UCSF UC San Francisco Previously Published Works

Title

Unimproved water sources and open defecation are associated with active trachoma in children in internally displaced persons camps in the Darfur States of Sudan

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/200268h3

Journal

Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, 113(10)

ISSN

0035-9203

Authors

Macleod, Colin K Binnawi, Kamal Hashim Elshafie, Balgesa Elkheir et al.

Publication Date

2019-10-11

DOI

10.1093/trstmh/trz042

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <u>https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</u>

Peer reviewed



Unimproved water sources and open defecation are associated with active trachoma in children in internally displaced persons camps in the Darfur States of Sudan

Colin K. Macleod^{a,*}, Kamal Hashim Binnawi^{b,c}, Balgesa Elkheir Elshafie^b, Husam Eldin Sadig^d, Awad Hassan^e, Naomi Cocks^a, Rebecca Willis^f, Brian Chu^f and Anthony W. Solomon^{a,g}, for the Global Trachoma Mapping Project[†]

^aClinical Research Department, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, WC1E 7HT, UK; ^bNational Program for Prevention of Blindness, Federal Ministry of Health, PO Box 303 Khartoum, Sudan; ^cDepartment of Ophthalmology, Al Neelain University, Khartoum, Sudan; ^dFaculty of Mathematical Sciences and Statistics, Al-Neelain University, Sudan; ^eSightsavers, Nile Avenue, Khartoum, Sudan; ^fTask Force for Global Health, 330 W Ponce de Leon Ave, Decatur, GA 30030, USA; ^gDepartment of Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

> *Corresponding author: Tel: +44 7586 298 159; E-mail: colin.macleod@lsthm.ac.uk †See Appendix.

Received 8 February 2019; revised 1 April 2019; editorial decision 26 April 2019; accepted 30 May 2019

Purpose: To estimate the proportion of children with trachomatous inflammation—follicular (TF) and adults with trachomatous trichiasis (TT) in internally displaced persons (IDP) camps in the Darfur States of Sudan and to evaluate associated risk factors.

Methods: IDP camps were identified from government census data. We conducted a subanalysis of data collected in these camps during 2014–2015 as part of surveys covering 37 districts of the Darfur States within the Global Trachoma Mapping Project. A random-effects hierarchical model was used to evaluate factors associated with TF in children or TT in adults.

Results: Thirty-six IDP camps were represented in the survey data, in which 1926 children aged 1–9 y were examined, of whom 38 (8%) had TF. Poor sanitation, younger age and living in a household that purchased water from a vendor were associated with TF in children aged 1–9 y. Of 2139 individuals examined aged \geq 15 y, 16 (0.7%) had TT. TT was strongly independently associated with being older and living alone.

Conclusion: Trachoma is found at low levels in these camps, but still at levels where intervention is needed. Disease elimination in conflict-related settings presents a unique challenge for the trachoma community, and may require an innovative approach. Understanding how best to undertake trachoma elimination interventions in these areas should be prioritized.

Keywords: Darfur, Global Trachoma Mapping Project, prevalence, Sudan, trachoma, trichiasis

Introduction

The United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) estimates that in 2014 more than 59 million people worldwide were displaced from their homes due to conflict or insecurity.¹ Over 38 million of these were internally displaced persons (IDPs) still living within the borders of their own country.² Displaced persons present unique challenges to health systems, having an increased risk of infectious disease,^{3–5} malnutrition

related to food and water insecurity,^{6–8} trauma-related psychiatric disorders^{9–11} and maternal mortality.^{12,13} Even where healthcare needs could otherwise be managed, large-scale interventions are made difficult by ongoing risks of violence^{3,14,15} and the itinerant nature of the population.

Trachoma is an eye disease that blinds through recurrent^{16,17} conjunctival infection with the bacterium *Chlamydia trachomatis*. It is the most common infectious cause of blindness worldwide,¹⁸ affecting the world's poorest and most vulnerable populations.¹⁹

© World Health Organization 2019 Licensee Oxford University Press

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution IGO License (http://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by/3.0/igo/legalcode), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. In any reproduction of this article there should not be any suggestion that WHO or this article endorse any specific organisation or products. The use of the WHO logo is not permitted. This notice should be preserved along with the article's original URL. Infection is spread from eye to eye directly by touch, or indirectly through fomites or eye-seeking flies of the *Musca* genus. Female *Musca* spp. flies preferentially lay eggs on human feces left exposed on the soil.²⁰ Trachoma is associated with low levels of access to water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), being found in areas of extreme poverty across the globe.²¹

WHO has targeted trachoma for elimination by 2020^{22} using the SAFE strategy. This consists of Surgery for those with advanced disease, Antibiotic treatment, Facial cleanliness and Environmental improvement in endemic areas.²³ Recommendations for the A, F and E interventions are stratified by the prevalence of the sign trachomatous inflammation—follicular (TF), with (for example) areas having a prevalence of TF $\geq 10\%$ in children aged 1–9 y requiring mass drug administration (MDA) of antibiotics, plus implementation of the F and E components of SAFE for at least 3 y before review.^{21,24} In theory, F reduces the community-level volume of infected secretions available for transfer from eye to eye²⁵; E, which involves increasing access to water and sanitation, facilitates facial cleanliness and reduces the number of breeding sites for *Musca* spp.²⁶ However, the evidence base for the F and E interventions is significantly weaker than that for S and A.²⁷⁻²⁹

The Darfur States in Sudan have been affected by conflict and population displacement since the outbreak of civil war in 2003. UNOCHA estimates that as of December 2015 there were 2.7 million displaced people in Darfur out of a total population of 8.8 million.^{30,31} Darfur comprises five states in the West of Sudan: North, East, West, South and Central Darfur.

