


RESEARCH ARTICLE

A localized sanitation status index as a proxy for fecal contamination in urban Maputo, Mozambique

Drew Capone¹, Zaida Adriano^{2,3}, David Berendes⁴, Oliver Cumming⁵, Robert Dreibelbis⁵, David A. Holcomb⁶, Jackie Knee¹, Ian Ross⁵, Joe Brown^{1*}

1 Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America, **2** WE Consult, Maputo, Mozambique, **3** Departamento de Geografia, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, Maputo, Mozambique, **4** Waterborne Disease Prevention Branch, Division of Foodborne, Waterborne, and Environmental Diseases, National Center for Emerging Zoonotic and Infectious Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America, **5** Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom, **6** Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, United States of America

* joe.brown@ce.gatech.edu



OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Capone D, Adriano Z, Berendes D, Cumming O, Dreibelbis R, Holcomb DA, et al. (2019) A localized sanitation status index as a proxy for fecal contamination in urban Maputo, Mozambique. PLoS ONE 14(10): e0224333. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224333>

Editor: Zhi Zhou, Purdue University, UNITED STATES

Received: May 21, 2019

Accepted: October 10, 2019

Published: October 25, 2019

Copyright: This is an open access article, free of all copyright, and may be freely reproduced, distributed, transmitted, modified, built upon, or otherwise used by anyone for any lawful purpose. The work is made available under the [Creative Commons CC0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) public domain dedication.

Data Availability Statement: Our publicly accessible data repository for this paper is here at Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/d967q/>.

Funding: This study was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (www.usaid.gov) under Translating Research into Action (Cooperative Agreement No. GHS-A- 00-09-00015-00) to JB and OC and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (www.gatesfoundation.org) grant OPP1137224 to OC and JB. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and

Abstract

Sanitary surveys are used in low- and middle-income countries to assess water, sanitation, and hygiene conditions, but have rarely been compared with direct measures of environmental fecal contamination. We conducted a cross-sectional assessment of sanitary conditions and *E. coli* counts in soils and on surfaces of compounds (household clusters) in low-income neighborhoods of Maputo, Mozambique. We adapted the World Bank’s Urban Sanitation Status Index to implement a sanitary survey tool specifically for compounds: a Localized Sanitation Status Index (LSSI) ranging from zero (poor sanitary conditions) to one (better sanitary conditions) calculated from 20 variables that characterized local sanitary conditions. We measured the variation in the LSSI with *E. coli* counts in soil (nine locations/compound) and surface swabs (seven locations/compound) in 80 compounds to assess reliability. Multivariable regression indicated that a ten-percentage point increase in LSSI was associated with 0.05 (95% CI: 0.00, 0.11) log₁₀ fewer *E. coli*/dry gram in courtyard soil. Overall, the LSSI may be associated with fecal contamination in compound soil; however, the differences detected may not be meaningful in terms of public health hazards.

Introduction

Disparities in sanitation coverage exist across the globe: in North America and Europe 97% of the population have access to at least basic sanitation compared to 28% in Sub-Saharan Africa [1]. The United Nations Joint Monitoring Programme’s (JMP) Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6 calls for universal access to safely managed sanitation by 2030, which it defines as “the use of improved facilities and where excreta are safely disposed of *in situ* or treated off-site” [1]. One step below safely managed on the JMP sanitation ladder is the basic sanitation service level, defined as “use of unshared improved facilities.”

analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The funder provided support in the form of salaries for author ZA in her capacity as an employee of the data collection firm WE Consult (as a contractor to LSHTM), but neither the funder nor WE Consult had any additional role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The specific roles of these authors are articulated in the 'author contributions' section.

Competing interests: ZA is a paid employee of WE Consult. There are no patents, products in development or marketed products associated with this research to declare. This does not alter our adherence to PLOS ONE policies on sharing data and materials.

Safely managed sanitation is one of multiple water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) interventions designed to serve as a primary barrier to environmental enteric pathogen transmission and, subsequently, reduce enteric infections [2]. Human excreta is more likely to spread infection via multiple interacting pathways when safely managed sanitation is absent [3]. There is increasing interest in soil as an important environmental transmission pathway for enteric pathogens, especially among children who may mouth contaminated hands or objects, or directly ingest soil [4–8]. The pathways through which human excreta spreads to the environment further suggests that soil serves as a sink for enteric pathogens [3,9]. As such, the levels of fecal contamination in soils—and on other household surfaces frequently contacted by children—may provide a useful metric for assessing the fecal waste-related hazards present generally at local household and near-household scales.

Recent large health impact trials found mixed effects of WASH interventions on children's growth and diarrhea [10–12]. Fecal-oral pathogens are transmitted through multiple pathways [2,13,14] and recent large health impact trials may have insufficiently reduced the dose of pathogens ingested by children or failed to reduce a sufficient number of transmission pathways to observe a health impact. Given that children's growth and diarrhea prevalence are distal effects of sanitation, presumably mediated by reductions in fecal contamination, understanding and reducing fecal contamination in soil [15–17]—and other environmental matrices [18,19]—may be useful before further expensive health impact trials are conducted. Without changes to other indicators of sanitary quality (e.g. drainage, solid waste management, fecal sludge management, presence of animals, latrine flooding), simple WASH improvements (e.g. providing latrines with only a slab) may be insufficient to reduce exposure risks to fecal-oral pathogens. Reducing environmental fecal contamination may require systems-based approaches [20], including holistic, transformative interventions that ensure effective sequestration of human and animal fecal wastes both at the household and downstream in the sanitation chain.

Sanitary surveys are a systems-based approach to assess the disposal chain of human excreta and sanitary conditions [21–24]. Many existing sanitary survey instruments are intended to support the development of sanitation master plans or to identify areas in need of sanitation interventions, particularly at neighborhood or city-wide levels [21–25]. A localized (i.e., near-household) sanitary survey may be useful as a proxy for environmental fecal contamination. However, there is limited evidence of the validity of localized sanitary survey instruments as useful and reliable indicators of compound environmental fecal contamination [26].

A major challenge in evaluating environmental fecal contamination with such sanitary survey metrics is the choice of indicator organism or pathogen for reasons of cost and capacity. Statistically representative, quantitative measures of enteric pathogens or pathogen/fecal indicators in all environmental media of interest in a given setting are both time-consuming and generally prohibitively expensive [27]. Proxy measures of fecal contamination are often useful in approximating sanitary risks and evaluating sanitation status [27]. By comparing sanitary survey scores to the occurrence of *E. coli*, a widely used fecal indicator, in soils and on surfaces, we can evaluate the suitability of such an approach for approximating localized fecal contamination.

The objectives of our study were to (1) design and implement a sanitary survey that systematically quantified the sanitary conditions at compounds enrolled in a sanitation trial in low-income urban communities of Maputo, Mozambique; (2) evaluate whether and how the sanitary survey were associated with localized fecal hazards, as indicated by *E. coli* occurrence in soil and on surfaces from study compounds; and (3) identify other key variables associated with *E. coli* counts in courtyard soils and on surfaces in this setting. Results of this study could inform future sanitary survey validation in other settings.

Materials and methods

The Maputo sanitation (MapSan) trial

The Maputo metropolitan area contains 2.7 million people [28], of which about only 136,000 (5%) are served by a sewer system that is insufficiently funded for adequate maintenance [29]. Among those without sewerage, about 36% use pit latrines and 64% use pour-flush toilets leading to a pit or septic tank [25]. About 14% of on-site sanitation facilities in Maputo are shared by two or more households [30].

The MapSan Trial was a controlled, before-and-after trial to estimate the health impacts of an urban sanitation intervention [31]. The intervention consisted of private pour-flush latrines (to septic tank) shared by multiple households in compounds (S1 Fig), which were installed from 2015–2017. Areas of Maputo with a high-water table were excluded from receiving the intervention. Controls used existing shared private latrines throughout the trial. The study area was in densely populated, low-income, unplanned neighborhoods of urban Maputo, Mozambique. The study area is characterized by poor sanitary and environmental conditions, which contribute to a high burden of enteric disease and child mortality [32–35]. As a purposive, nested sub-study, this study included a selection of both intervention and control compounds enrolled in the MapSan trial.

The localized sanitation status index

We conducted a literature review to identify methodologies to consider for adaptation that yielded six recent sanitary surveys [21–25,36]. These surveys relied on similar inputs: socioeconomic variables [21], habitation characteristics [21,24], water access and availability [21–25], the full disposal chain of human excreta [21–25], solid waste disposal methods [21–25], drainage and waste water conditions [21,23–25], latrine sharing [21,23,25], latrine hygienic conditions [21,23,25], the safety of the latrine superstructure [25], and open defecation practices (S1 Table) [36]. Of these surveys, we chose to adapt the World Bank's Urban Sanitation Status Index (USSI) because 1) its methodology was the most feasible, and 2) it was locally relevant, as it was developed in Maputo [37].

The USSI was constructed using the guidelines proposed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation for the construction of composite indicators [38]. The USSI was developed based on the theoretical framework proposed by the World Bank's Water and Sanitation Program (WSP), which accounts for the three main steps in on-site sanitation management: containment, emptying and transport, and treatment and disposal [39,40]. WSP recognized sanitation as a series of interlinked services and therefore included “complementary services” as the fourth component to evaluate sanitation status.[25] For each of the four components, WSP conducted a literature review to select the USSI's indicators using the following criteria: (1) appropriate to the study context; (2) data could be easily collected; (3) sensitive to spatial or temporal change; (4) easy to interpret; (5) policy-relevant or actionable [25].

The USSI uses surveys of households and local sanitation experts to calculate nine indicators of sanitary conditions and the overall sanitary score [25,37]. In constructing the Localized Sanitation Status Index (LSSI), we retained 18 of the 20 variables from the USSI. We did not add any additional variables but did split the *transport safety* (to separate the household and community inputs present in the USSI variable) and *onsite sanitation superstructure* (the USSI used *roof* and *walls* as unique sub-variables in the on-site sanitation superstructure variable, we reported them as two variables for transparency) variables into two variables for each, for a total of 20 unique variables. We excluded the *level of treatment of excreta* variable used in the USSI from the LSSI to avoid including homogenous inputs (there was only one poorly

maintained treatment plant in Maputo at the time of survey). Similarly, we excluded the *drainage canals* variable because minimal drainage infrastructure served the study area at the time of survey.

Our adaptation followed the same framework as the USSI, except the outcome of USSI was an average community level sanitation score while we chose to analyze and retain individual household data to produce a localized sanitation score. We designed household and community block leader survey questions to correspond to the 20 input variables of sanitary conditions for the LSSI (Table 1).

We assigned ordinal values ranging from 0 to 1 (in order of poorest to best sanitary conditions) to each survey response for each of the 20 input variables. Intermediate values were split evenly across the range (e.g. ordinal responses of A, B, C, and D were assigned 0, 0.33, 0.67, and 1, respectively). We weighted the 20 input variables according to the previously-implemented USSI in Maputo [37] and used weighted values created by the World Bank for Maputo to calculate the nine indicators of local sanitary conditions (Table 1). The weights for Maputo were created using the Analytic Hierarchy Process technique [54] to estimate the relative importance of each indicator from a questionnaire of 20 local sanitation experts [25,37]. Local sanitation experts included utility and local government sanitation managers, environmental health officers, NGOs and aid workers, researchers, and provincial/national government personnel. We aggregated the nine indicators according to their weight to calculate the LSSI for each compound (Table 1). We provide further detail on variable and indicator aggregation in the supporting information (S1 Text).

Recognizing that the development of the within-variable categorial weights, variable weights and indicator weights may have been subjective, we developed a simplified LSSI alternative, the Unweighted LSSI, to compare against the LSSI. We calculated the Unweighted LSSI by a simple average of the 20 LSSI variables.

Survey groups

This survey took place from December 2017 to July 2018 (S2 Text). We trained enumerators to conduct interviews with household residents through a two-day facilitated workshop and during one week of survey piloting in December 2017, and an additional two days of survey piloting in April 2018. We trained enumerators to conduct interviews with community block leaders through a one-day facilitated workshop and one day of survey piloting in May 2018. Enumerators conducted interviews with household residents from April–July 2018 and with community block leaders in June 2018.

All questionnaires were communicated by the enumerators in either Portuguese or the local language, Changana, as requested by the respondent. Our sampling frame included one household respondent from each compound enrolled in the MapSan trial that had completed the 12-month follow-up household survey.[31] We recognized that MapSan respondents were a relatively homogenous group (women with young children). Therefore, we aimed to survey a second non-MapSan household respondent from each compound, who we identified as an adult resident of the third household on the right of the compound entrance.

In ArcGIS (ESRI, Redlands, CA) we laid a grid of 40 points across the MapSan trial area approximately 300 meters apart and determined the community block each point was located in. Enumerators visited the corresponding community block leaders and surveyed them at their homes. Community block leaders are volunteers who serve as the lowest level government officials in Maputo, and their responsibilities include mobilizing residents to look after public infrastructure and cleanliness [25]. We matched household survey responses to the nearest community block leader by GPS location for neighborhood-level LSSI inputs (S2 Fig).

Table 1. LSSI/USSI variables.

