

1 **Title:** Nitrogen dioxide exposures from LPG stoves in a cleaner-cooking intervention trial

2

3 **Authors:** Josiah L Kephart^{+ °} (1, 2), Magdalena Fandiño-Del-Rio⁺ (1, 2), Kendra N Williams (2,
4 3), Gary Malpartida (4, 5), Alexander Lee (6), Kyle Steenland (7), Luke P. Naeher (8), Gustavo
5 F. Gonzales (9, 10), Marilu Chiang (5), William Checkley* (2, 3, 12), Kirsten Koehler* (1);
6 CHAP trial Investigators[§]

7

8 1. Department of Environmental Health and Engineering, Bloomberg School of Public
9 Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA.

10 2. Center for Global Non-Communicable Disease Research and Training, School of
11 Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA.

12 3. Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University,
13 Baltimore, MD, USA.

14 4. Molecular Biology and Immunology Laboratory, Research Laboratory of Infectious
15 Diseases, Department of Cell and Molecular Sciences, Faculty of Sciences and
16 Philosophy, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Perú

17 5. Biomedical Research Unit, Asociación Benéfica PRISMA, Lima, Perú

18 6. Howard University, Washington, DC, USA

19 7. Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory
20 University, Atlanta, GA, USA

21 8. Department of Environmental Health Science, College of Public Health, The University
22 of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

- 23 9. Laboratories of Investigation and Development, Department of Biological and
24 Physiological Sciences, Faculty of Sciences and Philosophy, Universidad Peruana
25 Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Perú
- 26 10. High Altitude Research Institute, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Perú
- 27 11. Department of Biological and Physiological Sciences, Faculty of Sciences and
28 Philosophy, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Perú
- 29 12. Program in Global Disease Epidemiology and Control, Department of International
30 Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD,
31 USA.

32

33 + Joint first authors

34 ° Current address: Urban Health Collaborative, Dornsife School of Public Health, Drexel
35 University, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

36 * Joint last authors

37 § Cardiopulmonary outcomes and Household Air Pollution (CHAP) trial Investigators:

38 **Steering Committee:** William Checkley MD PhD (Johns Hopkins University,
39 Baltimore, MD, USA), Gustavo F Gonzales MD (Universidad Peruana Cayetano
40 Heredia, Lima, Peru), Luke Naeher PhD (University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA),
41 Joshua Rosenthal PhD (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA), N Kyle
42 Steenland PhD (Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA).

43 **Johns Hopkins University Investigators:** Theresa Aguilar, Vanessa Burrowes PhD,
44 Magdalena Fandiño-Del-Río PhD, Elizabeth C Fung MSPH, Dina Goodman MSPH,
45 Steven A Harvey PhD, Phabiola Herrera MD, Josiah L Kephart PhD, Kirsten Koehler

46 PhD, Alexander Lee, Kathryn A Lee MPH, Catherine H Miele MD MPH, Mitra
47 Moazzami MSPH, Lawrence H. Moulton PhD, Saachi Nangia, Carolyn O'Brien MSPH,
48 Suzanne Simkovich MD MS, Timothy Shade, Lena Stashko MSPH, Ariadne Villegas-
49 Gomez MSPH, Kendra N Williams PhD, Abigail Winiker MSPH.

50 **Asociación Benéfica PRISMA Investigators:** Marilu Chiang MD MPH, Gary
51 Malpartida, Carla Tarazona-Meza MPH.

52 **Washington University Investigators:** Victor Davila-Roman MD, Lisa de las Fuentes
53 MD.

54 **Emory University Investigators:** Dana Barr Boyd PhD, Maria Jolly MSPH, Angela
55 Rozo MS.

56

57 **Correspondence:**

58 William Checkley, MD, PhD
59 Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care
60 Johns Hopkins University
61 1830 E. Monument St Room 555
62 Baltimore, MD 21287
63 wcheckl1@jhmi.edu

64

65 **Acknowledgements**

66 Financial support for the CHAP trial was received from the Global Environmental and
67 Occupational Health, Fogarty International Center, United States National Institutes of Health
68 (U01TW010107 and U2RTW010114); the Clean Cooking Alliance of the United Nations
69 Foundation (UNF 16-810), the Johns Hopkins Center for Global Health, and the COPD

70 Discovery Fund of Johns Hopkins University. The Center for Global Non-Communicable
71 Disease Research and Training field site in Puno, Peru, also received generous support from Mr.
72 William and Bonnie Clarke III.
73
74 JLK and KNW were supported by the NIH Fogarty International Center, NINDS, NIMH,
75 NHBLI and NIEHS under NIH Research Training Grant # D43 TW009340 and the Johns
76 Hopkins Center for Global Health. JLK was also supported by the Ruth L. Kirschstein
77 Institutional National Research Service Award (5T32ES007141-33) funded by the NIH/NIEHS.
78 KNW was also supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National
79 Institutes of Health under Award Number T32HL007534. MFDR was further supported by the
80 Global Environmental and Occupational Health (GEOHealth), Fogarty International Center, and
81 by the David Leslie Swift Fund of the Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins
82 University. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily
83 represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

84

85 **Abstract**

86

87 **Background:** Liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) stoves have been promoted in low- and middle-
88 income countries (LMICs) as a clean energy alternative to biomass burning cookstoves.

89

90 **Objective:** We sought to characterize kitchen area concentrations and personal exposures to
91 nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) within a randomized controlled trial in the Peruvian Andes. The
92 intervention included the provision of an LPG stove and continuous fuel distribution with
93 behavioral messaging to maximize compliance.

94

95 **Methods:** We measured 48-hour kitchen area NO₂ concentrations at high temporal resolution in
96 homes of 50 intervention participants and 50 control participants longitudinally within a
97 biomass-to-LPG intervention trial. We also collected 48-hour mean personal exposures to NO₂
98 among a subsample of 16 intervention and 9 control participants. We monitored LPG and
99 biomass stove use continuously throughout the trial.

100

101 **Results:** In 367 post-intervention 24-hour kitchen area samples of 96 participants' homes,
102 geometric mean (GM) highest hourly NO₂ concentration was 138 ppb (geometric standard
103 deviation [GSD] 2.1) in the LPG intervention group and 450 ppb (GSD 3.1) in the biomass
104 control group. Post-intervention 24-hour mean NO₂ concentrations were a GM of 43 ppb (GSD
105 1.7) in the intervention group and 77 ppb (GSD 2.0) in the control group. Kitchen area NO₂
106 concentrations exceeded the WHO indoor hourly guideline an average of 1.3 hours per day
107 among LPG intervention participants. GM 48-hour personal exposure to NO₂ was 5 ppb (GSD

108 2.4) among 35 48-hour samples of 16 participants in the intervention group and 16 ppb (GSD
109 2.3) among 21 samples of 9 participants in the control group.

110

111 **Discussion:** In a biomass-to-LPG intervention trial in Peru, kitchen area NO₂ concentrations
112 were substantially lower within the LPG intervention group compared to the biomass-using
113 control group. However, within the LPG intervention group, 69% of 24-hour kitchen area
114 samples exceeded WHO indoor annual guidelines and 47% of samples exceeded WHO indoor
115 hourly guidelines. Forty-eight-hour NO₂ personal exposure was below WHO indoor annual
116 guidelines for most participants in the LPG intervention group, and we did not measure personal
117 exposure at high temporal resolution to assess exposure to cooking-related indoor concentration
118 spikes. Further research is warranted to understand the potential health risks of LPG-related NO₂
119 emissions and inform current campaigns which promote LPG as a clean-cooking option.

