 65)	-11pp (-34, 12)
After handling poultry feces	12%	17%	55%	76%	43pp (24, 62)	60pp (40, 79)	17pp (-10, 44)

After feeding poultry/ handling poultry or poultry products	2.4%	0	33%	57%	31pp (15, 47)	57pp (41, 73)	26pp (3.4, 48)
After handling other animal feces	7.1%	33%	19%	51%	12pp (-2.0, 22)	19pp (-0.94, 39)	7.0pp (-15, 29)
Uncontained poultry feces piles observed in the household dwelling							
No feces pile	50%	60%	85%	77%	35pp (17, 54)	16pp (-7.2, 40)	-19pp (-49, 11)
1-25 feces piles	45%	38%	12%	22%	-33pp (-52, -14)	-16pp (-38, 5.9)	17pp (-12, 46)
>25 feces piles	4.8%	2.7%	2.4%	2.7%	-2.3pp (-11, 5.8)	0.0 (-7.6, 7.6)	2.3pp (-8.8, 13)
Uncontained poultry feces piles observed in the veranda	n = 35	n = 25	n = 35	n = 26			
No feces pile	43%	20%	46%	31%	2.9pp (-23, 28)	11pp (-8.9, 30)	7.9pp (-24, 40)
1-25 feces piles	57%	60%	54%	54%	-2.9pp (-28, 23)	-6.2pp (-27, 15)	-3.3pp (-36, 30)
>25 feces piles	0	20%	0	15%	-	-4.6pp (-13, 3.3)	-4.6pp (-12, 3.2)
Uncontained poultry feces piles observed in the courtyard ^d			n = 40	n = 37			
No feces pile	0	0	0	2.7%	-	2.7pp (-2.6, 8.0)	2.7pp (-2.3, 7.7)
1-25 feces piles	21%	8.1%	13%	14%	-8.9pp (-24, 6.1)	5.4pp (-7.6, 18)	14pp (-5.4, 34)
>25 feces piles	79%	92%	88%	84%	8.9pp (-6.1, 24)	-8.1pp (-22, 5.9)	-17pp (-37, 3.3)
Percent of households dispose of poultry feces in a specific pit/trash	33%	5.4%	62%	68%	29pp (8.2, 49)	62pp (46, 78)	34pp (8.0, 59)

^a When n is different, it is presented in the table above the relevant data

^b An outdoor, multi-compartment poultry night-shed with cross-ventilation that is elevated off the ground

^c Three households had access to an improved shed which were owned by another households in the same compound

^d During endline, in two households of the non-subsidy arm, the enumerators could not access the courtyard to observe and count the poultry feces

813 Figure 1: Flow chart of study household selection, enrollment, and participation

814 Figure 2: Poster displaying recommended behaviors, shown and discussed at group meetings

Four Key Behavioral Recommendation




Figure 2

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)




Figure 1