Component	Indicator	Indicator Weight	Variable	Data Source	Variable Weight	References
Containment	Access to Infrastructure	14.9%	Type of on-site sanitation system	Household survey	0.7	[1,3,41,42]
			On-site sanitation sharing	Household survey	0.3	[43,44]
	Containment Safety	8.6%	Structural stability of the facility	Household survey	0.25	[41,45]
			Type of lining	Household survey	0.25	[3,45,46]
			On-site sanitation system roof	Household survey	0.125	[3,45,47]
			On-site sanitation system walls	Household survey	0.125	[3,45,47]
			Containment effectiveness	Household survey	0.25	[3,9,24]
	Groundwater level	Community block leader survey	*	[3,9,45,46]		
	Hygiene	12.9%	Hygienic condition of the on-site sanitation system	Household survey	0.4	[21,23,42]
Soap and water nearby for handwashing			Household survey	0.3	[3,43,48]	
Type of lid covering the drop hole			Household survey	0.3	[3,9,47]	
Emptying and Transport	Access to emptying services	18.0%	Intended type of equipment to empty the latrine or septic tank	Household survey	1	[9,25,49,50]
	Transport safety	7.9%	Local amount of fecal waste transported to WWTP	Household survey	0.5	[9,25,49,50]
			Neighborhood amount of fecal waste transported to WWTP	Community block leader survey	0.5	[9,25,49,50]
Final Disposal	Final disposal	14.4%	Quality of disposal management	Household survey	1	[3,9,49]
			Groundwater level	Community block leader survey	*	[3,9,45,46]
Complementary services	Access to water supply	7.7%	Water availability for flushing and cleaning	Household survey	1	[3,23,51]
	Solid Waste Management	7.0%	Local accumulation of solid waste	Household survey	0.8	[21,25,45]
			Neighborhood accumulation of solid waste	Community block leader survey	0.2	[21,25,45]
	Storm- and greywater management	8.4%	Local accumulation of storm water	Household survey	0.5	[25,45,52]
			In-house greywater management	Household survey	0.5	[25,52,53]

*Groundwater level had no weight. It was used as a multiplier and is explained in the supporting information (S1 Text).

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224333.t001>

Environmental sampling site selection

We calculated preliminary LSSI scores to identify compounds for environmental sampling by applying the LSSI methodology to household survey data collected during the most recent (24-month) follow-up visits of the MapSan trial. In calculating the preliminary LSSI, we ignored neighborhood and certain household-level variables that were not collected as part of the MapSan survey conducted from 2017–2018. Based on resource constraints we aimed *a priori* to sample from 80 total compounds: those with the 40 highest and 40 lowest scores on the preliminary LSSI to test the hypothesis that the LSSI varies with objective measures of fecal contamination. The selection of compounds at the extremes of LSSI equipped the study with the greatest power to detect differences in environmental fecal contamination between relatively low and high LSSI scores. We conducted environmental sampling of soils and surfaces from May–June 2018.

Soil sampling

At each compound we collected nine soil samples at the following locations, as identified by an adult member of a household enrolled in the MapSan trial: 1) the most frequently used

compound entrance; 2) the household entrance, 3) the latrine entrance; 4) the food preparation area; 5) the dish-washing area; 6) clothes washing area; and 7) the area solid waste was stored; 8) the center of the compound yard we estimated by approximating the midpoint of all the household entrances in a compound; and 9) a second household entrance, from a household not enrolled in the MapSan study, selected by locating a household entrance across the compound yard from the first household entrance. If there was no household across the compound yard from the first household (sample location 9), we selected the household entrance that was farthest away from the first household entrance. We collected all soil samples using a metal scoop that was disinfected with 10% bleach and 70% ethanol between uses. For each sample, we used the metal scoop to homogenize a 10 cm x 10 cm x 1 cm volume of soil, which we transferred into one 5-mL cryotube and three 2-mL cryotubes. Soil samples remained on ice packs after collection and were processed within 6 hours of collection. A soil sample was recorded as “moist” or “dry” based on whether it was visibly wet at the time of collection (S3 Text). Using an estimate of the sun’s trajectory from approximately 9:00 am to 3:00pm on the day sampling took place (sampling took place during these hours each day) and the presence of nearby coverings (e.g. trees and houses), we estimated daily sun exposure, classifying each sample as “shaded”, “partially shaded” or in “direct sunlight” (S3 Text).

Bacteria were eluted from soil using modified methods from Boehm et al. [55], similar to methods reported elsewhere [56–58]. Briefly, we eluted approximately one gram of soil in 100 mL of distilled water using a 532-mL self-standing Whirl-Pak bag (Nasco, Fort Atkinson, WI). We manually shook soil samples for two minutes and then allowed samples to settle for 15 minutes. We aliquoted one mL of supernatant onto Compact Dry plates for quantification of *E. coli* (Compact Dry™ EC, VWR, Vienna, Austria). We incubated the Compact Dry plates at 37°C for 24 hours as per the manufacturer’s instructions. We processed a separate one-gram soil sample from the same cryotube for replicate analysis of each sample and ran a negative control for every 9 soil samples. When one or both replicate samples yielded colonies too numerous to count, we tested a third sample from the same cryotube using a 1:15 dilution of the supernatant. We measured moisture content of soil samples using the microwave oven method [4,58,59]. We calculated *E. coli* counts in colony forming units (CFUs) per gram dry soil by a simple average of the two replicate values. Based off the manufacturer’s instructions and the dilutions used, the lower limit of detection was $2 \log_{10}$ CFU *E. coli* per gram of soil, not accounting for moisture content, and the upper limit of detection was $6.48 \log_{10}$ CFU *E. coli* per gram of soil.

Swab sampling

At each compound we collected fourteen swab samples at seven locations that were identified by an adult in a household enrolled in the MapSan trial. The household member indicated or provided: 1) the most frequently used compound entrance door or door frame, 2) the household entrance door, 3) latrine entrance door or door frame, 4) a food preparation surface, 5) a plate used to serve food, 6) a plastic chair (we swabbed the horizontal seat surface), and 7) the most frequent play toy of a child from the subject’s household. We recorded whether each surface was visibly dirty at the time of sampling. We swabbed adjacent surface areas of 100 cm² and 10cm² using a method adapted from Hedin et al. and similar to other studies [4,60]. We swabbed each surface with two sterile nylon flocked swabs (Copan Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA). First, we wetted a swab with sterile ¼ strength Ringer’s solution (MilliporeSigma, Burlington, MA) and swabbed the entire surface in the horizontal, vertical and diagonal directions. Then we repeated this process on the same surface using a dry swab. We cut the swab end of the wet and dry swabs using scissors sterilized with 10% bleach and 70% ethanol and inserted the

swabs into an Ojal Test Kit (Ojal Water Technologies Pvt. Ltd, Bangalore, India, www.ojalwatertest.com), an *E. coli* test that uses Aquatest medium [61,62] to produces a color change in the presence of *E. coli* (S4 Text). We added either 100 mL or 10 mL of distilled water to the Ojal test kits with the swabs in them, according to the manufacturer's instructions, and then shook samples for two minutes to elute *E. coli* from the swabs. The limit of detection from this test was ≥ 1 *E. coli* per 10 cm² and ≥ 1 *E. coli* per 100cm². We ran a blank control of only distilled water and a second control containing distilled water and a swab wetted in ¼ strength Ringer's solution for every seven samples processed. We incubated the Ojal Test kits at 37°C for 24 hours, per the manufacturer's instructions, before reading.

Data analysis

We analyzed data in R version 3.5.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). To account for nested clusters of households within clusters of compounds we used linear mixed-effect models (LMM) on log₁₀-transformed values of CFU *E. coli* per dry gram of soil to perform linear regression modelling, and generalized linear mixed-effect models (GLMM) on binary detect/non-detect *E. coli* in soil, and binary detect/non-detect *E. coli* on surfaces to perform Poisson regression modelling. In our models, *E. coli* concentration or detect/non-detect was our dependent variable and the LSSI was our independent variable. We used the "lme4" package in R for regression analysis and used a Poisson (log) distribution for calculation of unadjusted risk ratios (RR) and adjusted risk ratios (aRR) [63].

We *a priori* decided to adjust for sunlight, location of the soil sample in the courtyard, a compound's wealth index, and presence of chickens and ducks (S3 Fig) [64], as literature suggests these variables may be important confounders [4,57,65]. We did not adjust for soil moisture as both sunlight and the location of a soil sample in the courtyard were associated with soil moisture and moisture was already accounted for by normalizing *E. coli* concentrations by moisture content (per gram dry soil). *A priori* we decided to evaluate associations between *E. coli* in soil and the LSSI score continuously and by quartiles. Given the low levels of *E. coli* detected on surfaces and suggested confounders from a previous study [4], we decided to analyze the detection/non-detection of *E. coli* on surfaces and adjusted for visible dirt on the surface, intra-compound location, and wealth [4].

We assigned *E. coli* concentrations in non-detect soil samples to half the value of the LLOD [15,66] and we did not observe any samples with *E. coli* concentrations above the upper limit of detection. We calculated household wealth using eight of the ten inputs from the Simple Poverty Scorecard for Mozambique [67]. We excluded number of beds and latrine type from our calculation of household wealth because of limited data and latrine type due to our cross sectional design [68]. When we surveyed two households in a compound, we used the mean wealth score as the compound wealth score and the mean LSSI as the compound LSSI.

Ethical approvals

Before conducting a survey with an adult household member or a community block leader we obtained written informed consent from the respondent. We obtained verbal consent from the head of a compound to perform environmental sampling and requested permission to sample from all compound heads at least one day in advance. The study protocols were approved by the Comité Nacional de Bioética para a Saúde (CNBS), Ministério da Saúde (333/CNBS/14, 81/CNBS/18), the Ethics Committee of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (Reference # 8345) and the Institutional Review Board of the Georgia Institute of Technology (Protocol # H15160, # H18027). The associated MapSan trial has been registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02362932).

Results

Household characteristics

We visited 147 households at 80 MapSan compounds (13 compounds lacked a second household to interview; [S2 Table](#)) and conducted interviews with 133 households at 75 MapSan compounds (three respondents did not consent and 11 had moved away). The median amount of time respondents lived in their home was nine years and the average was 14 years ([S2 Table](#)). Compounds contained an average of four families, 17 people, two children under the age of five, and scored 33 out of 81 (Standard Deviation (SD) = 11) on the Mozambique Simple Poverty Scorecard ([S2 Table](#)) [67]. We observed human feces in the compound yard or on the floor of the on-site sanitation system at 11% (n = 9) of compounds, used children's diapers on the ground or in a pile of garbage at 13% of compounds (n = 10), and standing water at 49% (39) compounds ([S2 Table](#)). We observed animals in 59% (n = 47) of compounds consisting of cats (n = 32, [40%]), chickens (n = 12, [15%]), ducks (n = 8, [10%]), dogs (n = 7, [9%]), and pigeons (n = 1, [1%]). The on-site sanitation systems at the 80 environmental sampling compounds were predominantly pour-flush to pit or septic tank (n = 50, [63%]), while 16% (n = 13) possessed pit latrine with concrete slab, and 21% (n = 17) possessed a pit latrine without a concrete slab ([S2 Table](#)). Additionally, 39 of 40 community block leaders (98%) consented to an interview.

Soils

We collected 720 soil samples from 80 MapSan compounds and detected *E. coli* in 74% of samples with a mean concentration of 4.10 log₁₀ CFU *E. coli* per gram of dry soil (standard deviation = 4.78 log₁₀) and a median of 2.77 log₁₀ CFU *E. coli* per gram of dry soil (range = no detect (ND), 6.14 log₁₀). The mean difference between the replicate soil samples analyzed from each location was 3.76 log₁₀ CFU *E. coli* per gram of dry soil, the median was 2.50 log₁₀ CFU *E. coli*, and the Pearson's correlation coefficient was 0.84 ([S5 Text](#)). We most frequently detected *E. coli* in soils from washing areas for clothes (91%) and dishes (90%), while least frequently detected *E. coli* in soils at the compound center (60%) and the non-MapSan household entrance (59%) ([Table 2](#)). Among intra-compound locations, the highest average *E. coli* concentration was found at the dishwashing area (mean 4.54 log₁₀ CFU *E. coli*), while the center of the compound yard had the lowest concentrations (mean 3.66 log₁₀ CFU *E. coli*). We noted 65% of samples as visibly wet at the time of sampling and 35% as visibly dry; we most frequently observed soil from the clothes washing area (85%, [n = 68/80]) and dishwashing area (90%, [n = 72/80]) as visibly wet ([S3 Table](#)). We recorded that 13% (95) of sample locations experienced complete

Table 2. CFU *E. coli* counts at intra-compound locations.

Intra-compound location	≥LLOD	≥10 ³	≥10 ⁴	Mean (log ₁₀)	SD	Median (log ₁₀)	Range
Clothes Washing Area	91%	60%	20%	4.08	4.49	3.28	(ND, 5.30)
Dish Washing Area	90%	60%	26%	4.54	5.20	3.21	(ND, 6.14)
Garbage Storage Area	81%	54%	26%	4.35	4.71	3.06	(ND, 5.48)
Latrine Entrance	76%	51%	18%	3.96	4.40	3.05	(ND, 5.29)
MapSan Household Entrance	73%	36%	8%	3.74	4.35	2.42	(ND, 5.24)
Compound Entrance	69%	40%	16%	3.98	4.55	2.48	(ND, 5.46)
Food Prep Area	69%	31%	13%	3.98	4.48	2.42	(ND, 5.25)
Compound Center	60%	24%	8%	3.66	4.26	1.89	(ND, 5.14)
Non-MapSan Household Entrance	59%	33%	11%	3.73	4.18	2.32	(ND, 4.97)
All Locations	74%	43%	16%	4.10	4.78	2.77	(ND, 6.14)

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224333.t002>

sunlight throughout the day, 30% (288) both direct sunlight and shade, and 47% (337) remained completely shaded. We estimated sun exposure status to be similar across intra-compound locations, except for the center of the compound yard which was estimated to be in full sun (29%, [n = 23/80]) more often than other locations and the food preparation area which was estimated to be complete shade (65%, [n = 52/80]) more often than the other locations (S4 Table).