120

121 **Keywords:** nitrogen dioxide, biomass cookstove, liquefied petroleum gas, household air
122 pollution, clean cooking

123

124 *1. Introduction*

125 Nearly 40% of the global population uses biomass fuels as their primary source of energy for
126 cooking.¹ Biomass cookstove emissions often result in high levels of household air pollution
127 (HAP), a leading environmental contributor to the global burden of disease and the cause of an
128 estimated 1.6 million premature deaths in 2017.² Exposure to HAP has been associated with
129 increased blood pressure,^{3,4} lung cancer,^{5,6} and COPD⁷⁻¹⁰ in adults. Women and their children
130 are particularly vulnerable to biomass smoke exposure due to their proximity to cooking
131 activities in many settings.¹¹ The existing HAP literature has focused on fine particulate matter
132 (PM_{2.5}) and carbon monoxide (CO) as the components of biomass emissions which are most
133 relevant to public health.^{2,12} However, nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), an air pollutant causally related to
134 poor respiratory outcomes,¹³ has also been reported in homes with biomass cookstoves at
135 concentrations which exceed WHO indoor air quality guidelines.¹⁴⁻²³

136

137 To reduce HAP exposures and prevent HAP-related disease, most public health interventions
138 have focused on improved biomass cookstoves, which aim to reduce HAP exposures by
139 improving stove combustion efficiency and/or directing stove emissions outdoors, often while
140 continuing to rely on locally available biomass fuels.²⁴ Although emissions from these improved
141 cookstoves are often lower than traditional cookstoves, concentrations and exposures from
142 improved biomass cookstoves generally remain above WHO indoor guidelines.^{25,26} More
143 recently, international campaigns²⁷ and national governments^{28,29} have promoted liquefied
144 petroleum gas (LPG) as a cleaner-burning alternative to biomass fuels. LPG is typically
145 transported in portable cylinders that are connected to a stove by a hose. LPG is becoming a
146 common household fuel in many urban areas of low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).³⁰

147 These LPG stoves appear to be effective at reducing emissions of PM_{2.5} and CO^{26,31–35} to levels
148 which could provide substantial public health benefits.³⁶ However, a recent study of nearly
149 76,000 gas and electricity users in China found lower all-cause mortality in homes with vs.
150 without kitchen ventilation,³⁷ suggesting that even “clean” fuels can produce health-altering
151 emissions. Beyond PM_{2.5} and CO, little is known about the effect of transitioning from biomass
152 to LPG stoves on other household air pollutants, including NO₂.

153

154 NO₂ is a widely regulated ambient air pollutant^{38,39} that is considered by the United States
155 Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) to be causally related to respiratory effects.¹³ The
156 most established health effects associated with NO₂ include pediatric asthma^{40,41} and reduced
157 lung function.^{42–49} A growing body of literature suggests associations between NO₂ exposure and
158 cardiovascular, respiratory, and all-cause mortality.^{50–52} In high income countries (HICs),
159 natural gas is a common household fuel, and natural gas-burning appliances such as stoves,
160 ovens, and heaters can be significant household sources of indoor NO₂.^{13,53–55} NO₂
161 concentrations in homes with gas appliances in HICs can often meet or exceed WHO indoor
162 annual guidelines,^{53–57} and indoor NO₂ concentrations in such homes have specifically been
163 associated with respiratory symptoms in children.⁵³ Stove quality, maintenance, design, and gas
164 fuel type (i.e. natural gas, LPG) are known to impact emissions of NO₂ from gas stoves.^{26,58}
165 However, nearly all assessments of NO₂ exposure from gas appliances have taken place in HICs.
166 Given the known elevated concentrations of indoor NO₂ from natural gas stoves in HICs and the
167 plausible differences between primary fuel type, gas stove design, function, and quality between
168 HICs and LMICs, there is a need for direct measurement of NO₂ exposures from LPG stoves in
169 LMIC settings. This information is critical to inform the promotion of LPG stoves as an effective

170 public health intervention. This study aims to characterize the impact of a biomass-to-LPG
171 intervention trial on kitchen area concentrations and personal exposures to NO₂ in the Peruvian
172 Andes. As a secondary analysis to inform HAP exposure assessment strategies, we analyzed
173 between-participant versus within-participant variance across 1) two consecutive 24-hour
174 samples and 2) two 24-hour samples taken months apart during the post-intervention period.

175

176 *2. Methods*

177 *2.1. Study design and setting*

178 We conducted a randomized controlled trial of a cleaner-cooking intervention among women
179 who used biomass cookstoves in the Peruvian Andes. The study took place in the Puno region of
180 southern Peru, bordering Lake Titicaca and located approximately 3,825 meters above sea level.
181 Puno is a rural agricultural region where subsistence farming, alpaca husbandry, and small-scale
182 quinoa and potato production are common. Study participants were enrolled from Indigenous
183 Aymara communities where Spanish and Aymara are commonly spoken. In these low-density
184 communities, homes are a median distance of 101 meters from the closest neighboring house.⁵⁹
185 Local sources of ambient air pollution are minimal and only 4% of houses in the study area are
186 within 100 meters of an arterial road.⁵⁹

187

188 In the Cardiopulmonary outcomes and Household Air Pollution (CHAP) trial,⁵⁹ 181 women
189 between the ages of 25 – 64 years were enrolled and randomized 1:1 into an LPG intervention
190 arm and a control arm. One control participant withdrew from the study after baseline
191 assessments, leaving an intention-to-treat sample of 180 participants. Participants in the LPG
192 intervention arm received a free, three-burner LPG cookstove (**Figure 1**) installed by trained

193 research staff, free LPG fuel delivered as needed for one year, as well as education and
194 behavioral reinforcement of exclusive LPG stove use. Participants in the control arm continued
195 to use biomass and will receive a free LPG stove and one-year of fuel the following year.
196 Eligibility criteria included daily use of biomass fuels for cooking, full-time residence in their
197 current location for at least six months, and being the primary cook for the household. Women
198 were excluded if they had hypertension, COPD, or pulmonary tuberculosis, smoked cigarettes
199 daily, were pregnant or planned to become pregnant within the next year, or if they planned to
200 move out of the study area in the coming year. Demographic information was collected at
201 baseline via questionnaires and HAP assessments were performed at baseline and at three, six,
202 and 12 months post-intervention. NO₂ exposure in 100 homes with biomass cookstoves using the
203 CHAP trial baseline assessments ¹⁴ and further information on the CHAP trial study design and
204 assessments has been previously published.⁵⁹

205
206 We sampled kitchen area NO₂ concentrations during the CHAP trial's post-intervention, follow-
207 up period in a randomized subsample of 100 participants from the larger trial (n = 180). All
208 subsequent references to intervention and control groups refer to this subset of 100 participants.
209 Of the subset of 100 participants, 25 participants were randomly selected for additional
210 assessment of personal exposure to NO₂. All participants gave verbal informed consent and study
211 protocols were approved by the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health Institutional Review
212 Board (00007128), A.B. PRISMA Ethical Institutional Committee (CE2402.16), and the
213 Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia Institutional Review Board (66780).

214

215 *2.2. Nitrogen dioxide exposure assessment*

216 *2.2.1. Kitchen area assessment*

217 NO₂ kitchen area concentrations were measured at one-minute resolution with direct-reading
218 instruments for a targeted 48 hours at baseline ¹⁴ and three, six, and 12 months post-intervention.
219 A randomly selected subsample of 25 kitchens was also assessed using passive time-integrated
220 samplers. Direct-reading and passive samplers (when applicable) were co-located in wire bird
221 cages and hung from the ceiling of participants' kitchens. Trained research staff used measuring
222 tapes to place monitors 1.5 meters above the floor and 1.0 meter horizontally from the edge of
223 the cookstove combustion zone, avoiding windows and doors as much as possible, to
224 approximate the breathing zone of a woman tending the fire.

225
226 To measure kitchen area NO₂ concentrations at high-temporal resolution, we used Aeroqual
227 Series 500 portable monitors with NO₂ sensor heads (Aeroqual Limited, Auckland, New
228 Zealand). These direct-reading monitors were supported by two auxiliary batteries due to limited
229 electricity in participant homes. Every four months, we co-located all direct-reading monitors in
230 the field office to assess imprecision between devices. Using an LPG stove as a source of NO₂
231 emissions, we subjected all co-located monitors to NO₂ concentrations ranging continuously
232 from background concentration to approximately 1000 ppb and back to background
233 concentration. We then estimated the median measurement from all co-located sensors at each
234 minute of the colocation. We used robust linear regression with Siegel repeated medians (*mblm*
235 R package v0.12.1; Komsta, 2019) to calculate intercept and slope adjustments for each sensor,
236 adjusting each sensor to the median concentration observed across the continuous range of
237 concentrations (background to approximately 1000 ppb). To determine the limit of detection
238 (LOD), two direct-reading monitors were brought to the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore,

239 USA for co-location with a gold-standard reference instrument (model 42c, Thermo
240 Environmental Instruments Inc., Franklin, MA, USA). We defined the LOD as three times the
241 standard deviation (SD) of the difference between the device measurements and reference
242 instrument-confirmed zero-air from a dynamic gas calibrator (model 146i, Thermo
243 Environmental Instruments Inc., Franklin, MA, USA). We estimated an LOD of 20 ppb for the
244 direct-reading monitors, and 35% of all collected 1-minute measurements during the post-
245 intervention period fell beneath the LOD. All concentrations < 20 ppb were replaced with
246 $\text{LOD}/\sqrt{2} \approx 14.1$ ppb, which is similar to a recent modeled estimate of annual ambient NO_2
247 concentrations in the Puno region (≈ 12 ppb).⁶⁰ We decommissioned NO_2 sensor heads after
248 twelve months of field sampling and replaced with new, factory-calibrated sensor heads, as
249 recommended by the manufacturer for high concentration settings.