Swabs

We swabbed adjacent 100cm² and 10cm² surfaces at 560 locations in 80 MapSan compounds, of which 23% appeared visibly dirty. The Ojal Test yielded *E. coli* concentrations of ≥ 1 *E. coli* per 100cm² at 3.4% of the 100cm² surfaces and ≥ 1 *E. coli* per 10cm² at 2.9% of the 10cm² surfaces. We detected *E. coli* from either the 100cm² or 10cm² surface at 5.4% of swab locations.

The complete LSSI

LSSI scores ranged from 0.20 to 0.91, with a mean of 0.55 (SD = 0.20) and the distribution was bimodal (Fig 1). In the 50 compounds where we interviewed two respondents, the average intra-compound LSSI variation between respondents was 0.12 (median: 0.06).

Continuous *E. coli* counts

Using multivariable regression and adjusted for sun exposure status, intra-compound location, presence of chickens and ducks, and household wealth, a ten-percentage point increase in the LSSI was associated with 0.05 log₁₀ fewer CFU *E. coli* per gram dry soil (95% CI: -0.10, 0.00; Table 3 and S4 Fig). However, *E. coli* counts in soil were generally heterogenous across the range of LSSI scores (S5 Fig). Similarly, a ten-percentage point increase in the Unweighted LSSI was associated with 0.07 log₁₀ fewer CFU *E. coli* per gram dry soil (95% CI: -0.13, -0.01). Four of the 20 LSSI variables were individually associated with log₁₀-transformed *E. coli* counts in soil. A ten-percentage point increase in the *on-site sanitation sharing* variable was associated with 0.06 log₁₀ fewer CFU *E. coli* per gram dry soil (95% CI: -0.10, -0.02), the *groundwater level*




Fig 1. Kernel density plot of complete LSSI results.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224333.g001>

Table 3. Uni- and multi-variable regression models for log₁₀-transformed *E. coli* concentrations in soil and adjusted for sunlight, intra-compound location, compound wealth, chickens and ducks.

Soil Covariates	Description	Reference	Univariable β (95% CI)	Multivariable β (95% CI)
Complete LSSI	Localized Sanitation Status Index	Ten-percentage point increase	-0.06 (-0.13, 0.00)	-0.05 (-0.11, 0.00)
Unweighted LSSI	Simple average of the 20 LSSI variables		-0.09 (-0.17, -0.01)	-0.07 (-0.13, -0.00)
LSSI: Q2	LSSI divided into quartiles	Q1	-0.03 (-0.40, 0.34)	0.01 (-0.30, 0.31)
LSSI: Q3			-0.40 (-0.77, -0.03)	-0.29 (-0.60, 0.02)
LSSI: Q4			-0.31 (-0.68, 0.06)	-0.25 (-0.56, 0.07)
Sunlight: partial sun	Estimated daily sun exposure: full sun, partial sun, full shade	Full sun	0.19 (-0.04, 0.42)	0.13 (-0.10, 0.35)
Sunlight: full shade			0.47 (0.23, 0.71)	0.39 (0.16, 0.62)
Moisture	Soil sample classified as "visibly wet" or "dry"	Dry	0.97 (0.83, 1.11)	0.83 (0.69, 0.98)
Compound entrance	One of nine sample locations where soil was collected from each compound	Center of the compound yard	0.35 (0.08, 0.61)	0.29 (0.02, 0.56)
MapSan household entrance			0.22 (-0.04, 0.49)	0.15 (-0.13, 0.42)
Non-MapSan household entrance			0.21 (-0.05, 0.47)	0.14 (-0.13, 0.41)
Latrine entrance			0.58 (0.31, 0.84)	0.45 (0.18, 0.73)
Food preparation area			0.27 (0.00, 0.53)	0.19 (-0.08, 0.47)
Dish washing area			0.89 (0.63, 1.15)	0.82 (0.55, 1.10)
Clothes washing area			0.86 (0.60, 1.12)	0.75 (0.48, 1.02)
Garbage storage area			0.80 (0.54, 1.06)	0.74 (0.47, 1.01)
Wealth Index	Wealth quartile	1-quartile increase	-0.14 (-0.25, -0.02)	-0.09 (-0.19, 0.01)
Chickens	Chickens present in the compound	No chickens	0.94 (0.61, 1.26)	0.66 (0.33, 0.99)
Ducks	Ducks present in the compound	No ducks	0.73 (0.30, 1.16)	0.42 (-0.06, 0.89)

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224333.t003>

variable was associated with 0.03 fewer log₁₀ fewer CFU *E. coli* per gram dry soil (95% CI: -0.06, 0.00), the *quality of disposal management* variable was associated with 0.05 log₁₀ fewer CFU *E. coli* per gram dry soil (95% CI: -0.09, -0.01), and the *neighborhood accumulation of solid waste* variable was associated with 0.03 log₁₀ fewer CFU *E. coli* per gram dry soil (95% CI: -0.06, 0.00) (S5 Table). We did not observe significant associations between the LSSI, when divided by quartile, and *E. coli* concentrations in soil. Adjusted *E. coli* concentrations in soil were significantly associated with shade (higher in full shade vs. full sun), moisture (higher in visibly wet vs. dry soil), and chicken presence (higher with chickens present).

Any *E. coli* detection

Using multivariable Poisson regression and adjusted for sun exposure status, intra-compound location, presence of chickens and ducks and household wealth, we found a ten-percentage point increase in the LSSI had no apparent association with detection of *E. coli* (aRR: 0.98, 95% CI: 0.94, 1.02; Table 4). We did not find any apparent associations between the LSSI divided into quartiles and *E. coli* in soil. Additionally, visibly wet soil was associated with greater risk of detection of *E. coli* in soil.

No covariates were significantly associated with the detection of *E. coli* on compound surfaces in univariable or multivariable regression after controlling for visible dirt on a surface, intra-compound location, and wealth index.

Discussion

At compounds in low-income urban Maputo with sanitation shared by multiple households, our adapted sanitary survey methodology, the LSSI, was associated with continuous measures of *E. coli* from compound soils, but not with binary measures of *E. coli* in soils or from

Table 4. Logistic regression models using detect/non-detect *E. coli* as the response variable.

Soil Covariates	Reference	RR	aRR	
Complete LSSI	Ten-percentage point increase	0.97 (0.93, 1.02)	0.98 (0.94, 1.02)	
Unweighted LSSI		0.96 (0.91, 1.01)	0.97 (0.92, 1.02)	
LSSI Q2	Quartile 1	0.91 (0.72, 1.16)	0.95 (0.73, 1.22)	
LSSI Q3		0.87 (0.68, 1.10)	0.90 (0.70, 1.15)	
LSSI Q4		0.82 (0.63, 1.05)	0.84 (0.65, 1.09)	
Partial sun	Full Sun	1.24 (0.93, 1.67)	1.19 (0.88, 1.63)	
Shade		1.30 (0.98, 1.75)	1.27 (0.94, 1.73)	
Visibly wet	Visible Dry	1.84 (1.51, 2.26)	1.77 (1.42, 2.23)	
Food Prep Area	Compound yard center	1.15 (0.78, 1.69)	1.12 (0.75, 1.69)	
Compound Entrance		1.15 (0.78, 1.69)	1.14 (0.77, 1.71)	
MapSan Household Entrance		1.21 (0.83, 1.78)	1.19 (0.80, 1.79)	
Non-MapSan Household Entrance		0.98 (0.65, 1.47)	0.96 (0.63, 1.46)	
Latrine Entrance		1.27 (0.87, 1.86)	1.23 (0.83, 1.83)	
Garbage Storage Area		1.35 (0.93, 1.97)	1.32 (0.91, 1.97)	
Dish Washing Area		1.50 (1.04, 2.17)	1.47 (1.01, 2.17)	
Clothes Washing Area		1.52 (1.06, 2.20)	1.49 (1.04, 2.19)	
Chicken Present		No chickens	1.32 (1.06, 1.63)	1.23 (0.96, 1.56)
Duck Present		No ducks	1.23 (0.94, 1.58)	1.07 (0.75, 1.49)
Wealth Index		1-quartile increase	0.93 (0.73, 1.09)	0.94 (0.87, 1.02)
Compound Surface Covariates				
LSSI		Ten-percentage point increase	0.97 (0.77, 1.24)	0.97 (0.75, 1.23)
Surface visibly dirty		Not visibly dirty	1.25 (0.47, 2.97)	0.91 (0.31, 2.40)
Plastic chair	Compound Entrance	1.80 (0.62, 5.86)	1.80 (0.62, 5.87)	
Food prep surface		0.20 (0.01, 1.24)	0.20 (0.01, 1.23)	
Dinner Plate		0.20 (0.01, 1.24)	0.20 (0.01, 1.23)	
MapSan Household door		0.40 (0.06, 1.86)	0.40 (0.06, 1.85)	
Latrine door		0.60 (0.12, 2.44)	0.60 (0.12, 2.45)	
Child's toy		0.80 (0.20, 3.02)	0.83 (0.19, 3.35)	
Wealth index		1 quartile increase	1.00 (0.64, 1.56)	1.00 (0.64, 1.57)

>Soil models adjusted for sunlight, intra-compound location, compound wealth, chickens and ducks. Surface models adjusted for visible dirt, location, and compound wealth

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224333.t004>

compound surfaces. However, we observed a modest 0.05 log₁₀ CFU decrease in *E. coli* in compound soil per ten-percentage point increase in the LSSI, which is smaller than expected, given the range of WASH characteristics across surveyed sites. Thus, a theoretical compound with an LSSI of zero that improved its sanitary conditions to achieve an LSSI of one would experience an average reduction in *E. coli* concentrations of only 0.50 log₁₀ per gram dry soil in this setting. These findings are consistent with a large, systematic study of environmental contamination in Bangladesh, where seemingly large changes in sanitation—e.g. the presence vs absence of a latrine—were associated with only a 0.56 log₁₀ reduction of *E. coli* in soil [57]. Animals may also be important contributors to environmental fecal contamination in this setting. Though statistically significant, the observed reductions in *E. coli* concentrations are minimal and may not reflect a meaningful difference in environmental contamination, and potential subsequent risks of exposure to feces-associated enteric pathogens. *E. coli* in soils from this environment were widely detected (74% of samples) and in high concentrations (mean: log₁₀ 4.10), so relative differences in *E. coli* may not reflect actual differences of public health relevance.

Our goal was to assess the potential for an association between a policy-relevant metric in use by the World Bank and by cities in Rwanda, Zambia and Mozambique with measures of fecal contamination [37]. Our results suggest that sanitary surveys may serve as useful proxies for localized environmental fecal contamination; the LSSI encompassed relevant sanitary hazards that impacted the spread of human fecal contamination into the environment, thus an association with measures of *E. coli* in soil was anticipated. However, the LSSI should be improved upon to attempt to produce a proxy for fecal contamination that associates with log-level reductions in environmental fecal contamination of public health significance. The association between the access to infrastructure indicator and measures of *E. coli* in soil was greater than association with the complete LSSI. While important for hygiene, the presence of soap and water for handwashing likely had little impact on the spread of fecal contamination into compound soil. Most households in Maputo reported never having emptied their on-site sanitation system [30]; emptying frequency is dependent on the type of on-site sanitation system and the depth of the water table such that sanitation facilities in Maputo take on average one to five years to fill up [30]. How compounds intended to empty their on-site sanitation system may not be temporally relevant to a cross-sectional sanitary survey. Future iterations of the LSSI may improve their utility by only including variables with a biologically plausible pathway to contribute to localized fecal contamination. In lieu of expert weights which may be subjective, these pathways could be weighted based on the volume, frequency, and likelihood for fecal contaminations to spread into the environment.

As in other low-income settings globally, results from our adjusted estimates indicate animals—and especially chickens—may make a significant contribution to the onsite burden of feces. In fact, recent evidence has suggested onsite fecal contribution from animals may be more than feces from humans, including in urban areas [69]. Non-human fecal contamination by domestic or wild animals can contribute to detection of fecal indicators and may indicate presence of zoonotic enteric pathogens [6]. Consistent with a cross sectional study in Bangladesh, chickens were associated with higher *E. coli* counts in soil compared to other animals [57]. The ubiquitous fecal contamination observed in this and other studies [15,16,57] in low-income settings may limit the ability for WASH interventions to consistently reduce environmental fecal contamination [70]. Future iterations of sanitary surveys would benefit from including the presence of animals or animal feces as inputs.

After feces is introduced to the environment, the persistence of enteric pathogens is dependent on time, temperature, soil moisture content, and exposure to UV radiation from sunlight among other factors [42]. Consistent with other studies, we found concentrations of *E. coli* in soil to be associated with the sun exposure status of a sample and whether the sample was visibly wet [4,57]. Despite sampling during the dry season, nearly two-thirds of soil samples were visibly wet, and we observed standing water at almost half of compounds. Unsurprisingly, we detected *E. coli* most frequently from locations where soil was most frequently visibly wet, the areas where water-based activities such as dishwashing and clothes washing were performed [4].

In sanitation assessments latrine entrances are typically assumed to be directly impacted by the intervention. However, among the nine intra-compound locations we tested *E. coli* at the latrine entrance was the third most prevalent and sixth highest in concentration. The heterogeneity of *E. coli* concentrations among intra-compound locations emphasizes the importance of spatial standardization for soil sampling. Soil samples should be collected from locations where similar activities are performed across sites. Our results suggest that sites such as a child's most recent play area or where a child most recently spent time [71] may not be sufficiently standardized for soil sampling in this and similar contexts.

Swabs of common compound surfaces yielded infrequent detection of fecal contamination across surfaces in this context. We most often detected *E. coli* on plastic chairs, which we

suspect is a result of swabbing the horizontal seat of the plastic chair which may collect dirt and debris. All entrance swab surfaces were vertical, while kitchen related surfaces are typically cleaned regularly. A similar study in Tanzania found vertical latrine wall surfaces had the lowest *E. coli* counts compared to other common household surfaces [4]. We did not account for how recently each surface was cleaned, which may have been heterogeneous and we did not specify the type of child's play toy or food preparation surface for swab sampling. These factors may explain limited detection of *E. coli* on surfaces. Exclusively swabbing horizontal surfaces such as floors [18], or identical sentinel objects such as a child's play toy, may be better approaches to standardize swab surfaces among households [19,72,73].

E. coli in soil is an imperfect indicator of sanitation-related fecal contamination in this context and the *E. coli* we detected may not have come from human sources, as supported by our observed associations between chicken presence and *E. coli* in soil. Previous work has suggested *E. coli* may be indigenous to soils in the tropics [74,75]. Soil-borne *E. coli* can grow and replicate when incubated at 30–37°C and can persist longer than one month when temperatures exceed 25°C, which is common year-round in Maputo [76]. Furthermore, not all *E. coli* are pathogenic and *E. coli* do not serve as an adequate indicator for enteric pathogens in many settings [15,16,77]. Further molecular analyses of these samples will be useful to understand whether and to what extent enteric pathogens are detected in soils from these sites.

Our study has several important limitations. The sample size of 80 compounds limited the number of covariates included in models and statistical power, including multivariable assessment of variables (such as the presence of chicken or ducks) that were infrequently observed. Additionally, we did not collect data to differentiate between compounds with penned animals and free-roaming animals, which may have impacted local environmental fecal contamination. The LSSI did not include disposal of children's feces, which, if improperly disposed of, may be spread fecal contamination into the environment [3]. The LSSI included observed human feces in and around the latrine, but open defecation rates are difficult to capture in a cross-sectional study and may vary among households in a compound [78]. The pre-selection of compounds enrolled in the MapSan trial was purposive; thus our conclusions may not be generalizable to all compounds in low-income areas of Maputo, or broader contexts. The range of the LSSI in the compounds we sampled did not include many compounds with LSSI values close to 0 and 1; a larger sample size may be useful in future research to capture compounds at the extremes. The absence of association between LSSI quartiles and continuous *E. coli* counts may have been due to a small sample size or may suggest a non-linear relationship and could be an area of future research. LSSI weights developed from surveys of local sanitation experts may have been subjective and may not have best associated with localized fecal contamination. Substantial heterogeneity existed between sample location and sample type despite our intention to select comparable sites for soils and swab samples between compounds. Other statistical approaches may be more useful to optimize the LSSI. For example, future research could use decision tree analysis to determine which variables have the greatest impact on fecal contamination.

In low-income, pathogen- and fecal contamination-rich, urban settings where sanitary conditions are poor, our study suggests better sanitary conditions measured via a sanitary survey may be associated with lower measures of environmental fecal contamination relative to poorer scores, though the absolute difference in contamination between poor and better sanitary conditions is minor and the association we found was borderline significant. There was no significant difference in the complete LSSI's association with concentrations and detection of *E. coli* in soil compared with the unweighted LSSI alternative, suggesting a need for improved variable selection and weights. Further research should explore the inclusion of animals as sanitary survey inputs and how to optimize sanitary survey weighting schemes. The

LSSI provides a helpful first iteration of a proxy for environmental fecal contamination in low-income settings where analysis of environmental samples is not feasible.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. MapSan compound diagram and examples of intra-compound locations.
(PDF)

S1 Table. Six sanitary surveys from literature review.
(PDF)

S1 Text. Additional LSSI information.
(PDF)

S2 Text. Survey questions in Portuguese and English.
(PDF)

S3 Text. Descriptive definitions.
(PDF)

S2 Fig. Map of project area.
(PDF)

S4 Text. Validation of Ojal Test Kit.
(PDF)

S3 Fig. Directed acyclic graph for model selection.
(PDF)

S4 Fig. LSSI Model diagnostics.
(PDF)

S2 Table. Household and compound characteristics.
(PDF)

S5 Text. Explanation of soil replicate results.
(PDF)

S3 Table. Visibly wet soil by intra-compound location.
(PDF)

S4 Table. Soil sun exposure by intra-compound location.
(PDF)

S5 Fig. *E. coli* vs LSSI scatterplots.
(PDF)

S5 Table. Association of LSSI variables with *E. coli* counts in soil.
(PDF)

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge data collection services and support provided by the WE Consult team and the outstanding work of enumerators Isabel Maninha Chiquele and Sérgio Adriano Macumbe.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Drew Capone, Joe Brown.

Data curation: Drew Capone, Zaida Adriano, Robert Dreibelbis, Jackie Knee, Ian Ross.

Formal analysis: Drew Capone.

Funding acquisition: Oliver Cumming, Joe Brown.

Investigation: Drew Capone, Zaida Adriano, Robert Dreibelbis, David A. Holcomb.

Methodology: Drew Capone, David Berendes, David A. Holcomb, Jackie Knee, Ian Ross, Joe Brown.

Project administration: Oliver Cumming, Robert Dreibelbis, Joe Brown.

Supervision: Joe Brown.

Writing – original draft: Drew Capone.

Writing – review & editing: Zaida Adriano, David Berendes, Oliver Cumming, Robert Dreibelbis, David A. Holcomb, Jackie Knee, Ian Ross, Joe Brown.

References

1. UNICEF & WHO. Progress on Drinking Water, Sanitation and Hygiene [Internet]. 2017. Available: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2017/launch-version-report-jmp-water-sanitation-hygiene.pdf>
2. Wagner E, Lanoix J. Excreta disposal for rural areas and small communities. *Monogr Ser World Heal Organ.* 1958; 39: 1–182.
3. World Health Organization. Guidelines on Sanitation and Health [Internet]. Geneva; 2018. Available: <http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/274939/9789241514705-eng.pdf?ua=1>
4. Pickering AJ, Julian TR, Marks SJ, Mattioli MC, Boehm AB, Schwab KJ, et al. Fecal contamination and diarrheal pathogens on surfaces and in soils among Tanzanian households with and without improved sanitation. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2012; 46: 5736–5743. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es300022c> PMID: 22545817
5. Mattioli MCM, Davis J, Boehm AB. Hand-to-mouth contacts result in greater ingestion of feces than dietary water consumption in Tanzania: A quantitative fecal exposure assessment model. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2015; 49: 1912–1920. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es505555f> PMID: 25559008
6. Penakalapati G, Swarthout J, Delahoy MJ, McAliley L, Wodnik B, Levy K, et al. Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A Systematic Review and Proposed Research Priorities. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2017; 51: 11537–11552. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b02811> PMID: 28926696
7. Ngure FM, Humphrey JH, Mbuya MNN, Majo F, Mutasa K, Govha M, et al. Formative research on hygiene behaviors and geophagy among infants and young children and implications of exposure to fecal bacteria. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2013; 89: 709–716. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.12-0568> PMID: 24002485
8. Reid B, Orgle J, Roy K, Pongolani C, Chileshe M, Stoltzfus R. Characterizing potential risks of fecal–oral microbial transmission for infants and young children in Rural Zambia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2018; 98: 816–823. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.17-0124> PMID: 29405109
9. Williams AR, Overbo A. Unsafe return of human excreta to the environment: a literature review. 2015.
10. Null C, Stewart CP, Pickering AJ, Dentz HN, Arnold BF, Arnold CD, et al. Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Kenya: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Heal.* The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an Open Access article under the CC BY 4.0 license; 2018; 6: e316–e329. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(18\)30005-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30005-6) PMID: 29396219
11. Luby SP, Rahman M, Arnold BF, Unicomb L, Ashraf S, Winch PJ, et al. Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Heal.* 2018; 6: e302–e315. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(17\)30490-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30490-4) PMID: 29396217
12. Prendergast AJ, Chasekwa B, Evans C, Mutasa K, Mbuya MNN, Stoltzfus RJ, et al. Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on


- stunting and anaemia among HIV-exposed children in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Child Adolesc Heal*. 2019; 3: 77–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(18\)30340-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30340-7) PMID: 30573417
13. Wang Y, Moe CL, Null C, Raj SJ, Baker KK, Robb KA, et al. Multipathway quantitative assessment of exposure to fecal contamination for young children in low-income urban environments in Accra, Ghana: the Sanipath analytical approach. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2017; 97: 1009–1019. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.16-0408> PMID: 29031283
 14. Robb K, Null C, Teunis P, Yakubu H, Armah G, Moe CL. Assessment of Fecal Exposure Pathways in Low-Income Urban Neighborhoods in Accra, Ghana: Rationale, Design, Methods, and Key Findings of the SaniPath Study. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2017; 97: 1020–1032. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.16-0508> PMID: 28722599
 15. Ercumen A, Pickering AJ, Kwong LH, Mertens A, Arnold BF, Benjamin-Chung J, et al. Do Sanitation Improvements Reduce Fecal Contamination of Water, Hands, Food, Soil, and Flies? Evidence from a Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural Bangladesh. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2018; <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b02988> PMID: 30256095
 16. Baker KK, Senesac R, Sewell D, Sen Gupta A, Cumming O, Mumma J. Fecal Fingerprints of Enteric Pathogen Contamination in Public Environments of Kisumu, Kenya associated with Human Sanitation Conditions and Domestic Animals. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2018; [acs.est.8b01528](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b01528) <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b01528> PMID: 30106283
 17. Pickering AJ, Ercumen A, Arnold BF, Kwong LH, Parvez SM, Alam M, et al. Fecal Indicator Bacteria along Multiple Environmental Transmission Pathways (Water, Hands, Food, Soil, Flies) and Subsequent Child Diarrhea in Rural Bangladesh. *Environ Sci Technol*. American Chemical Society; 2018; 52: 7928–7936. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b00928> PMID: 29902374
 18. Exum NG, Olórtegui MP, Yori PP, Davis MF, Heaney CD, Kosek M, et al. Floors and Toilets: Association of Floors and Sanitation Practices with Fecal Contamination in Peruvian Amazon Peri-Urban Households. *Environ Sci Technol*. American Chemical Society; 2016; 50: 7373–7381. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b01283> PMID: 27338564
 19. Stauber C, Walters A, de Aceituno A, Sobsey M, Stauber CE, Walters A, et al. Bacterial Contamination on Household Toys and Association with Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Conditions in Honduras. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute; 2013; 10: 1586–1597. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10041586> PMID: 23598302
 20. Eisenberg JNS, Trostle J, Sorensen RJD, Shields KF. Toward a Systems Approach to Enteric Pathogen Transmission: From Individual Independence to Community Interdependence. *Annu Rev Public Health*. Annual Reviews; 2012; 33: 239–257. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031811-124530> PMID: 22224881
 21. Campos LC, Ross P, Nasir ZA, Taylor H, Parkinson J. Development and application of a methodology to assess sanitary risks in Maputo, Mozambique. 2015; 27: 371–388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247815595784>
 22. Mehta M, Mehta D. City sanitation ladder: moving from household to citywide sanitation assessment. *J Water, Sanit Hyg Dev*. 2013; 3: 481. <https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2013.134>
 23. Gunawardana IPP, Galagedara LW. A new approach to measure sanitation performance. *J Water Sanit Hyg Dev*. 2013; 3: 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2013.046>
 24. Milroy CA. Evaluating sanitary quality and classifying urban sectors according to environmental conditions. *Environ Urban*. 2001; 13: 235–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095624780101300117>
 25. Hawkins P, Muximpua O. Developing Business Models for Fecal Sludge Management in Maputo. *Water Sanit Progr Rep*. 2015; Available: <https://www.wsp.org/sites/wsp.org/files/publications/WSP-Developing-Business-Models-for-Fecal-Sludge-Management-Maputo.pdf>
 26. Ercumen A, Naser AM, Arnold BF, Unicom L, Jr JMC, Luby SP. Can Sanitary Inspection Surveys Predict Risk of Microbiological Contamination of Groundwater Sources? Evidence from Shallow Tubewells in Rural Bangladesh. 2017; 96: 561–568. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.16-0489> PMID: 28115666
 27. Rochelle-Newall E, Nguyen TMH, Le TPQ, Sengtaheuanghoung O, Ribolzi O. A short review of fecal indicator bacteria in tropical aquatic ecosystems: knowledge gaps and future directions. *Front Microbiol*. 2015;6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.00006> PMID: 25713560
 28. Hanlon J. Mozambique News Reports & Clippings, number 400 [Internet]. Open University; 2018. Available: bit.ly/mozamb
 29. van Esch MS, van Ramshorst JGV. The sewer system of urban Maputo [Internet]. 2014. Available: <https://tinyurl.com/ya7eeo8u>
 30. Bauerl M, Arsénio AM, Muximpua O, Hawkins P. Emptying of sanitation facilities in Maputo, Mozambique. Assessment of Attitudes and Practices at a Household Level. 2016;