250

251 We sampled time-integrated kitchen area NO_2 concentrations in a subset of 25 households using
252 Ogawa passive samplers (Ogawa USA, Pompano Beach, FL, USA). We used standard
253 colorimetric methods⁶¹ to analyze the passive samples at the Universidad Peruana Cayetano
254 Heredia in Lima, Peru. We measured temperature and relative humidity during each sample with
255 a collocated Enhanced Children's Monitor (RTI Inc., Research Triangle Park, NC, USA)⁶² to
256 assist in calculating final NO_2 concentrations. Temperature data for one sample was missing due
257 to instrument failure and was imputed using the median temperature from all kitchen samples.

258 We took passive sampler field blanks every 10th sample and calculated the LOD as the mean plus
259 $\text{SD} \times 3$ concentration among blanks. We estimated an LOD of 2.6 ppb, similar to the manufacturer
260 recommended lower range of accuracy (2 ppb). One of the passive sampler kitchen area
261 concentrations (4%) fell beneath the LOD and was replaced with $\text{LOD}/\sqrt{2} \approx 1.8$ ppb.

262

263 *2.2.2. Personal exposure assessment*

264 We assessed personal exposure to NO₂ for 48 hours among 25 participants using Ogawa passive
265 samplers as described previously. These badge samplers are small, lightweight, and can be easily
266 worn by participants, in contrast to the direct-reading monitors used for kitchen area sampling
267 which allow for measurements at high temporal resolution but are bulkier and heavier. We
268 altered aprons that are commonly worn by women in the study setting and attached the NO₂
269 sampler and temperature and humidity monitors to the central chest region, to approximate each
270 woman's breathing zone. Field staff demonstrated how to put on and remove the device-laden
271 aprons, and requested that participants wear the aprons at all times during waking-hours and
272 place the apron nearby when bathing or sleeping. Two personal samples had missing temperature
273 data, which were replaced with the median temperature among all personal samples. We used the
274 same passive sampler LOD of 2.6 ppb for personal exposure samples, and we replaced seven
275 personal exposure samples (18%) that were below the LOD with $\text{LOD}/\sqrt{2} \approx 1.8$ ppb.

276

277 *2.3. Stove use monitoring*

278 The temperature of each LPG stove was monitored every minute throughout the duration of the
279 study using Digit-TL temperature loggers with aluminum encasings (LabJack Corporation,
280 Lakewood, CO, USA). As higher stove temperatures indicate cookstove use, temperature loggers
281 have become an important method of directly monitoring stove use in cookstove studies,^{63–66}
282 commonly referred to as Stove Use Monitors (SUMs). We suspended a temperature logger from
283 the middle burner of each LPG stove. To monitor biomass cookstoves, we attached temperature
284 loggers as close as possible to the cooking surface of the cookstove, typically within the smoke

285 stream and within 1.0 meters of the combustion zone. Additional information on the SUMs
286 methods are included as a supplement.

287

288 *2.4 Statistical Methods*

289 *2.4.1 Analysis of nitrogen dioxide measurements*

290 We hypothesized that mean kitchen area concentrations were highly driven by short-term
291 concentration spikes associated with a small number of cooking events per day. To avoid bias
292 from variability in the duration of samples (and the number of cooking events contained in that
293 duration), we calculated 24-hour mean concentrations for each of the two days if at least 20
294 hours of measurement data was available. Due to battery failure, 66 of 352 total direct-reading
295 samples (19%) had durations < 20 hours and were excluded from the analysis. For 64 of 352
296 total samples (18%) with durations between 20 and 44 hours, we used the first 24 hours to
297 calculate 24-hour means (of which three samples had durations between 20 – 24 hours and the
298 full available duration was considered a 24-hour mean). A total of 222 of 352 samples (63%)
299 lasted ≥ 44 hours and two 24-hour mean concentrations were calculated (1st day and 2nd day of
300 total sample).

301

302 Because of the high-altitude setting in Puno, we assumed an altitude of 3825 MASL and
303 conditions of 10°C to estimate an atmospheric pressure of 625 hPa and convert mass
304 concentration WHO indoor guidelines to conditions-adjusted ppb (annual, $40 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3 = 33 \text{ ppb}$;
305 hourly $200 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3 = 163 \text{ ppb}$).²³ We calculated hourly mean concentrations as the centered,
306 rolling 60-minute mean during each 24-hour sample. We also calculated the proportion of time
307 in which kitchen concentrations exceeded 163 ppb, the conditions-adjusted WHO indoor hourly

308 guideline,²³ and derived the number of daily hours in excess of the indoor hourly guideline. We
309 calculated summary statistics for the maximum hourly mean, 24-hour mean, and daily hours in
310 excess of 163 ppb. Using the SUMs results and the direct-reading monitors, we calculated mean
311 kitchen area NO₂ concentrations during cooking events and outside of recorded cooking events.
312 Finally, we calculated summary statistics for the time-integrated passive badge samples of
313 kitchen area concentration and personal exposure.

314

315 *2.4.2 Stove use analysis*

316 We developed separate empirical algorithms to predict LPG and biomass cookstove use with
317 recorded stove temperatures from the SUMs. Additional information on statistical methods is
318 included as a supplement.

319

320 *2.4.3. Analysis of effect of LPG stove intervention on NO₂ concentrations*

321 To assess longitudinal changes in NO₂ concentrations over the course of the 12-month post-
322 intervention period, we used a one-way ANOVA to examine marginal differences in mean
323 kitchen area concentrations between post-intervention time points within the LPG intervention
324 and control households separately.

325

326 In baseline measurements,¹⁴ we observed differences in kitchen area mean NO₂ concentration
327 between treatment groups despite randomization (one-way ANOVA, mean NO₂ concentrations
328 32 ppb lower in LPG intervention group than control group at baseline, $p = 0.04$, $N = 143$ 24-
329 hour means). To assess whether differences in post-intervention NO₂ concentrations were
330 associated with the intervention versus the result of baseline differences between treatment

331 groups, we used linear regression to estimate the effect of the intervention on kitchen area NO₂
332 concentrations during the entire post-intervention period, adjusting for baseline concentrations.
333 We used a single time-weighted-average (TWA) concentration for each household at each post-
334 intervention time point for this longitudinal analysis, averaging the 1st and 2nd day 24-hour means
335 from each sample when available (N=160 48-hour samples) and using the 1st day 24-hour mean
336 if the sample did not last long enough to provide a valid 2nd day 24-hour mean (N=47 24-hour
337 samples).

338

339 *2.4.4. Analysis of variance of 1st versus 2nd consecutive sampling days*

340 We analyzed the reproducibility of 24-hour sampling by comparing consecutive 1st and 2nd day
341 mean kitchen area concentrations among all post-intervention samples that achieved two full
342 days of sampling (44 - 48 hours total duration). We observed heteroscedasticity in the residuals
343 which violated model assumptions and was resolved by log-transforming NO₂ concentrations for
344 the final analysis. We performed a one-way mixed effects ANOVA assessing between-
345 participant and within-participant (1st day vs 2nd day) variation in log-transformed 24-hour mean
346 kitchen area NO₂ concentration using a random intercept for the (two-day) sample. We treated
347 post-intervention samples (3-, 6-, 12-month) as independent samples, and analyzed control (N =
348 76 paired samples) and LPG intervention (N = 84 paired samples) groups independently. Using
349 the results from the mixed effects ANOVA, we calculated the intraclass correlation coefficient
350 (ICC), which describes between-participant variance as a proportion of the total variance. We
351 also calculated the coefficient of variation (CV) for 1st and 2nd day samples to assess the
352 reproducibility of a one-day kitchen area NO₂ sample when compared to the subsequent day.

353

354 *2.4.5. Analysis of variance of 1st versus 2nd post-intervention time points*

355 We analyzed the reproducibility of collecting single versus multiple longitudinal NO₂ samples by
356 exploring within-participant versus between-participant variance of kitchen area samples taken
357 months apart during the post-intervention period. We included in the analysis the first two valid
358 samples from the post-intervention period for each participant. We used only the 1st day 24-hour
359 mean from each 48-hour sample to improve the comparison with results from the 1st day vs 2nd
360 consecutive day variance analysis (Section 2.4.4.). We log-transformed 24-hour mean NO₂
361 concentrations to comply with model assumptions of homoscedasticity of residuals. In our final
362 model, we conducted a one-way mixed effects ANOVA with a random intercept for household,
363 analyzing intervention and control groups independently and calculating the ICC for between-
364 household variance. Additionally, we calculated the treatment group-specific coefficient of
365 variation for 1st and 2nd post-intervention samples to quantify the reproducibility of kitchen area
366 NO₂ samples taken longitudinally throughout the post-intervention period of the trial. All
367 analyses were performed using R (www.r-project.org).