31. Brown J, Cumming O, Bartram J, Cairncross S, Ensink J, Holcomb D, et al. A controlled, before-and-after trial of an urban sanitation intervention to reduce enteric infections in children: research protocol for the Maputo Sanitation (MapSan) study, Mozambique. *BMJ Open*. 2015; 5: e008215–e008215. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008215> PMID: 26088809
32. Un-Habitat. The Challenge of Slums—Global Report on Human Settlements [Internet]. Earthscan Publications on behalf of UN-Habitat. 2003. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/meq.2004.15.3.337.3>
33. UN-Habitat. The State of African Cities: Re-imagining sustainable urban transitions [Internet]. United Nations Human Settlements Programme, Nairobi. 2014. <https://doi.org/10.2174/97816080506351100101>
34. Siteo A, Breiman RF, Bassat Q. Child Mortality in Mozambique: a Review of Recent Trends and Attributable Causes. *Curr Trop Med Reports*. Current Tropical Medicine Reports; 2018; 5: 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40475-018-0156-4>
35. Knee J, Sumner T, Adriano Z, Berendes D, de Bruijn E, Schmidt W-P, et al. Risk factors for childhood enteric infection in urban Maputo, Mozambique: A cross-sectional study. Meija R, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018; 12: e0006956. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006956> PMID: 30419034
36. Jenkins MW, Freeman MC, Routray P. Measuring the safety of excreta disposal behavior in India with the new Safe San Index: reliability, validity and utility. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2014; 11: 8319–46. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph110808319> PMID: 25153464
37. Gallego-Ayala J, Muximpua O, Hawkins P. The Urban Sanitation Status Index: A Diagnostic Tool for Prioritizing Interventions. 2017.
38. OECD, European Union, Joint Research Centre—European Commission. Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide [Internet]. 2008. Available: <http://www.oecd.org/sdd/42495745.pdf>
39. Tremolet S. Identifying the Potential for Results-Based Financing for Sanitation. Washington, DC: Water and Sanitation Program, The World Bank; 2011.
40. Hawkins P, Blackett I, Heymans C. Poor-Inclusive Sanitation: An Overview. Washington, DC: Water and Sanitation Program, The World Bank; 2013.
41. Exley JLR, Liseka B, Cumming O, Ensink JHJ. The sanitation ladder, what constitutes an improved form of sanitation? *Environ Sci Technol*. 2015; 49: 1086–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es503945x> PMID: 25513885
42. Feachem RG, Bradley DJ, Hemda G, Mara DD. Sanitation and Disease: Health Aspects of Excreta and Waste-water Management. 1st ed. World Bank Studies in Water Supply and Sanitation. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons; 1983.
43. Baker KK, O'Reilly CE, Levine MM, Kotloff KL, Nataro JP, Ayers TL, et al. Sanitation and Hygiene-Specific Risk Factors for Moderate-to-Severe Diarrhea in Young Children in the Global Enteric Multicenter Study, 2007–2011: Case-Control Study. Tumwine JK, editor. *PLOS Med*. 2016; 13: e1002010. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002010> PMID: 27138888
44. Heijnen M, Cumming O, Peletz R, Chan GK-S, Brown J, Baker K, et al. Shared Sanitation versus Individual Household Latrines: A Systematic Review of Health Outcomes. Baradaran HR, editor. *PLoS One*. 2014; 9: e93300. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0093300> PMID: 24743336
45. Julius DS, Gunnerson CG, Mara DD. Appropriate Sanitation Alternatives: A Planning and Design Manual [Internet]. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press; 1982. Available: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/701511468740361506/pdf/multi-page.pdf>
46. Graham JP, Polizzotto ML. Pit Latrines and Their Impacts on Groundwater Quality: A Systematic Review. *Environmetal Heal Perspect*. 2013; 5: 521–530. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1206028> PMID: 23518813
47. Brikke F, Bredero M. Sanitation. Linking technology choice with operation and maintenance in the context of community water supply and sanitation. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003. pp. 103–128.
48. Luby SP, Agboatwalla M, Feikin DR, Painter J, Billhimer W, Altaf A, et al. Effect of handwashing on child health: A randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2005; 366: 225–233. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)66912-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66912-7) PMID: 16023513
49. Niwagaba CB, Mbeguere M, Strande L. Faecal Sludge Quantification, Characterisation and Treatment Objectives. *Faecal Sludge Management*. 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
50. Peal A, Evans B, Blackett I, Hawkins P, Heymans C. Fecal sludge management: a comparative analysis of 12 cities. *J Water, Sanit Hyg Dev*. 2014; 4: 563. <https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2014.026>
51. Saxton RE, Yeasmin F, Alam M-U, Al-Masud A, Dutta NC, Yeasmin D, et al. If I do not have enough water, then how could I bring additional water for toilet cleaning?! Addressing water scarcity to promote hygienic use of shared toilets in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Trop Med Int Heal*. 2017; 22: 1099–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.12914> PMID: 28656596

52. World Health Organization. WHO Guidelines for the Safe use of Wastewater, Excreta, and Greywater. World Health Organization; 2006.
53. Alexander KA, Godrej A. Greywater Disposal Practices in Northern Botswana—The Silent Spring? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2015; 12: 14529–40. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph121114529> PMID: 26580640
54. Saaty TL. How to make a decision: The analytic hierarchy process. *Eur J Oper Res*. 1990; 48: 9–26. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(90\)90057-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(90)90057-1)
55. Boehm AB, Griffith J, McGee C, Edge TA, Solo-Gabriele HM, Whitman R, et al. Faecal indicator bacteria enumeration in beach sand: A comparison study of extraction methods in medium to coarse sands. *J Appl Microbiol*. 2009; 107: 1740–1750. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2009.04440.x> PMID: 19659700
56. Mattioli MC, Boehm AB, Davis J, Harris AR, Mrisho M, Pickering AJ. Enteric pathogens in stored drinking water and on caregiver's hands in Tanzanian households with and without reported cases of child diarrhea. *PLoS One*. 2014; 9. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084939> PMID: 24392161
57. Ercumen A, Pickering AJ, Kwong LH, Arnold BF, Parvez SM, Alam M, et al. Animal Feces Contribute to Domestic Fecal Contamination: Evidence from *E. coli* Measured in Water, Hands, Food, Flies, and Soil in Bangladesh. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2017; 51: 8725–8734. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b01710> PMID: 28686435
58. Navab-Daneshmand T, Friedrich MND, Gächter M, Montealegre MC, Mlambo LS, Nhwitiwa T, et al. *Escherichia coli* contamination across multiple environmental compartments (soil, hands, drinking water, and handwashing water) in urban Harare: Correlations and risk factors. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2018; 98: 803–813. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.17-0521> PMID: 29363444
59. Schneekloth J, Bauder T, Broner I, Waskom R. Measurement of Soil Moisture [Internet]. 2002. Available: <http://extension.colostate.edu/disaster-web-sites/drought-resources/drought-related-tip-sheets/measurement-of-soil-moisture/>
60. Hedin G, Rynbäck J, Loré B. New technique to take samples from environmental surfaces using flocked nylon swabs. *J Hosp Infect*. Elsevier; 2010; 75: 314–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2010.02.027> PMID: 20451296
61. Bain RES, Woodall C, Elliott J, Arnold BF, Tung R, Morley R, et al. Evaluation of an inexpensive growth medium for direct detection of *Escherichia coli* in temperate and sub-tropical waters. *PLoS One*. 2015; 10: 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0140997> PMID: 26495983
62. Trent M, Dreibeilbis R, Bir A, Tripathi SN, Labhasetwar P, Nagarnaik P, et al. Access to Household Water Quality Information Leads to Safer Water: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial in India. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2018; *acs.est.8b00035*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b00035> PMID: 29641184
63. Bates D, Machler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using {lme4}. *J Stat Softw*. 2015; 67: 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
64. Burnham KP, Anderson DR. Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach. 2nd ed. New York: Springer; 1998.
65. Abu-Ashour J, Joy DM, Lee H, Whiteley HR, Zelin S. Transport of microorganisms through soil. *Water, Air, Soil Pollut*. 1994; 75: 141–158. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01100406>
66. Ercumen A, Mertens A, Arnold BF, Benjamin-Chung J, Hubbard AE, Ahmed MA, et al. Effects of Single and Combined Water, Sanitation and Handwashing Interventions on Fecal Contamination in the Domestic Environment: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural Bangladesh. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2018; *acs.est.8b05153*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b05153> PMID: 30256102
67. Schreiner M. Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool Mozambique [Internet]. 2013. Available: SimplePovertyScorecard.com
68. Rheingans R, Anderson JD, Luyendijk R, Cumming O. Measuring disparities in sanitation access: does the measure matter? *Trop Med Int Heal*. 2014; 19: 2–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.12220> PMID: 24851256
69. Berendes DM, Yang PJ, Lai A, Hu D, Brown J. Estimation of global recoverable human and animal faecal biomass. *Nat Sustain*. 2018; 1: 679–685. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0167-0>
70. Wolf J, Johnston RB, Hunter PR, Gordon B, Medlicott K, Prüss-Üstün A. A Faecal Contamination Index for interpreting heterogeneous diarrhoea impacts of water, sanitation and hygiene interventions and overall, regional and country estimates of community sanitation coverage with a focus on low- and middle-income countries. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. 2018; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2018.11.005> PMID: 30503228
71. Ercumen A, Pickering AJ, Kwong LH, Mertens A, Arnold BF, Benjamin-Chung J, et al. Do Sanitation Improvements Reduce Fecal Contamination of Water, Hands, Food, Soil, and Flies? Evidence from a Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial in Rural Bangladesh. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2018; 52: 12089–12097. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b02988> PMID: 30256095

72. Huda TMN, Schmidt W-P, Pickering AJ, Unicomb L, Mahmud ZH, Luby SP, et al. Effect of Neighborhood Sanitation Coverage on Fecal Contamination of the Household Environment in Rural Bangladesh. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2019; <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.16-0996> PMID: 30675846
73. DiVita MA, Halder AK, Jahid IK, Islam M, Sobsey MD, Luby SP, et al. The Utility of Common Household Objects as Markers of Home Hygiene in the Context of Access to Improved Sanitation. *Epidemiology.* 2008; 19: S323. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ede.0000340507.17483.d7>
74. Fujioka R, Sian-Denton C, Borja M, Castro J, Morphey K. Soil: the environmental source of *Escherichia coli* and *Enterococci* in Guam's streams. *J Appl Microbiol.* 1998; 85: 83S–89S. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.1998.tb05286.x> PMID: 21182696
75. Hardina CM, Fujioka R. Soil: The environmental source of *Escherichia coli* and *enterococci* in Hawaii's streams. *Environ Toxicol.* 1991; 6: 185–195. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1002/tox.2530060208>
76. Ishii S, Ksoll WB, Hicks RE, Sadowsky MJ. Presence and Growth of Naturalized *Escherichia coli* in Temperate Soils from Lake Superior Watersheds. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2006; 72: 612–621. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.72.1.612-621.2006> PMID: 16391098
77. Sobsey MD, Khatib LA, Hill VR, Alocilja E, Pillai S. Pathogens in Animal Wastes and the Impacts of Waste Management Practices on Their Survival, Transport and Fate. *Anim Agric Environ.* 2006; 609–665.
78. Ritter RL, Peprah D, Null C, Moe CL, Armah G, Ampofo J, et al. Within-Compound Versus Public Latrine Access and Child Feces Disposal Practices in Low-Income Neighborhoods of Accra, Ghana. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2018; 98: 1250–1259. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.17-0654> PMID: 29557327

S1 Fig. MapSan compound diagram and examples of intra-compound locations



1. Example of a food preparation area:



2. Example of a garbage storage area



3. Example of a latrine entrance: Entrance on the left was used for bathing and the entrance on the right contained the latrine drophole.



4. Example of a household entrance:



5. Example of a dish washing area:



6. Example of a clothes washing area:



7. Example of the center of the compound yard



8. Aerial view of a neighborhood. Compounds are typically surrounded by walls made of block or corrugated metal. Compound entrances may be a gap in the walls, an empty doorway, or a lockable doorway.



S1 Table. Sanitary Survey Inputs from Literature Review.

Variable Type	Milroy et. al	Mehta et. al	Campos et. al	Gunawardana et. al	Hawkins et. al	Jenkins et. al
Socioeconomic variables			X			
Condition of habitation	X		X			
Extent of pavement	X					
Water access	X	X	X	X	X	
Fecal waste disposal chain variables	X	X	X	X	X	
Drainage & wastewater	X		X	X	X	
Solid waste collection	X	X	X	X	X	
Latrine sharing			X	X	X	
Latrine superstructure safety					X	
Hygiene			X	x	X	
Open defecation practices						X

S1 Text. Additional LSSI Information.