368

369 *3. Results*

370 *3.1 Participant characteristics*

371 We sampled kitchen area NO₂ concentrations using direct-reading monitors among 49
372 participants in the LPG intervention group and 47 participants in the control group (total N=96
373 participants). Due to battery failures, four participants (4% of N=100) did not have any post-
374 intervention samples reaching the minimum duration (20 hours) and were excluded from the
375 analysis. The mean age among all participants in the NO₂ assessment was 48.2 years and 59% of
376 participants had a primary school education or less (**Table 1**). Ninety-three percent of

377 participants were in the lowest two quintiles of socio-economic status in Peru. Only 6% of
378 intervention participants' kitchens had a chimney, while 67% had an opening in the roof above
379 the biomass cookstove and 27% had no specific cookstove ventilation. This differed somewhat
380 from control participants, who had more chimneys (13%), fewer roof openings (38%), and more
381 homes with no cookstove ventilation (49%). Typical kitchens among study participants had roofs
382 of corrugated metal or natural fiber, walls of adobe or mud, and earth floors. Many kitchens had
383 no windows (40%), while 44% of kitchens had one window and 17% of kitchens had two or
384 more windows. Using the SUMs which monitored both LPG and biomass cookstoves
385 continuously in all participants' homes, we estimated that women in the LPG intervention group
386 used their LPG stoves exclusively in 98% of monitored days.

387

388 *3.2. Post-intervention kitchen area nitrogen dioxide concentrations*

389 During the post-intervention period and using direct-reading monitors, we successfully collected
390 367 24-hour mean kitchen area concentrations from 207 samples (20-48 hours duration)
391 representing a total of 96 unique households from the intervention and control groups. We
392 observed a geometric mean (GM) 24-hour kitchen area NO₂ concentration of 43 ppb (geometric
393 standard deviation [GSD] 1.7) in the LPG intervention group during the post-intervention period,
394 30% higher than the WHO indoor annual guideline of 33 ppb (**Table 2**). Sixty-nine percent of
395 LPG intervention kitchen samples had 24-hour mean concentrations that exceeded the WHO
396 indoor annual guideline. In control kitchens, the GM 24-hour kitchen area concentration during
397 the post-intervention period was 77 ppb (GSD 2.0). Kitchen area NO₂ concentrations exceeded
398 the WHO indoor hourly guideline for a mean of 1.3 hours per day in intervention households and
399 2.5 hours per day in control households. We observed a GM kitchen concentration of 91 ppb

400 (GSD 2.1) during LPG cooking events in the intervention group, compared to a GM
401 concentration of 33 ppb (GSD 1.8) outside of LPG cooking events (though the mean
402 concentration outside of cooking events includes time directly after cooking events ended, when
403 NO₂ concentrations likely remained elevated before decaying to background levels). In control
404 households, GM kitchen area concentrations were 296 ppb (GSD 2.8) during biomass cooking
405 events and 39 ppb (GSD 2.0) outside of recorded cooking events. A subset of participants
406 received additional kitchen area sampling of 48-hour time-weighted average concentration via
407 passive samplers. Among 37 post-intervention samples from 16 unique participants in the LPG
408 intervention group, we observed a GM 48-hour mean kitchen area concentration of 29 ppb (GSD
409 2.2). In the control group, we observed a GM 48-hour kitchen area mean of 99 ppb (GSD 4.3) in
410 21 post-intervention samples from 9 unique participants (**Table 2**).

411
412 We observed acute spikes in NO₂ kitchen area concentrations during common cooking times
413 among participants in both the intervention and control groups. We present these data as a bar
414 plot of kitchen area concentrations throughout each minute of the calendar day (**Figure 2**) from
415 all post-intervention samples. Dark blue indicates the proportion of households with kitchen area
416 NO₂ concentrations \leq 32 ppb at a given time of day, with increasingly higher concentrations
417 represented by other colors as described in the legend. A substantial proportion of kitchens in the
418 LPG intervention group (**Figure 2**, top panel) experience NO₂ concentrations exceeding WHO
419 indoor guidelines (annual 33 ppb, hourly 163 ppb) during common cooking times (05:00-09:00
420 and 18:00-20:00 hours). For example, at approximately 08:00 hours, NO₂ concentrations were \geq
421 250 ppb in 15% of households (red color), \geq 163 ppb (the WHO indoor hourly guideline) in 25%
422 of households (red and orange colors), and \geq 66 ppb in 55% of households (red, orange, and

423 yellow colors). In the corresponding figure of NO₂ concentrations in biomass cookstoves
424 (**Figure 2**, bottom panel), concentrations are elevated during the same common cooking hours,
425 but peaks are at higher concentrations in biomass homes than in LPG homes. The GM highest
426 hourly concentration during each 24-hour sample was 138 ppb (GSD 2.1) in LPG intervention
427 homes and 450 ppb (GSD 3.1) in biomass control households (**Table 2**). We present the
428 distribution of highest hourly means in the intervention and control groups as a modified
429 empirical distribution function plot (**Figure 3**), with the WHO indoor hourly guideline as a
430 reference. The X-axis represents NO₂ concentration and the Y-axis represents the percent of 24-
431 hour samples with a maximum hourly-average concentration less than the corresponding
432 concentration. During the intervention period 47% of 24-hour samples in the LPG intervention
433 group and 81% of 24-hour samples in the biomass control group had hourly means exceeding the
434 WHO indoor hourly guideline.

435

436 *3.3. Personal exposure to nitrogen dioxide*

437 Among 35 samples from 16 unique participants in the LPG intervention group, we observed a
438 48-hour mean NO₂ personal exposure of 8 ppb (SD 11 ppb) with a GM of 5 ppb (GSD 2.4). We
439 observed a mean of 23 ppb (SD 24 ppb) and a geometric mean of 16 ppb (geometric SD 2.3 ppb)
440 48-hour personal exposure among 21 samples from 9 participants in the control group. Three
441 percent (N = 1 of 35) of personal exposure samples from women in the LPG intervention group
442 and 19% (N = 4 of 21) of personal exposure samples in the control group had 48-hour time-
443 integrated personal exposures in excess of the WHO indoor annual guideline of 33 ppb.

444

445 *3.4. Longitudinal effect of LPG intervention on NO₂ exposures*

446 In **Figure 4**, kitchen area 24-hour means are presented from baseline through the end of the post-
447 intervention period, with lines indicating treatment group means at each time point, points
448 representing individual 24-hour mean concentrations, and the WHO indoor annual guideline
449 added for reference. Using a one-way ANOVA, we found no evidence of longitudinal
450 differences in group means across post-intervention time points in either 179 24-hour means
451 from 49 participants in the LPG intervention group (p-value = 0.09) or 188 24-hour means from
452 47 participants in the control group (p-value = 0.99).

453

454 Because baseline kitchen area concentrations were lower in the LPG intervention group, we used
455 linear regression to estimate the effect of treatment group on post-intervention kitchen area NO₂,
456 adjusting for baseline concentration (Section 2.4.3.). We estimate that among 79 participants
457 with baseline and post-intervention samples, being in the LPG intervention group was associated
458 with a 45 ppb lower (95% CI -59 to -31) post-intervention daily mean kitchen area concentration
459 when compared to the control group.

460

461 *3.5. Between- and within- variation among 1st versus 2nd consecutive sampling days*

462 We examined between-participant versus within-participant variance among kitchen area 24-
463 hour means on the 1st versus 2nd consecutive days of sampling (Section 2.4.4.). In both the LPG
464 intervention and control groups, we found greater variance between households than within
465 households, however the reproducibility of sampling within a household on consecutive days
466 was somewhat poor. Within 76 paired samples (1st and 2nd consecutive days) in the LPG
467 intervention group we observed an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.68, indicating that
468 68% of the total variance was between households while 32% of total variance was within

469 households (**Table 3**). Similarly, we found that 73% of variance was between households (ICC
470 0.73) with a CV of 35% in 84 paired samples of the biomass control group.

471

472 *3.6. Between- and within- variation among 1st versus 2nd post-intervention time points*

473 We also compared kitchen area NO₂ concentrations from longitudinal samples taken months
474 apart during the post-intervention period (Section 2.4.5.). In the LPG intervention group, we
475 observed an ICC of 0.14 among 38 sample pairs (1st and 2nd available post-intervention time
476 points), indicating more variance within a given household across time (86% of total variance)
477 than between different households (14% of total variance). Within the same group we estimated
478 a CV of 49%, suggesting poor reproducibility within participants over time. In the control group
479 of 38 sample pairs, the ICC was 0.57 with a CV of 52%, suggesting a more equal balance of
480 between/within variance but similarly poor reproducibility across the post-intervention period.

481

482 *4. Discussion*

483 This study is the first study that the authors are aware of to measure kitchen area concentrations
484 of NO₂ at high-temporal resolution or personal exposure to NO₂ from LPG stoves in an LMIC
485 field setting. We observed substantial reductions in kitchen area concentration and personal
486 exposure to NO₂ in a biomass-to-LPG intervention. While lower than biomass control
487 households, in the LPG intervention group, we observed large concentrations spikes of kitchen
488 area NO₂ concentrations during common cooking times. In the LPG intervention group, 69% of
489 24-hour samples exceeded the WHO indoor annual guideline and 47% of samples exceeded the
490 WHO indoor hourly guideline. Participants in the LPG intervention group experienced a mean of
491 1.3 hours per day (SD 1.6 hours) of kitchen area NO₂ concentrations above the WHO indoor

492 hourly guideline. GM 24-hour average kitchen area concentrations were 1.3 times higher than
493 the WHO indoor annual guideline (163 ppb) in the LPG intervention group and 2.3 times higher
494 in the biomass control group. However, GM 48-hour mean personal exposure was well below
495 WHO indoor annual guidelines in the LPG intervention group.

496

497 Among homes using LPG stoves, we observed an arithmetic mean 24-hour kitchen area NO₂
498 concentration of 49 ppb (SD 26 ppb) using direct-reading monitors and 38 ppb (SD 29 ppb) in a
499 subset of homes using passive samplers. These values are similar to a arithmetic mean of 38 ppb
500 NO₂ reported by Padhi et al. among 24-hour samples of kitchens with LPG stoves in India.²⁰

501 While assessments of NO₂ exposures from LPG stoves in LMIC settings are sparse, a few other
502 studies have reported NO₂ concentrations in kitchens with natural gas or non-specific “gas
503 stoves”. A study of kitchens with gas stoves in Bangladesh reported a 24-hour geometric mean
504 kitchen area NO₂ concentration of 84 ppb,¹⁷ though the specific type of gas fuel (i.e. natural gas,
505 LPG, other) was not reported. Colbeck et al. observed 1-week mean NO₂ concentrations in
506 kitchens with natural gas stoves in Pakistan of 129 ppb in the winter when windows are kept
507 closed and 43 ppb in the summer when windows are open,¹⁸ suggesting that ventilation may be
508 an important and actionable predictor of indoor NO₂ concentrations in homes with gas stoves.

509 This was corroborated on a smaller magnitude among LPG intervention participants in our study,
510 in which mean kitchen area concentrations were 52 ppb (SD 29 ppb, N = 53 24-hour samples) in
511 winter and 45 ppb (SD 20 ppb, N = 27 24-hour samples) in summer.

512

513 The relative NO₂ emissions of LPG stoves vs natural gas stoves in LMIC field settings is poorly
514 understood, and other factors which have major impacts on area concentrations, including stove

515 burner design, individual cooking behaviors, and kitchen size and ventilation are rarely available
516 in the current literature. In a seminal review of NO₂ exposures from gas stoves in HICs, where
517 overall stove quality is potentially higher than in many LMIC settings, use of a gas stove
518 increased mean indoor NO₂ by 15 ppb compared to homes with electric stoves. In this review, an
519 equivalent 15 ppb increase in indoor area NO₂ concentration corresponded with an odds ratio of
520 1.18 for lower respiratory tract illnesses in children.⁵³ In homes with LPG stoves in Puno, we
521 observed a GM 24-hour kitchen area NO₂ concentration of 43 ppb in the LPG intervention
522 group, 10 ppb higher than the WHO indoor annual guideline of 33 ppb. We also observed
523 concentration spikes that commonly exceeded 500 ppb and a mean maximum hourly mean
524 kitchen area concentration of 178 ppb (WHO indoor hourly guideline: 163 ppb). Concentration
525 spikes on this order of magnitude have been reported previously in homes with gas appliances in
526 HICs. For example, a field study of children in Australian homes with gas stoves found 1-hour
527 mean personal exposures of greater than 200 ppb during periods of gas stove use.⁶⁷
528
529 We assessed the between-participant vs within-participant variance of measuring kitchen area
530 NO₂ on two consecutive days during the post-intervention period. We found greater between-
531 participant variance than within-participant variance, suggesting that limited sampling resources
532 may be more efficiently directed towards sampling a larger number of participants for 24-hours
533 than fewer participants for 48-hours. However, 24-hour kitchen area NO₂ samples had poor
534 reproducibility on consecutive days, and the limitations of a 24-hour kitchen area samples should
535 be considered when designing studies which are focused on individual-level health outcomes,
536 where personal exposure levels are more relevant.
537

538 We also analyzed the between-participant vs within-participant variance of kitchen area NO₂
539 measurements taken months apart during the post-intervention period. Compared to the analysis
540 of samples on subsequent days, we found more within-participant variability among samples
541 taken months apart, which may be related to seasonality. Within-participant variability was
542 similar between the LPG intervention and biomass control groups, but between-participant
543 variability was substantially lower in the LPG group (16% of total variance). This could be
544 explained by more similarity in emissions from LPG stoves than biomass stoves due to
545 standardization of the stoves and fuel, which were provided to participants in the intervention
546 trial. In contrast, biomass stoves are often homemade and can use a variety of biomass fuel types.
547 It may be that given a standardized LPG intervention, a relatively small number of participants
548 are needed to reasonably assess NO₂ kitchen area concentrations in the group longitudinally,
549 though likely only in settings where other emissions-related factors such as kitchen ventilation
550 are also consistent. It is worth noting that in this intervention trial, we observed 98% exclusive
551 adoption of LPG stoves and consistency in NO₂ concentrations longitudinally across post-
552 intervention samples, and it is highly unlikely that the observed levels of NO₂ are due to
553 continued use of biomass stoves in the LPG intervention arm.

554

555 This study is strengthened by its use of direct-reading monitors, which allowed us to characterize
556 concentration spikes associated with LPG cooking and compare kitchen area concentrations with
557 WHO indoor hourly air quality guidelines, which have not been previously reported. By
558 deploying stove use monitors, we were also able to co-monitor stove use and kitchen area NO₂
559 concentration to estimate concentrations during cooking events and the duration of time per day
560 spent above WHO indoor guidelines. We also measured 48-hour mean personal exposure to NO₂

561 among a subsample of LPG and biomass users, which is a novel contribution to the field. This
562 study was further strengthened by the use of longitudinal measurements throughout a cleaner-
563 cooking intervention with a one-year follow-up period. This study is limited by a lack of
564 measurements of hourly or peak personal exposure to NO₂, due to the burden of asking
565 participants to carry NO₂ direct-reading monitors. Based on the observed high concentration
566 spikes of kitchen area NO₂ concentrations during cooking and studies in HICs, we believe the
567 greatest risk of exposure to NO₂ for people who use LPG stoves are concentration spikes as
568 opposed to mean NO₂ concentrations. While many women in our setting may not spend the
569 entire duration of a cooking event in the kitchen area, the peak personal exposures of women in
570 our setting may in fact be comparable to the concentration spikes observed in the kitchen areas
571 when they are actively cooking. However, 48-hour mean personal exposures to NO₂ were well
572 below WHO indoor annual guidelines for most participants in the LPG intervention group.
573 Future research is warranted to characterize personal exposure to LPG stove-related NO₂
574 concentration spikes, assess personal exposure among children who are especially vulnerable to
575 NO₂ exposure, and to compare NO₂ exposures in households with LPG stoves to households
576 with electric stoves in LMICs.

577

578 *5. Conclusions*

579 In a biomass-to-LPG intervention trial in the Peruvian Andes, we observed substantially lower
580 NO₂ kitchen area concentrations and personal exposures among participants in the LPG
581 intervention. However, within LPG intervention households, 69% of 24-hour samples of kitchen
582 area concentration exceeded WHO indoor annual guidelines and 47% of samples exceeded

583 WHO indoor hourly guidelines. Among a subsample of participants, GM 48-hour personal
584 exposure was well below WHO indoor annual guidelines in the LPG intervention group.