LSSI Ordinal Weights

[Access to Infrastructure](#)

The type of toilet used by households and the number of households sharing it.

Access to infrastructure = 0.7 * Type of Toilet + 0.3 * Sharing toilet

[Type of Toilet](#)

Classification	Score
Connection to a sewer system	1
Pour flush/squat pan connected to a septic tank or pit	0.75
Pit latrine with a concrete slab	0.5
Traditional pit latrine without a concrete slab	0.25
Open defecation, bucket, bag, etc.	0

[On-site Sanitation Sharing](#)

Sharing toilet = 0.5 * Households + 0.5 * Persons

[Households](#)

1 household (no sharing)	1
2-3 households	0.625
4-5 households	0.125
>5 households	0

[Persons](#)

1-5 persons	1
6-10 persons	0.67
11-15 persons	0.33
>15 persons	0

[Containment Safety](#)

Containment Safety = 0.25 * slab/floor stability + 0.125 * type of walls + 0.125 * type of roof + 0.25 *

type of lining * groundwater level + 0.25 * containment effectiveness

[Slab/Floor Stability](#)

Overall in good condition and floor is made of concrete	1
---	---

Overall in good condition, but floor is made of sand	0.75
Cracked or broken, but no holes in the floor, and no risk of collapse	0.5
Cracked or broken, with holes in the floor, and no risk of collapse	0.25
Apparent risk of collapse	0

Walls

Masonry (blocks, concrete, etc.)	1
Corrugated iron sheets	0.75
Grass or reeds OR Scrap Metal OR Asbestos cement sheets	0.5
Plastic sheets, sacking, or cloth	0.25
None	0

Roof

Tiles OR Concrete slab OR Corrugated iron or asbestos cement sheets	1
Timber or scrap metal	0.75
Grass or reeds	0.5
Plastic sheets, sacks or cloth	0.25
None	0

Lining

Masonry	1
Tires	0.75
Timber / Wood	0.5
Metal or plastic barrels OR Reeds	0.25
None	0

Groundwater Level

Low Water Table: >3 below ground level	1
Medium Water Table: 1.5-3 m below ground level	0.5
High Water Table: <1.5m below ground level	0

Containment Effectiveness

Liquid never overflows or leaks from the latrine or the ground near the latrine	1
Liquid rarely overflows or leaks from the latrine or the ground near the latrine	0.667
Liquid occasionally overflows or leaks from the latrine or the ground near the latrine	0.333
Liquid often overflows or leaks from the latrine or the ground near the latrine	0

Hygiene

$$\text{Hygiene} = 0.4 * \text{Hygienic condition} + 0.3 * \text{Soap} + 0.3 * \text{Cover}$$

Hygienic Condition

Clean	1
Presence of dirty water	0.75
Presence of solid waste	0.5
Presence of urine	0.25
Presence of feces or used anal cleansing materials OR Open defecation	0

Soap

Soap available, signs it has been used recently	1
Soap available, but no signs it has been used recently	0.5
No soap available, but signs it has been used recently	0.5
No soap available, no signs of recent use	0

Cover

Tight-fitting lid in place (latrine) OR Water seal toilet (pour flush)	1
Loose fitting lid or cover in place (latrine)	0.5
No cover	0

Emptying and Transport

Access to emptying services: future intentions for emptying on-site sanitation

Note: Where a latrine is covered over when full and rebuilt, the household is excluded from the calculation of this indicator and this component.

Formal emptying: vacuum truck or trash pump OR Sewer connection	1
Informal Emptying: buckets and other hand tools	0

Transport Safety

If Local Transport = 0 (Transport = 0)

If Local Transport = 1 (Transport = 0.5 * Local Transport + 0.5 Neighborhood Transport)

Local Transport

Formal emptying and fecal sludge is taken to WWTP	1
OR Compound latrine will be covered and rebuilt	
Compound empties sludge manually (ie. Buckets) and dumps into a hole in the yard, into a hole near the compound, or dumps in a nearby ditch or drain,	0

Neighborhood Transport

Formal emptying is most frequent in the nearby area (according to nearest <i>chefe de quarteirão</i>)	1
Local dumping of sludge occurs most frequently (according to nearest <i>chefe de quarteirão</i>).	0

Disposal

Quality of Disposal Management

If Disposal = Taken to WWTP (Final Disposal = 1)

If Disposal = Buried in-situ (Final Disposal = Disposal * Water Table)

Disposal

Fecal sludge taken to ETAR de Infulene (WWTP)	1
Buried in-situ	0.667

Water Table

Water table >3m deep	1
Water table 1.5-3m deep	0.5
Water table 1.5m or less	0

Complementary Services

Water Access

Water available in recipient at the latrine	1
Functioning tap within 1m of the latrine, but no recipient for when the water is not running	0.5
No water available	0

Solid Waste Management

$$\text{Solid waste} = 0.8 * \text{household solid waste} + 0.2 * \text{neighborhood solid waste}$$

Household Solid Waste Management

All solid waste is contained	1
There is some accumulation of solid waste inside the compound, but no large piles	0.5
There is significant accumulation of solid waste inside the compound	0

Neighborhood Solid Waste Management

No accumulation of solid waste in the neighborhood	1
Accumulation of solid waste only around public waste skips	0.5
Significant accumulation of solid waste in public spaces	0

Storm and Grey Water Management

$$\text{Storm and Grey Water Management} = 0.5 * \text{Household Grey Water} + 0.5 * \text{Water Ponding}$$

In-house Greywater Management

Discharged to a drain OR Used to water plants inside the compound	1
Poured into the latrine or septic tank	0.5
Dumped on the ground in the street or walkway OR Dumped on the ground inside the compound	0

Local Accumulation of Storm Water

After a rain storm standing water remains inside or near the compound for <1 day	1
After a rain storm standing water remains inside or near the compound for 1 day	0.667
After a rain storm standing water remains inside or near the compound for 2 days	0.333
After a rain storm standing water remains inside or near the compound for 3 or more days	0

S2 Text. Survey questions in English and Portuguese

Question (English)	Question (Portuguese)	Response (Portuguese)	Response (English)
Quantos agregados familiares existem neste composto?	How many HHs live in this compound?	integer	
Quantas pessoas no total vivem neste composto (incluindo crianças)?	How many people in total live in this compound?	integer	
Quantas crianças menores de 5 anos vivem neste composto?	How many children less than 5 years of age live on this compound?	integer	
Alguém neste agregado possui algum desses seguintes itens? (escolha todos que se aplicarem)	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? BICYCLE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? MOTORBIKE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? CAR	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? IRON	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? FREEZER	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? CLOCK	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? RADIO	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? STEREO	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? CASSETTE PLAYER	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? SOFA	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE
	Does anyone in your HH own the following items? NONE OF THE ABOVE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	1. TRUE 0. FALSE

Onde o seu agregado normalmente colecta água?	Where does your HH normally collect water from?	1. Torneira em casa/ torneira privada 2. Torneira no composto 3. Torneira do vizinho 4. Torneira ou fontanário público 5. Poço protegido 6. Poço desprotegido 7. Água da chuva 8. Furo	1. Tap in the home 2. Tap outside the home 3. Neighbours tap 4. Public tap 5. Protected spring 6. Unprotected spring 7. Rainwater 8. Borehole
Quantas horas por dia a água esta disponível na fonte?	How many hours a day is water available?	1. <1 hora 2. 1-3 horas 3. 4-6 horas 4. 7-8 horas 5. > 8 horas	1. <1 hr 2. 1-3 hrs 3. 4-6 hrs 4. 7-8 hrs 5. > 8 hrs
Quantas latrinas construídas pela WSUP existem no composto?	How many WSUP latrines are there in this compound?	integer	
Que tipo de latrina da WSUP existe no composto?	Which type of WSUP latrine is there on this compound?	Blocos sanitarios Ladrina partilhada	
Quantas latrinas não construídas pela WSUP existem no composto?	How many non-WSUP latrines are there in this compound	integer	
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Ladrina da WSUP - Number	How many WSUP latrines are there on this compound?	integer	
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Despejo para sistema de esgoto - Number	How many latrines connected to the sewer are there on this compound?	integer	
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Despejo para fossa séptica - Number	How many latrines connected to a septic tank are there on this compound?	integer	
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Despejo manual para fora ou fossa	How many latrines: flush / pour flush to onsite / above ground pit	integer	

superficial - Number			
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Latrina com laje de concreto - Number	How many latrines: pit with concrete slab	integer	
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Latrina sem laje de concreto - Number	How many latrines: pit without concrete slab	integer	
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Balde - Number	How many latrines/sites: bucket	integer	
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Plástico - Number	How many latrines/sites: plastic bag	integer	
Para cada tipo de latrinas / WC, quantos existem no composto : Fecalismo a céu aberto - Number	How many sites: open defecation	integer	
Tire uma foto da latrina	Take a photo of the latrine	photo	
Observe: De que material é feito o piso das latrinas/sanitário?	Observe: What material is the latrine floor made of?	0. Piso de terra 1. Bloco de concreto 2. Laje de concreto 3. Madeira 4. Tijoleira 20. Other	0. Dirt floor 1. Concrete block 2. Concrete slab 3. Wood 4. Scrap metal 20. Other:

<p>Observe: De que material são construídas as paredes das latrinas/ sanitário?</p>	<p><i>Observe:</i> What material are the latrine walls built from?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alvenaria 2. Chapa de zinco 3. Tijolos de lama 4. Madeira 5. Ferro velho 6. Folhas de cimento 7. Capim ou caniço 8. Plástico, sacos ou pano 9. Latrinas sem paredes 20. Other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Masonry 2. Corrugated iron sheets 3. Mud bricks 4. Timber 5. Scrap metal 6. Cement sheets 7. Grass or reeds 8. Plastic sheets, sacking or cloth 9. No latrine walls 20. Other:
<p>Observe: De que material é construído a cobertura das latrinas?</p>	<p><i>Observe:</i> What material is the latrine roof built from?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. telhas 2. laje de concreto 3. chapos de zinco 4. madeira 5. ferro velho 6. capim ou caniço 7. plástico, sacos ou pano 8. nenhum 20. Other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tiles 2. concrete slab 3. corrugated iron sheets 4. timber 5. scrap metal 6. Grass or reeds 7. Plastic sheets, sacking or cloth 8. None 20. Other:
<p>Observe/pergunte: Qual a condição da laje / piso?</p>	<p><i>Observe/ask:</i> What is the condition of the slab / floor?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Em geral, em boas condições 2. Rachados ou quebrado, mas sem furos no chão ou risco aparente de colapso 3. Rachados ou quebrados, buracos no chão, mas sem risco de colapso 4. Laje ou piso parece em risco de colapso 5. Em geral apresenta boas condições, mas sem laje de concreto, o piso é de areia 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall in good condition 2. Cracked or broken, but with no holes in the floor or apparent risk of collapse 3. Cracked or broken, holes in the floor, but with no risk of collapse 4. Slab or floor appears at risk of collapse 5. In general appears in good condition but there is no concrete slab
<p>Observe: A água está disponível perto da latrina / sanita?</p>	<p><i>Observe:</i> Is water available near the latrine/toilet?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A água está disponível num recipiente 2. A água está disponível na torneira ao lado da latrina 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water is available in a container 2. Water is available at tap next to the latrine 3. Water is not available

		3. A água não está disponível	
Observe: Existe acumulação de lixo dentro do composto?	Observe: Is there garbage accumulation inside this compound?	2. Sim, há montes de lixo 1. Sim. Não há montes de lixo, mas há algum lixo acumulado em volta do composto 0. Não, todo o lixo está contido	2. Yes, there are piles of garbage 1. Yes. There are no piles of garbage, but there is some accumulation of garbage around the compound 0. No, all garbage is contained
Observe: Actualmente há água estagnada neste composto?	Observe: Is there currently standing water at this compound?	0. Não 1. Sim	
Observe: Qual é a condição higiénica desta latrina?	Observe: What is the hygienic condition of this latrine? Presence of dirty water	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Observe: What is the hygienic condition of this latrine? Presence of solid waste	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Observe: What is the hygienic condition of this latrine? Presence of urine	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Observe: What is the hygienic condition of this latrine? Presence of anal cleaning materials used	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Observe: What is the hygienic condition of this latrine? Presence of feces	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Observe: What is the hygienic condition of this latrine? Nothing observed: the latrine looks clean and well maintained	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	