585

586 While measurements of NO₂ concentrations from LPG stoves are sparse in LMICs, these results
587 are not unexpected given previous assessments of NO₂ in kitchens with gas stoves in LMICs and
588 the growing body of literature on the health impacts of NO₂ exposures from gas stoves in HICs.

589 As the global community considers the promotion of LPG and other gas stoves as cleaner-
590 burning alternatives to biomass based on reductions in PM_{2.5} and CO, exposures to NO₂ emitted
591 by LPG stoves may persist at levels that pose a risk to health. In settings where LPG stoves are
592 currently being used or use of electric stoves is still far off, the ability of actionable factors such
593 as ventilation and stove design to mitigate NO₂ exposures should be explored further and
594 incorporated into LPG promotion campaigns.

595

596 References

- 597 1. Bonjour S, Adair-Rohani H, Wolf J, et al. Solid fuel use for household cooking: Country
598 and regional estimates for 1980-2010. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2013;121(7):784-790.
599 doi:10.1289/ehp.1205987
- 600 2. Stanaway JD, Afshin A, Gakidou E, et al. Global, regional, and national comparative risk
601 assessment of 84 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or
602 clusters of risks for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: A systematic analysis for the
603 Global Burden of Disease Stu. *Lancet.* 2018;392(10159):1923-1994. doi:10.1016/S0140-
604 6736(18)32225-6
- 605 3. Baumgartner J, Schauer JJ, Ezzati M, et al. Indoor air pollution and blood pressure in
606 adult women living in rural China. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2011;119(10):1390-1395.
607 doi:10.1289/ehp.1003371
- 608 4. Young BN, Clark ML, Rajkumar S, et al. Exposure to household air pollution from
609 biomass cookstoves and blood pressure among women in rural honduras: a cross-sectional
610 study. *Indoor Air.* 2018;29(1):130-142. doi:10.1111/ina.12507
- 611 5. Bruce N, Dherani M, Liu R, et al. Does household use of biomass fuel cause lung cancer?
612 A systematic review and evaluation of the evidence for the GBD 2010 study. *Thorax.*
613 2015;70(5):433-441. doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2014-206625
- 614 6. Hosgood HD, Wei H, Sapkota A, et al. Household coal use and lung cancer: Systematic
615 review and meta-analysis of case-control studies, with an emphasis on geographic
616 variation. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2011;40(3):719-728. doi:10.1093/ije/dyq259
- 617 7. Po JYT, FitzGerald JM, Carlsten C. Respiratory disease associated with solid biomass fuel
618 exposure in rural women and children: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Thorax.*

- 619 2011;66(3):232-239. doi:10.1136/thx.2010.147884
- 620 8. Siddharthan T, Grigsby MR, Goodman D, et al. Association Between Household Air
621 Pollution Exposure and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Outcomes in 13 Low-
622 and Middle-income Country Settings. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. January
623 2018;rccm.201709--1861OC. doi:10.1164/rccm.201709-1861OC
- 624 9. Kurmi OP, Semple S, Simkhada P, et al. COPD and chronic bronchitis risk of indoor air
625 pollution from solid fuel: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Thorax*. 2010;65(3):221-
626 228. doi:10.1136/thx.2009.124644
- 627 10. Li J, Qin C, Lv J, et al. Solid Fuel Use and Incident COPD in Chinese Adults: Findings
628 from the China Kadoorie Biobank. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2019;127(5):057008.
629 doi:10.1289/ehp2856
- 630 11. WHO. *Burning Opportunity: Clean Household Energy for Health, Sustainable
631 Development, and Wellbeing of Women and Children.*; 2016.
632 http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/204717/1/9789241565233_eng.pdf.
- 633 12. Bruce N, Smith KR, Balme J, et al. *WHO Indoor Air Quality Guidelines: Household Fuel
634 Combustion - Review 4: Health Effects of Household Air Pollution (HAP) Exposure*.
635 Geneva; 2014. <http://www.who.int/indoorair/guidelines/hhfc>.
- 636 13. U.S. EPA. *Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) for Oxides of Nitrogen – Health Criteria
637 (Final Report, 2016)*. Washington, DC; 2016. doi:EPA/600/R-15/068, 2016
- 638 14. Kephart JL, Fandiño-Del-Rio M, Williams KN, et al. Nitrogen dioxide exposures from
639 biomass cookstoves in the Peruvian Andes. *Indoor Air*. February 2020;ina.12653.
640 doi:10.1111/ina.12653
- 641 15. Ni K, Carter E, Schauer JJ, et al. Seasonal variation in outdoor, indoor, and personal air

- 642 pollution exposures of women using wood stoves in the Tibetan Plateau: Baseline
643 assessment for an energy intervention study. *Environ Int.* 2016;94:449-457.
644 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2016.05.029
- 645 16. Kumie A, Emmelin A, Wahlberg S, et al. Magnitude of indoor NO₂ from biomass fuels in
646 rural settings of Ethiopia. *Indoor Air.* 2009;19(1):14-21. doi:10.1111/j.1600-
647 0668.2008.00555.x
- 648 17. Khalequzzaman M, Kamijima M, Sakai K, Chowdhury NA, Hamajima N, Nakajima T.
649 Indoor air pollution and its impact on children under five years old in Bangladesh. *Indoor*
650 *Air.* 2007;17(4):297-304. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0668.2007.00477.x
- 651 18. Colbeck I, Nasir ZA, Ali Z, Ahmad S. Nitrogen dioxide and household fuel use in the
652 Pakistan. *Sci Total Environ.* 2010;409(2):357-363. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.09.037
- 653 19. Kilabuko JH, Matsuki H, Nakai S. Air quality and acute respiratory illness in biomass fuel
654 using homes in Bagamoyo, Tanzania. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2007;4(1):39-44.
655 doi:10.3390/ijerph2007010007
- 656 20. Padhi BK, Padhy PK. Domestic fuels, indoor air pollution, and children's health: The case
657 of rural India. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2008;1140(1):209-217. doi:10.1196/annals.1454.015
- 658 21. Khalequzzaman M, Kamijima M, Sakai K, Hoque BA, Nakajima T. Indoor air pollution
659 and the health of children in biomass-and fossil-fuel users of Bangladesh: Situation in two
660 different seasons. *Environ Health Prev Med.* 2010;15(4):236-243. doi:10.1007/s12199-
661 009-0133-6
- 662 22. Wafula EM. Indoor air pollution in a Kenyan village. *East Afr Med J.* 1990;67(1):24-32.
663 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2354674>. Accessed June 21, 2019.
- 664 23. WHO (World Health Organization). *WHO Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality: Selected*

- 665 *Pollutants*. Copenhagen, Denmark; 2011.
- 666 24. Kshirsagar MP, Kalamkar VR. A comprehensive review on biomass cookstoves and a
667 systematic approach for modern cookstove design. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev*.
668 2014;30:580-603. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2013.10.039
- 669 25. Yip F, Christensen B, Sircar K, et al. Assessment of traditional and improved stove use on
670 household air pollution and personal exposures in rural western Kenya. *Environ Int*.
671 2017;99:185-191. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2016.11.015
- 672 26. Rehfuess E, Pope D, Bruce N, et al. *WHO Indoor Air Quality Guidelines: Household Fuel
673 Combustion - Review 6: Impacts of Interventions on Household Air Pollution
674 Concentrations and Personal Exposure*. Geneva; 2014.
675 <http://www.who.int/indoorair/guidelines/hhfc>. Accessed May 21, 2019.
- 676 27. Clean Cooking Alliance. Stoves: Gas/Biogas/Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG).
677 <https://www.cleancookingalliance.org/technology-and-fuels/stoves/#panel-4>. Published
678 2019. Accessed June 26, 2019.
- 679 28. Pollard SL, Williams KN, O'Brien CJ, et al. An evaluation of the Fondo de Inclusión
680 Social Energético program to promote access to liquefied petroleum gas in Peru. *Energy
681 Sustain Dev*. 2018;46:82-93. doi:10.1016/j.esd.2018.06.001
- 682 29. Quinn AK, Bruce N, Puzzolo E, et al. An analysis of efforts to scale up clean household
683 energy for cooking around the world. *Energy Sustain Dev*. 2018;46:1-10.
684 doi:10.1016/j.esd.2018.06.011
- 685 30. Hystad P, Duong M, Brauer M, et al. Health Effects of Household Solid Fuel Use:
686 Findings from 11 Countries within the Prospective Urban and Rural Epidemiology Study.
687 *Environ Health Perspect*. 2019;127(5):057003. doi:10.1289/ehp3915

- 688 31. Grieshop AP, Marshall JD, Kandlikar M. Health and climate benefits of cookstove
689 replacement options. *Energy Policy*. 2011;39(12):7530-7542.
690 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.03.024
- 691 32. Balakrishnan K, Mehta S, Authors L, et al. *WHO Indoor Air Quality Guidelines:
692 Household Fuel Combustion - Review 5: Population Levels of Household Air Pollution
693 and Exposures.*; 2014. <http://www.who.int/indoorair/guidelines/hhfc>. Accessed June 26,
694 2019.
- 695 33. Naeher LP, Leaderer BP, Smith KR. Particulate matter and carbon monoxide in highland
696 Guatemala: indoor and outdoor levels from traditional and improved wood stoves and gas
697 stoves. *Indoor Air*. 2000;10(3):200-205. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0668.2000.010003200.x
- 698 34. Albalak R, Bruce N, McCracken JP, Smith KR, De Gallardo T. Indoor respirable
699 particulate matter concentrations from an open fire, improved cookstove, and LPG/open
700 fire combination in a rural guatemalan community. *Environ Sci Technol*.
701 2001;35(13):2650-2655. doi:10.1021/es001940m
- 702 35. Bilsback K, Dahlke J, Fedak K, et al. A Laboratory Assessment of 120 Air Pollutant
703 Emissions from Biomass and Fossil-Fuel Cookstoves. *Environ Sci Technol*. May
704 2019;acs.est.8b07019. doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b07019
- 705 36. Steenland K, Pillarisetti A, Kirby M, et al. Modeling the potential health benefits of lower
706 household air pollution after a hypothetical liquified petroleum gas (LPG) cookstove
707 intervention. *Environ Int*. 2018;111(November 2017):71-79.
708 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2017.11.018
- 709 37. Yu K, Lv J, Qiu G, et al. Cooking fuels and risk of all-cause and cardiopulmonary
710 mortality in urban China: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Glob Heal*. 2020;8(3):e430-

- 711 e439. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30525-X
- 712 38. US EPA. Historical Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).
713 [https://www.epa.gov/no2-pollution/table-historical-nitrogen-dioxide-national-ambient-air-](https://www.epa.gov/no2-pollution/table-historical-nitrogen-dioxide-national-ambient-air-quality-standards-naaqs)
714 [quality-standards-naaqs](https://www.epa.gov/no2-pollution/table-historical-nitrogen-dioxide-national-ambient-air-quality-standards-naaqs). Published 2019. Accessed June 26, 2019.
- 715 39. European Commission. Air Quality Standards.
716 <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/quality/standards.htm>. Published 2018. Accessed June
717 26, 2019.
- 718 40. Achakulwisut P, Brauer M, Hystad P, Anenberg SC. Global, national, and urban burdens
719 of paediatric asthma incidence attributable to ambient NO₂ pollution: estimates from
720 global datasets. *Lancet Planet Heal*. 2019;0(0). doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(19)30046-4
- 721 41. Weinmayr G, Romeo E, De Sario M, Weiland SK, Forastiere F. Short-Term Effects of
722 PM₁₀ and NO₂ on Respiratory Health among Children with Asthma or Asthma-like
723 Symptoms: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Environ Health Perspect*.
724 2009;118(4):449-457. doi:10.1289/ehp.0900844
- 725 42. Gauderman WJ, Avol E, Gilliland F, et al. The Effect of Air Pollution on Lung
726 Development from 10 to 18 Years of Age. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;351(11):1057-1067.
727 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa040610
- 728 43. Urman R, McConnell R, Islam T, et al. Associations of children's lung function with
729 ambient air pollution: Joint effects of regional and near-roadway pollutants. *Thorax*.
730 2014;69(6):540-547. doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2012-203159
- 731 44. Mölter A, Agius RM, de Vocht F, et al. Long-term exposure to PM₁₀ and NO₂ in
732 association with lung volume and airway resistance in the MAAS birth cohort. *Environ*
733 *Health Perspect*. 2013;121(10):1232-1238. doi:10.1289/ehp.1205961

- 734 45. Rojas-Martinez R, Perez-Padilla R, Olaiz-Fernandez G, et al. Lung function growth in
735 children with long-term exposure to air pollutants in Mexico City. *Am J Respir Crit Care*
736 *Med.* 2007;176(4):377-384. doi:10.1164/rccm.200510-1678OC
- 737 46. Oftedal B, Brunekreef B, Nystad W, Madsen C, Walker S-E, Nafstad P. Residential
738 outdoor air pollution and lung function in schoolchildren. *Epidemiology.* 2008;19(1):129-
739 137. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e31815c0827
- 740 47. Jiang Y, Niu Y, Xia Y, et al. Effects of personal nitrogen dioxide exposure on airway
741 inflammation and lung function. *Environ Res.* 2019;177:108620.
742 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2019.108620
- 743 48. Usemann J, Decrue F, Korten I, et al. Exposure to moderate air pollution and associations
744 with lung function at school-age: A birth cohort study. *Environ Int.* 2019;126:682-689.
745 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2018.12.019
- 746 49. Dauchet L, Hulo S, Cherot-Kornobis N, et al. Short-term exposure to air pollution:
747 Associations with lung function and inflammatory markers in non-smoking, healthy
748 adults. *Environ Int.* 2018;121:610-619. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2018.09.036
- 749 50. Atkinson RW, Butland BK, Anderson HR, Maynard RL. Long-term concentrations of
750 nitrogen dioxide and mortality. *Epidemiology.* 2018;29(4):460-472.
751 doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000847
- 752 51. Faustini A, Rapp R, Forastiere F. Nitrogen dioxide and mortality: Review and meta-
753 analysis of long-term studies. *Eur Respir J.* 2014;44(3):744-753.
754 doi:10.1183/09031936.00114713
- 755 52. Eum K Do, Kazemiparkouhi F, Wang B, et al. Long-term NO₂ exposures and cause-
756 specific mortality in American older adults. *Environ Int.* 2019;124:10-15.

- 757 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2018.12.060
- 758 53. Hasselblad V, Eddy DM, Kotchmar DJ. Synthesis of Environmental Evidence: Nitrogen
759 Dioxide Epidemiology Studies. *J Air Waste Manage Assoc.* 1992;42(5):662-671.
760 doi:10.1080/10473289.1992.10467018
- 761 54. Levy JI, Lee K, Spengler JD, Yanagisawa Y. Impact of residential nitrogen dioxide
762 exposure on personal exposure: An international study. *J Air Waste Manag Assoc.*
763 1998;48(6):553-560. doi:10.1080/10473289.1998.10463704
- 764 55. Zhu Y, Connolly R, Lin Y, Mathews T, Wang Z. *Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on*
765 *Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health in California.* Los Angeles; 2020.
766 <https://ucla.app.box.com/s/xyzt8jc1ixnetiv0269qe704wu0ihif7>. Accessed May 13, 2020.
- 767 56. Paulin LM, Williams DAL, Peng R, et al. 24-h Nitrogen dioxide concentration is
768 associated with cooking behaviors and an increase in rescue medication use in children
769 with asthma. *Environ Res.* 2017;159:118-123. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.07.052
- 770 57. Penney D, Benignus V, Kephelopoulos S, Kotzias D, Kleinman M, Agnes Verrier.
771 *Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality.* Vol 9. Geneva; 2010. doi:10.1186/2041-1480-2-S2-I1
- 772 58. Basu D, Saha R, Ganguly R, Datta A. Performance improvement of LPG cook stoves
773 through burner and nozzle modifications. *J Energy Inst.* 2008;81(4):218-225.
774 doi:10.1179/014426008X370951
- 775 59. Fandiño-Del-Rio M, Goodman D, Kephart JL, et al. Effects of a liquefied petroleum gas
776 stove intervention on pollutant exposure and adult cardiopulmonary outcomes (CHAP):
777 Study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials.* 2017;18(1). doi:10.1186/s13063-
778 017-2179-x
- 779 60. Larkin A, Geddes JA, Martin R V., et al. Global Land Use Regression Model for Nitrogen