Observe: Como é que o buraco está coberto?	<i>Observe:</i> How is the drop hole covered?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tapa ajustada no lugar (latrina) 2. Tapa flexível no lugar (latrina) 3. Sem cobertura 4. Selagem de água (despejo) 5. Selagem de água quebrada ou não funcional (despejo) 20. Other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tight fitting lid in place (latrine) 2. Loose fitting lid or cover in place (latrine) 3. No cover 4. Water-seal (pour-flush) 5. Broken or non-functional water-seal (pour flush) 20. Other:
PERGUNTE: de que material foi feito o revestimento da fossa ou fossa septica?	Ask: What is the septic tank made from?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alvenaria 2. Conectado ao sistema de esgotos 3. Pneus 4. Madeira 5. Barris de metal ou plástico 6. Caniço 7. Nenhum 20. Other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Masonry 2. Connected to sewerage system 3. Tires 4. Timber 5. Metal or plastic barrels 6. Reeds 7. None 20. Other
Pergunte: Com que frequência líquidos transbordam ou escorrem desta latrina ou para o chão?	Ask: How often does liquid leak from this latrine or seep up through the ground near the latrine?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nunca 2. Muito raro 3. Ocasionalmente 4. Frequentemente 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Never 2. Very rarely 3. Occasionally 4. Often
Por favor tire uma foto do local onde os membros do agregado normalmente lavam as mãos	Take a photo of the place where HH members usually wash their hands	photo	
Este é o mesmo local onde lava as mãos depois de usar a latrina?	Is this the same place where you wash your hands after using the toilet?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. Não 1. Sim 	
OBSERVE Instalação fixa observada (Torneira de lavatório)	Where is the HWF located?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Na habitação 2. No pátio / quintal 3. Ao lado da latrina / sanitário 4. Objecto móvel observado (balde / jarro / chaleira) 5. Nenhuma instalação de lavagem das mãos observada 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In dwelling 2. In yard /plot 3. Next to latrine/toilet 4. Mobile object observed (Bucket / Jug / Kettle) 5. No hand washing facility observed

A água está disponível nas instalações de lavagem das mãos?	Is there water available at the HWF to wash hands?	0. Não 1. Sim	
Há presença de sabão / detergente / água com sabão no local para lavagem das mãos? (1)	Is there soap/ detergent or soapy water present at the place for HW?	0. Não 1. Sim	
Existem sinais de que o sabão tenha sido usado recentemente nesta instalação de lavagem das mãos (por exemplo, resíduo de sabão) (1)	Are there any signs that soap has been used recently at this handwashing facility (e.g. soap residue)	0. Não 1. Sim	
Por favor tire uma foto do local onde os membros do agregado lavam as mãos após usar a latrina/sanitário	Take a photo of the place where HH members wash their hands after using the toilet	photo	
Tem água disponível nessa instalação de lavagem das mãos?	is there water available to wash hands?	0. Não 1. Sim	
Há presença de sabão / detergente / água com sabão no local para lavagem das mãos? (2)	Is there soap/ detergent or soapy water present at the place for HW?	0. Não 1. Sim	
Existem sinais de que o sabão tenha sido usado recentemente nesta instalação de lavagem das mãos (por exemplo, resíduo de sabão) (2)	Are there any signs that soap has been used recently at this handwashing facility (e.g. soap residue)	0. Não 1. Sim	
Que tipo de latrina as pessoas da sua casa mais usam?	What type of latrine do people in your HH use most often?	1. Latrina da WSUP 2. Despejo para sistema de esgoto 3. Despejo para fossa séptica 4. Despejo manual para fora ou fossa superficial 5. Latrina com laje de concreto 6. Latrina sem laje de concreto 7. Balde 8. Plástico 9. Fecalismo a céu aberto	1. WSUP latrine 2. flush / pour flush toilet to sewer 3. flush / pour flush to underground tank 4. flush / pour flush to onsite / above ground pit 5. pit with concrete slab 6. pit without concrete slab 7. bucket 8. bag 9. open defecation

Compartilha a latrina que usa frequentemente com outras famílias?	Do you share the latrine/toilet you use most often with other families?	0. Não 1. Sim	
A latrina privada possui as seguintes condições? (marque todos os que se aplicam)	Private latrine has the following attributes (tick all that apply) Cleanable concrete, tile, or masonry slab	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Private latrine has the following attributes (tick all that apply) Masonry tile, concrete, or pedestal	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Private latrine has the following attributes (tick all that apply) Formal latrine superstructure	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Private latrine has the following attributes (tick all that apply) Covered ventilation tube	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
Compartilha todas as latrinas / buracos com todos os outros membros do composto ou determinadas latrinas são designadas para uso de determinadas famílias / gêneros / outros grupos?	Do you share all latrine stalls/drop holes with all other compound members or are certain stalls/drop holes designated for use by certain households/genders/other groups?	1. Todos os membros do composto compartilham a mesma latrina / sanitário 2. Minha casa usa um banheiro / latrina específica 3. Latrinas / sanitários são separados por gênero 4. Latrinas / sanitários são separados de acordo com as famílias	1. All compound members share the same latrine/toilet 2. My household uses a specific toilet/latrine 3. Latrine/toilets are separated by gender 4. Latrine/toilets are separated by families
Quantas famílias compartilham a latrina / sanitário que usa frequentemente?	How many families share the latrine/ toilet you use most often?	0. Apenas seu agregado 1. 2- 3 agregados 2. 4 – 5 agregados 3. 5 – 10 agregados 4. Mais 10 agregados	0. Just your household 1. 2- 3 households 2. 4 – 5 households 3. 5 – 10 households 4. More than 10 households

Quantas pessoas, incluindo a si e as crianças, compartilham a latrina / sanitário que usa frequentemente?	How many people including children share the latrine /toilet you use most often?	0. 1- 5 pessoas 1. 6-10 pessoas 2. 11 – 15 pessoas 3. 16 – 20 pessoas 4. Mais de 20 pessoas	0. 1- 5 people 1. 6-10 people 2. 11 – 15 people 3. 16 – 20 people 4. More than 20 people
Qualquer pessoa (publico em geral) pode usar a latrina / sanitário que usa frequentemente?	Can anyone (general public) use the toilet you use most often?	0. Não 1. Sim	
Estava a viver neste composto quando a latrina / sanitário que usa frequentemente foi construído?	Were you living on this compound when the toilet/ latrine you use most often was constructed?	0. Não 1. Sim	
O que aconteceu com a latrina que usava antes?	What happened to the latrine you used before?	1. Abandonou 2. Coberto com terra 3. Coberto com lixo 4. Coberto com outros 5. Vazio 20. Other	1. Abandoned 2. Covered with earth 3. Covered with garbage 4. Covered with other 5. Emptied 20. Other
Em que ano os residentes deste composto começaram a usar a latrina / sanitário que usa frequentemente?	In what year did the residents of this compound begin to use the latrine/ toilet you use most often?	integer (MT)	
Em que época do ano?	In what part of the year?	1. Inícios 2. Meados 3. Finais	
Quantas vezes foi construída uma nova fossa neste composto nos últimos 3 anos?	How many times has a new septic tank been constructed in this compound in the last 3 years	integer (MT)	
Quantas vezes foi esvaziada uma latrina / fossa séptica neste composto nos últimos 3 anos?	How many times has a latrine/septic tank on this compound been emptied in the last three years?	integer (MT)	

Quando foi a última vez que a latrina / fossa séptica que usa frequentemente foi esvaziada?	When was the last time the latrine/septic tank that you use most often was emptied?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nunca 2. Na última semana 3. No último mês 4. "Nos últimos seis meses " 5. "No último ano " 6. Nos últimos dois anos 7. Nos últimos 5 anos 8. Há mais de cinco anos 9. Pit / fossa séptica foi substituída, não foi esvaziada 20. Other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Never 2. With the last week 3. Within the last month 4. Within the last six months 5. Within the last year 6. Within the last two years 7. Within the last 5 years 8. More than five years ago 9. Pit/ tank was replaced not emptied 20. Others: _____
Quais destes serviços de esvaziamento estão disponíveis no seu bairro?	Which of these services exist in your barrio? Serviço de esvaziamento manual (ex. sacos)	"1. TRUE 0. FALSE"	
	Which of these services exist in your barrio? Bomba de esvaziamento manual	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Which of these services exist in your barrio? Bomba de esvaziamento mecânica	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Which of these services exist in your barrio? Esvaziamento mecânico a vácuo	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
Na ultima vez, quem esvaziou a fossa da latrina que usa frequentemente?	last time, who emptied the septic tank you use most frequently?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Latrina / fossa séptica foi esvaziada por membro AF 2. Latrina / fossa séptica foi esvaziada por Esvaziador informal 3. Latrina / fossa séptica foi esvaziada por um esvaziador formal 20. Other 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HH member 2. Informal emptier 3. Formal emptier 20. Other

<p>A última vez que a latrina ou fossa séptica que usa frequentemente foi esvaziada, qual foi o equipamento usado para esvaziar?</p>	<p>Last time the latrine/septic tank you use most frequently was emptied what equipment was used to empty it?</p>	<p>1. À mão, usando sacos, baldes ou ferramentas manuais semelhantes 2. À mão, usando uma bomba manual (como um gulper) 3. Mecanicamente, usando uma pequena bomba mecânica 4. Mecanicamente, usando um caminhão de vácuo 5. Incerto</p>	<p>1. By hand, using sacks, buckets or similar hand tools 2. By hand, using a hand pump (such as a gulper) 3. Mechanically, using a small mechanical pump (such as a trash pump) 4. Mechanically, using a vacuum truck 5. Unsure</p>
<p>Por que não escolheu usar um serviço de esvaziamento formal a última vez que esvaziou a sua fossa?</p>	<p>Why did you not choose a formal emptying service the last time you emptied the tank</p>	<p>0. Custo 1. O serviço não chega a minha casa 20. Other</p>	<p>0. Cost 1. Service not available near my house 20. Other</p>
<p>A última vez que a latrina ou fossa séptica que usa frequentemente foi esvaziada, qual era o nome da empresa que esvaziou?</p>	<p>Last time the latrine/septic tank you use most frequently was emptied which service provider did you use?</p>	<p>1. ACADEC 2. Mbonga Mbilo 3. Limpezas Maguanine 4. Oliveiras 5. Sisema 6. Paulinho 7. Município 20. Other</p>	
<p>A última vez que a latrina ou fossa séptica que usa frequentemente foi esvaziada, onde foram descartados os resíduos fecais?</p>	<p>Last time the pit or septic tank you use most often was emptied, where was the fecal waste disposed?</p>	<p>1. Enterrado dentro do composto 2. Enterrado nas proximidades, mas não dentro do composto 3. Deitado no chão fora do composto 4. Levado para ETAR de Infulene 5. Deitado fora do composto (destino desconhecido) 6. Deitado fora do composto (please specify) 7. Parte incerta 20. Other</p>	<p>1. Buried inside the compound 2. Buried nearby, but not inside the compound 3. Dumped on the ground nearby the compound 4. Taken to "O ETAR de Infulene" 5. Taken outside the compound (destination unknown) 6. Taken outside the compound (specify destination) _____ 7. Uncertain 20. Others: _____</p>

A última vez que a latrina ou fossa séptica que usa frequentemente foi esvaziada, onde foram descartados os resíduos fecais? (Deitado fora do composto (please specify)) - specify	Last time the pit or septic tank you use most often was emptied, where was the fecal waste disposed? (if outside of compound specify desitination)	text	
A última vez que a latrina ou fossa séptica que usa frequentemente foi esvaziada, onde foram descartados os resíduos fecais? (Other (please specify)) - specify	Last time the pit or septic tank you use most often was emptied, where was the fecal waste disposed? (other)	text	
A última vez que a latrina ou fossa séptica que usa frequentemente foi esvaziada, onde foram descartados os resíduos fecais? (Not Applicable)	Last time the pit or septic tank you use most often was emptied, where was the fecal waste disposed? (n/a)	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
A última vez que a latrina ou fossa séptica que usa frequentemente foi esvaziada, o que foi usado para limpar a área e o equipamento depois?	Last time the pit or septic tank you use the most often was emptied, what was used to clean the area and equipment afterwards? Nothing	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Last time the pit or septic tank you use the most often was emptied, what was used to clean the area and equipment afterwards? Water	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Last time the pit or septic tank you use the most often was emptied, what was used to clean the area and equipment afterwards? Bleach	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Last time the pit or septic tank you use the most often was emptied, what was used to clean the area and equipment afterwards? Soap (Omo)	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	

	Last time the pit or septic tank you use the most often was emptied, what was used to clean the area and equipment afterwards? Disinfectant	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Last time the pit or septic tank you use the most often was emptied, what was used to clean the area and equipment afterwards? Petrol	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Last time the pit or septic tank you use the most often was emptied, what was used to clean the area and equipment afterwards? Salt	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
	Last time the pit or septic tank you use the most often was emptied, what was used to clean the area and equipment afterwards? Other	1. TRUE 0. FALSE	
A próxima vez que a fossa ficar cheia, que acções específicas espera que sejam realizadas?	The next time you need to empty a pit or septic tank on this compound, what specific action do you expect to be performed?	1. Tapar e abrir uma outra dentro do composto 2. Tapar e usar a latrina de um outro composto 3. Latrina / fossa séptica será esvaziada por membro AF 4. Latrina / fossa séptica será esvaziada por Esvaziador informal 5. Latrina / fossa séptica será esvaziada por um esvaziador formal 6. Latrina / fossa séptica será substituída, não foi esvaziada 20. Other	1. close and open another pit in the compound 2. Close and use neighbour's latrine 3. Latrine/ Septic tank will be emptied by a HH member 4. Latrine/ septic tank will be emptied by informal emptier 5. Latrine/ Septic tank will be emptied by formal emptier 6. Latrine/ septic tank will be replaced not emptied 20. Other