- 780 Dioxide Air Pollution. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2017;51(12):6957-6964.
781 doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b01148
- 782 61. Ogawa USA. *NO, NO₂, NO_x and SO₂ Sampling Protocol Using The Ogawa Sampler.*;
783 2006. [http://ogawausa.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/prono-](http://ogawausa.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/prono-noxno2so206_206_1117.pdf)
784 [noxno2so206_206_1117.pdf](http://ogawausa.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/prono-noxno2so206_206_1117.pdf).
- 785 62. Burrowes VJ, Piedrahita R, Pillarisetti A, et al. Comparison of next-generation portable
786 pollution monitors to measure exposure to PM_{2.5} from household air pollution in Puno,
787 Peru. *Indoor Air*. January 2019:ina.12638. doi:10.1111/ina.12638
- 788 63. Mortimer K, Ndamala CB, Naunje AW, et al. A cleaner burning biomass-fuelled
789 cookstove intervention to prevent pneumonia in children under 5 years old in rural Malawi
790 (the Cooking and Pneumonia Study): a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*.
791 2017;389(10065):167-175. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32507-7
- 792 64. Northcross A, Shupler M, Alexander D, et al. Sustained usage of bioethanol cookstoves
793 shown in an urban Nigerian city via new SUMs algorithm. *Energy Sustain Dev*.
794 2016;35:35-40. doi:10.1016/j.esd.2016.05.003
- 795 65. Ruiz-Mercado I, Canuz E, Walker JL, Smith KR. Quantitative metrics of stove adoption
796 using Stove Use Monitors (SUMs). *Biomass and Bioenergy*. 2013;57:136-148.
797 doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.07.002
- 798 66. Pillarisetti A, Vaswani M, Jack D, et al. Patterns of stove usage after introduction of an
799 advanced cookstove: The long-term application of household sensors. *Environ Sci*
800 *Technol*. 2014;48(24):14525-14533. doi:10.1021/es504624c
- 801 67. Pilotto LS, Douglas RM, Attewell RG, Wilson SR. Respiratory effects associated with
802 indoor nitrogen dioxide exposure in children. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1997;26(4):788-796.

803 doi:10.1093/ije/26.4.788

804

805

806 Table 1. Characteristics of study participants and their kitchens in Puno, Peru.

	Intervention Homes	Control Homes	All Homes
	N (%) or Mean (SD)	N (%) or Mean (SD)	N (%) or Mean (SD)
Number of participants	49	47	96
Age in years	49.3 (8.5)	47.1 (11.9)	48.2 (10.3)
Education			
Primary or less	31 (63)	28 (60)	59 (61)
Secondary	18 (37)	19 (40)	37 (39)
National SES quintile			
1 (lowest)	24 (49)	28 (60)	52 (54)
2	21 (43)	16 (34)	37 (39)
3	4 (8)	3 (6)	7 (7)
4	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
5 (highest)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Cookstove ventilation			
Chimney	3 (6)	6 (13)	9 (9)
Roof opening	33 (67)	18 (38)	51 (53)
No cookstove ventilation	13 (27)	23 (49)	36 (38)
Roof type			
Corrugated metal	21 (43)	16 (34)	37 (39)
Natural fiber (thatch)	27 (55)	30 (64)	57 (59)
Other	1 (2)	1 (2)	2 (2)
Wall type			
Adobe/mud with plaster	14 (29)	13 (28)	27 (28)
Adobe/mud without plaster	31 (63)	32 (68)	63 (66)
Other	4 (8)	2 (4)	6 (6)
Floor type			
Dirt	45 (92)	44 (94)	89 (93)
Cement	4 (8)	3 (6)	7 (7)
Kitchen windows (#)			
0	19 (39)	19 (40)	38 (40)
1	24 (49)	18 (38)	42 (44)
2 +	6 (12)	10 (21)	16 (17)
Kitchen doors/entryways (#)			
1	49 (100)	47 (100)	96 (100)

Table 2. Nitrogen dioxide kitchen concentrations and personal exposures among women in the post-intervention period of a biomass-to-LPG cookstove intervention trial in Puno, Peru.

	LPG Intervention							Biomass Control							
	N	Mean	SD	GM	GSD	Median	IQR	N	Mean	SD	GM	GSD	Median	IQR	
Kitchen area: direct-reading															
Maximum 1-hr rolling means (ppb)	179	178	126	138	2.1	149	168	188	748	697	450	3.1	543	840	
24-hr means (ppb)	179	49	26	43	1.7	42	29	188	96	65	77	2.0	81	79	
Daily hours > 163 ppb	179	1.3	1.6	-	-	0.6	1.8	188	2.5	2.1	-	-	1.8	2.4	
Means during cooking (ppb)	102*	114	72	91	2.1	91	105	89*	455	397	296	2.8	377	450	
Kitchen area: passive badge															
48-hr means (ppb)	37	38	29	29	2.2	31	32	21	185	162	99	4.3	129	178	
Personal exposure: passive badge															
48-hr means (ppb)	35	8	11	5	2.4	4	5	21	23	24	16	2.3	17	18	

*Concentrations during cooking events were calculated over the entire available sample duration, not divided into multiple 24-hour averages

1 Table 3. Analysis of variance of kitchen area NO₂ concentrations between and within 1) consecutive
2 sample days and 2) repeated samples throughout the study follow-up period of an LPG cookstove
3 intervention trial in Puno, Peru.
4

	N of sample pairs	Intraclass Correlat. Coefficient	Coef. of Var. (CV)
<hr/>			
1 st day vs 2 nd day of 48-hour samples			
LPG Intervention Group	76	0.68	28%
Biomass Control Group	84	0.73	35%
1 st sample and 2 nd sample in follow-up period			
LPG Intervention Group	38	0.14	49%
Biomass Control Group	38	0.57	52%

5

6 **Figure Captions**

7 Figure 1. Three-burner LPG stove with table and LPG cylinder, as installed in the kitchens of
8 participants in the intervention group of an LPG cleaner-cooking trial in Puno, Peru.

9 Figure 2. Prevalence of kitchen area NO₂ concentrations by calendar minute in 179 24-hour
10 samples from 49 houses in the intervention group and 188 24-hour samples from 47 houses in
11 the control group of a biomass-to-LPG cleaner-cooking trial in Puno, Peru.

12 Figure 3. Cumulative distributions of the highest hourly mean NO₂ concentrations in 367 24-
13 hour samples of 96 kitchen areas, comparing intervention and control groups during the follow-
14 up period of a biomass-to-LPG intervention trial in Puno, Peru.

15 Figure 4. Longitudinal changes in kitchen area 24-hour mean NO₂ concentrations among
16 intervention and control groups in an LPG intervention trial. Lines indicate mean kitchen area
17 NO₂ concentrations at each time point for the intervention and control groups. Points represent
18 NO₂ 24-hour mean concentration from 367 samples in 96 unique households. The Y-axis
19 representing NO₂ ppb is log-scaled. Altitude- and temperature-adjusted WHO indoor air quality
20 guideline for annual mean NO₂ (33 ppb) presented as a reference.

21

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Appendix


Statistical methods for analysis of stove temperature monitors

We developed separate empirical algorithms to predict LPG and biomass cookstove use with recorded stove temperatures. To identify LPG stove use, we considered an LPG cooking event to begin at time t when the 20-minute rolling mean temperature at time $t + 5 \text{ minutes}$ was at least 10 % greater than at $t - 5 \text{ minutes}$ (depicted in **Appendix Figure 1**). A cooking event stopped when the 20-minute rolling mean temperature dropped 3°C below the maximum 20-minute rolling mean temperature in the cooking event. For biomass cookstoves, we considered a cookstove usage event to begin at time t when the 30-minute rolling mean temperature at time $t + 30 \text{ minutes}$ was 2°C greater than at t . A cooking event stopped when the 30-minute rolling mean temperature dropped 2°C below the maximum 30-minute rolling mean temperature in the cooking event. For both types of cookstove, we made *a priori* assumptions based on formative research that multiple cooking events within a 60-minute period were considered one cooking event, an individual cooking event cannot last more than four hours for an LPG stove or six hours for a biomass cookstove, and the rolling mean must exceed 20°C at some point during a cooking event. To assess the validity of the SUMs algorithms, an independent researcher not involved in the creation of the algorithm manually evaluated a 5-day random sample of SUMs data from each stove in each household in CHAP (N=180 households). Manual observations and algorithm estimates were in agreement on whether stove use had occurred in 95% of 787 days of monitored biomass cookstoves and in 99.7% of 762 days of monitored LPG stoves.

46 **Appendix Figure 1.** Empirical algorithm for identifying LPG stove use from stove temperature
47 logged throughout the duration of the study at one-minute intervals. A similar algorithm exists
48 for biomass cookstoves (not shown).


49

50







Percentage of households



Intervention

NO₂ ppb



Control

Hour of Day