<p>Na próxima vez que uma latrina/ fossa séptica deste composto necessite de esvaziamento, onde espera que os resíduos fecais sejam descartados?</p>	<p>Next time a pit or septic tank on this compound is emptied, where do you expect the fecal waste to be disposed?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enterrado dentro do composto 2. Enterrado nas proximidades, mas não dentro do composto 3. Deitado no chão fora do composto 4. Levado para ETAR de Infulene 5. Deitado fora do composto (destino desconhecido) 6. Deitado fora do composto (please specify) 7. Parte incerta 8. Nunca esvaziar 20. Other 	
<p>Na próxima vez que substituir uma latrina desse composto, o que fará com a latrina antiga?</p>	<p>Next time you replace a latrine on this compound, what will you do with the old latrine?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abandonar 2. Cubrir com sujeira/lixo 3. Cubrir com _____ (especifique) 20. Other 	
<p>Na próxima vez que as pessoas desse composto decidirem substituir uma latrina, como determinarão que a latrina / sanitário precisa ser substituído?</p>	<p>Next time people on this compound decide to replace a latrine, how will they determine the latrine/toilet needs to be replaced?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cheiro 2. Inspeção visual do nível das lamas fecais 3. Passado um certo prazo 4. Latrina / WC estiver transbordando 5. A estrutura de latrina / sanitário estiver danificado 20. Other 	
<p>Na próxima vez que as pessoas desse composto decidirem substituir uma latrina, como determinarão que a latrina / sanitário precisa ser substituído? (Other (please specify)) - specify</p>	<p>Next time people on this compound decide to replace a latrine, how will they determine the latrine/toilet needs to be replaced? (other)</p>	<p>text</p>	

Na próxima vez que uma latrina neste composto for substituída, qual será o principal motivo para a escolha de substituir em vez de esvaziar?	Next time a latrine on this compound is replaced, what will be the main reason for choosing to replace instead of emptying?	1. Custo 2. Acesso 3. Conveniência 4. Simplicidade 5. Saúde 6. Segurança 20. Other	
O que faz com mais frequência com as águas negras?	What do you normally do with grey water?	1. Despeja no chão dentro do composto 2. Despeja no chão na rua 3. Usa para regar plantas ou árvores dentro do composto 4. Despeja num dreno 5. Despeja na latrina ou no sanitário 20. Other	
O que faz com mais frequência com as águas negras? (Other (please specify)) - specify	What do you normally do with grey water? (other)	text	
Em geral, por quantos dias após chover há água estagnada no composto?	In general, how many days per year is there standing water inside the compound?	integer (MT)	
No último ano, alguma latrina ou fossa séptica deste composto transbordou sua estrutura de contenção?	In the last year, has any pit or septic tank on this compound overflowed its containment structure?	0. Não 1. Sim	

S3 Text. Descriptive definitions.

Visibly moist soil: Wet soil is darker in color than dry soil.



Full shade: An example of “full shade” underneath a covering. Fully shaded sample locations received no direct sunlight from 9:00am to 3:00pm.





Full sun: An example of “full sun”. Samples in full sun were out in the open, not near any trees or coverings that could provide shade. Completely sunny sample locations received direct sunlight from 9:00am to 3:00pm.



Partially shaded/sunny: An example of an area that is partially shaded. As the sun moves from 9:00am to 3:00pm this area received both direct sunlight and complete shade.



S2 Fig. Map of project area.





S4 Text. Validation of Ojal *E. coli* Test Kit.

We swabbed an additional 100 cm² surface on 33 of the 80 plastic chairs we tested as part of the study to validate the Ojal test kit. We followed the same swab procedure, except both wet and dry swabs were stored in a 15mL centrifuge tube containing 3ml of sterile ringer's solution (Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, Missouri) and shaken manually for 2 minutes. Samples were placed on ice and within 6 hours of collection we plated a 1 mL aliquot of the ringer's solution onto a Compact Dry EC plate and incubated the plates for 24 hours at 37°C as per manufacturer's instructions.

Using the Compact Dry EC plates, we found 15% of surfaces tested positive for the presence of *E. coli* and 5.2% surfaces tested positive for *E. coli* at concentrations ≥ 10 *E. coli* per 100cm². The 15% detection of *E. coli* by Compact Dry was higher than the 11% detection from the Ojal, while the 5.2% detection of *E. coli* at concentrations ≥ 10 *E. coli* per 100cm² was comparable to the 5.1% detection of ≥ 1 *E. coli* per 10 cm² from the Ojal kit.

S3 Fig. LSSI Model Diagnostics.

Plotting model residuals (of \log_{10} E. coli per gram dry soil) vs. LSSI shows that the linearity assumption in regression is true and the QQ plot shows the residuals are normally distributed. We performed Levene's test on our model, rejected the null hypothesis ($p=0.79$), and assumed homoscedasticity.



Lmer model output

```
Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
Formula: ecoli_log50 ~ Sun + Local + cssi_10 + Chicken + Duck + poverty_q +
  (1 | compound/household)
Data: soildata
```

REML criterion at convergence: 1792.6

Scaled residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.49	-0.65	-0.12	0.64	2.85

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.
household:compound	(Intercept)	0.05	0.21
compound	(Intercept)	0.16	0.40
Residual		0.66	0.81

Number of obs: 675, groups: household:compound, 600; compound, 75

Fixed effects:


	Estimate	Std. Error	t value
(Intercept)	2.61	0.24	10.76
Sun_partial	0.13	0.12	1.09
Sun_shade	0.39	0.12	3.26
Localfood	0.19	0.14	1.37
Localentrance	0.29	0.14	2.09
LocalHH	0.14	0.14	1.04
LocalHH2	0.14	0.14	0.98
LocalLatrine	0.45	0.14	3.23
Localgarbage	0.74	0.14	5.29
Localdishes	0.82	0.14	5.88
Localclothes	0.75	0.14	5.41
lssi_10	-0.05	0.03	-1.77
ChickenYes	0.65	0.17	3.79
DuckYes	0.42	0.25	1.69
poverty_q	-0.09	0.05	-1.81

	2.5 %	97.5 %
.sig01	0.00	0.47
.sig02	0.30	0.49
.sigma	0.70	0.88
(Intercept)	2.14	3.07
Sun_partial	-0.10	0.35
Sun_shade	0.16	0.62
Localfood	-0.08	0.47
Localentrance	0.02	0.56
LocalHH	-0.13	0.42
LocalHH2	-0.13	0.41
LocalLatrine	0.18	0.73
Localgarbage	0.47	1.01
Localdishes	0.55	1.10
Localclothes	0.48	1.02
cssi_10	-0.11	0.00
ChickenYes	0.33	0.99
DuckYes	-0.06	0.90
poverty_q	-0.19	0.01

anova(Levene.Model) #displays the results
Analysis of Variance Table

Response: Model.Res2	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
cssi_10	1	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.79
Residuals	673	391.70	0.58		

S4 Fig. Directed acyclic graph for model selection.



S2 Table. Household and compound characteristics.

Category	Description	Data
Respondent	Median time respondents lived in their homes	9 years
	Average time respondents lived in their homes	14 years
Compounds	Average number of families per compound	4
	Average number of people per compound	17
	Average number of children under 5 per compound	2
	Average poverty score (Mozambique Simple Poverty Scorecard)	33/81
Observations	Human feces on the ground or inside the sanitation system	11% (9)
	Used diapers on the ground or in a garbage pile	13% (10)
	Standing water	49% (39)
	Any animal present	59% (47)
	Cat present	40% (32)
	Chicken present	15% (12)
	Ducks present	10% (8)
	Dog present	9% (7)
	Pidgeon(s) present	1% (1)
On-site sanitation	Pour-flush to pit or septic tank	63% (50)
	Pit latrine with concrete slab	16% (13)
	Pit latrine without concrete slab	21% (17)

Note: All compounds contained a second household not enrolled in the MapSan trial that was suitable for environmental sampling. However, at each compound we attempted to interview a third individual, the compound head, in addition to the two households. The data collected from the compound heads was for a separate analysis. Survey questions asked to compound heads were different than the household survey questions. At 13 compounds the second household was the household of the compound head and we were therefore unable to calculate an LSSI for these households.

S5 Text. Explanation of soil replicate results

The large average difference between replicate soil samples was skewed from modest variation in highly concentrated samples; 86% of the total variation between replicates came from the 12% of samples with the highest concentrations of *E. coli*. For example, soil sample X with replicate concentrations of 100 and 200 CFU *E. Coli* per gram dry soil and replicate Y with replicate concentrations of 100,000 and 200,000 CFU *E. Coli* per gram dry soil are similarly correlated but the mean difference in replicate values is skewed by the highly concentrated replicate Y. Our protocol diluted soil samples 1:100, therefore the median difference between replicates ($2.50 \log_{10}$ CFU) corresponds to a 3 colony difference between replicate samples. Additionally, the Pearson's correlations coefficient (0.84) suggests a strong positive correlation between replicate soil samples. Given the small median variation between replicates and the strong correlation between replicates, the average of the two replicates from each location is suitable to model *E. coli* in this study.


S3 Table. Visibly wet soil by intra-compound location

Intra-compound location	Visibly wet soil
Dishwashing area	90% (n=72/80)
Clothes washing area	85% (n=68/80)
Latrine entrance	69% (n=55/80)
Garbage storage	68% (n=54/80)
Food prep	61% (n=49/80)
MapSan Household	60% (n=48/80)
Compound entrance	54% (n=43/80)
Non-MapSan Household	54% (n=43/80)
Center of the yard	45% (n=36/80)

S4 Table. Soil sun exposure by intra-compound location

Intra-compound location	Full Sun	Partial Sun	Full Shade
Center of the yard	29% (n=23/80)	49% (n=39/80)	22% (n=18/80)
Clothes washing area	15% (n=12/80)	40% (n=32/80)	45% (n=36/80)
Food prep	13% (n=10/80)	23% (n=18/80)	65% (n=52/80)
Non-MapSan Household	13% (n=10/80)	40% (n=32/80)	48% (n=38/80)
Compound entrance	11% (n=9/80)	53% (n=42/80)	36% (n=29/80)
Garbage storage	11% (n=9/80)	39% (n=31/80)	50% (n=40/80)
MapSan Household	11% (n=9/80)	39% (n=31/80)	50% (n=40/80)
Dishwashing area	9% (n=7/80)	38% (n=30/80)	54% (n=43/80)
Latrine entrance	8% (n=6/80)	41% (n=33/80)	51% (n=41/80)

S5 Fig. LSSI vs *E. coli* counts scatterplots.



S5 Table. Association of LSSI variables with *E. coli* counts in soil

Indicator	Reference	Univariable		Multivariable	
		Beta	95% CI	Beta	95% CI
Access to infrastructure	Ten percentage point increase	-0.09	(-0.17, -0.01)	-0.07	(-0.13, -0.00)
Containment safety		-0.05	(-0.11, 0.01)	-0.02	(-0.07, 0.03)
Hygiene		-0.04	(-0.09, 0.02)	-0.03	(-0.07, 0.01)
Access to emptying services		-0.02	(-0.05, 0.01)	-0.01	(-0.04, 0.01)
Transport safety		-0.01	(-0.05, 0.03)	-0.01	(-0.04, 0.03)
Final disposal		-0.04	(-0.08, 0.00)	-0.04	(-0.08, -0.01)
Access to water supply		-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)	-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)
Solid waste management		-0.07	(-0.13, 0.00)	-0.03	(-0.09, 0.03)
Storm- and greywater management		-0.05	(-0.11, 0.01)	-0.03	(-0.08, 0.01)
Variable					
Type of on-site sanitation system	Ten percentage point Increase	-0.05	(-0.12, 0.02)	-0.02	(-0.08, 0.03)
Toilet sharing		-0.06	(-0.11, -0.01)	-0.06	(-0.10, -0.02)
Structural stability		-0.02	(-0.06, 0.02)	-0.01	(-0.05, 0.02)
Type of lining		-0.02	(-0.07, 0.02)	-0.01	(-0.05, 0.04)
Superstructure roof		-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)	-0.01	(-0.03, 0.02)
Superstructure walls		-0.04	(-0.11, 0.03)	-0.03	(-0.09, 0.03)
Containment effectiveness		0	(-0.06, 0.07)	0.03	(-0.02, 0.09)
Groundwater level		-0.03	(-0.07, 0.01)	-0.03	(-0.06, 0.00)
Hygienic condition		-0.02	(-0.06, 0.01)	-0.02	(-0.05, 0.01)
Soap and water for handwashing		-0.02	(-0.06, 0.02)	-0.01	(-0.05, 0.03)
Type of on-site sanitation lid		-0.01	(-0.05, 0.03)	-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)
Type of emptying equipment		-0.02	(-0.05, 0.01)	-0.02	(-0.04, 0.01)
Local fecal waste transport		-0.02	(-0.05, 0.02)	-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)
Neighborhood fecal waste transport		-0.01	(-0.06, 0.05)	0.00	(-0.50, 0.50)
Disposal management		-0.05	(-0.10, 0.00)	-0.05	(-0.09, -0.01)
Access to water		-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)	-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)
Local solid waste		-0.03	(-0.09, 0.02)	-0.01	(-0.06, 0.04)
Neighbor solid waste		-0.04	(-0.08, 0.01)	-0.03	(-0.06, 0.00)
Greywater management		-0.02	(-0.07, 0.03)	-0.02	(-0.06, 0.02)
Neighbor stormwater accumulation		-0.03	(-0.7, 0.01)	-0.02	(-0.05, 0.02)