Recent trachoma surveys conducted in the Darfur States justify antibiotic MDA in five districts found to have a high prevalence of TF in children. These surveys included IDP camps, and found that living in an IDP camp was a strong independent risk factor for TF, with children living in these camps having odds of TF 2.6 times higher than non-IDP camp-resident children.³² In this paper, we conduct a subanalysis of this IDP camp population to identify independent risk factors that might explain this increased risk of trachoma in the IDP camp population. We report the trachoma prevalence and between-camp risk factors associated with disease.

Methods

Study design

We conducted a secondary analysis of data from 27 crosssectional population-based trachoma prevalence surveys carried out in the Darfur States during 2014–2015. Full details of the methodologies used in the original surveys are presented elswhere.^{32–34} IDP camps were identified from these primary data sets by cross-referencing government census data.

Water and sanitation access

Household-level data on access to water supply for drinking and washing, and sanitation facilities, were collected by field teams at the time of the survey by a focused interview with the head of the household and by direct observation. Water and sanitation access was recorded by a combination of direct observation of structures and responses to questions, depending on whether local or remote structures were used; reported use was obtained by interviewing the head of the household. Recorders were trained to identify water and sanitation infrastructure and access categories based on the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene definitions, which were used up to 2015.^{35,36} GPS coordinates were recorded at the front entrance to each household.

Climate variables

Data on local climate (at 2.5 arc-min resolution ~5 km) were downloaded from WorldClim BioClim variables (worldclim.org). Annual mean rainfall and mean temperature, maximum temperature of the hottest month, and major landcover type, were considered as variables that could potentially influence infection transmission and therefore disease prevalence. Values were extracted from available rasters at the cluster level, defined as the mean easting and mean northing GPS coordinates of all households in a given cluster.

Statistical analysis

Multilevel logistic regression was used in order to account for a change in the variance in the outcome variable between the different population levels.³⁷ Data were collected from units at three different levels (state, camp and household). Outcomes were evaluated for potential clustering of both TF and trachomatous trichiasis (TT) at state, camp and household levels. If no clustering was identified, a standard logistic regression model was used. Univariable associations were considered for inclusion in the multivariate model if $p \le 0.05$ (Wald's χ^2 test). A stepwise-inclusion approach was used, with variables retained in the model if significant at the $p \le 0.05$ level (likelihood ratio test). All risk factor analysis was carried out in Stata 10.2 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX, USA).

Results

A total of 36 IDP camp clusters within 11 districts were identified in 27 surveys in the Darfur States (Table 1, Figure 1). In principle, an IDP camp should be a transient place of residence for individuals who have been forced to migrate due to (for example) civil unrest or famine. In reality, some camps here were settled decades ago, with a proportion inhabited by those who migrated from what is now South Sudan, and they may have little hope of return. Because of the method of selection we used, all included data were by definition from IDP camps that were formally recognized by the government of Sudan, and so were not likely to be recent settlements.

A total of 1080 households and 4556 individuals were enumerated in the 36 IDP camp clusters (Table 2), of whom 3877 individuals (85%) were present and consented to examination. A total of 1926 children aged 1–9 y were enumerated over all identified IDP camps, with 1823 (95%) present and consenting to examination. The median age of participants of all ages was 13 y (range 1–100 y) and 56% were female.

 Table 1.
 Numbers sampled, examined, absent, refused and showing trachomatous inflammation—follicular (TF) or trachomatous trichiasis (TT), internally displaced persons camps, Darfur States, Sudan, 2014–2015

State	District (camp#)	Households	Examined	Absent	Refused/other		1–9-y-olds		10–14-y-olds		≥15-y-olds				
							TF	TT	Examined	TF	TT	Examined	TF	TT	Examined
Central Darfur	Azoom	30	103	3	0	106	0	0	45	0	0	6	0	4	55
	Zalinji (1)	30	115	38	1	154	0	0	48	0	0	20	0	0	86
	Zalinji (2)	30	93	26	0	119	11	0	49	0	0	19	0	0	51
East Darfur	El Daein (East) (1)	30	130	0	0	130	4	0	76	0	0	13	0	0	41
	El Daein (East) (2)	30	94	19	2	115	0	0	47	0	0	15	0	0	53
	El Daein (East) (3)	29	97	56	0	153	0	0	63	0	0	21	0	0	69
North Darfur	El Fashir (1)	30	102	14	0	116	7	0	62	1	0	21	1	1	54
	El Fashir (2)	31	109	0	0	109	2	0	54	0	0	1	0	0	61
	El Fashir (3)	31	112	2	0	114	0	0	43	0	0	12	0	0	55
	El Fashir (4)	29	98	9	0	107	2	0	47	0	0	15	0	0	54
	Dar El Salam (1)	30	109	28	0	137	4	1	39	0	0	26	0	1	44
	Dar El Salam (2)	30	104	12	0	116	14	0	57	0	0	11	0	1	46
	Dar El Salam (3)	30	101	9	0	110	9	0	48	0	0	2	0	1	57
South Darfur	Kas (1)	30	114	22	0	136	1	0	47	0	0	9	0	0	53
	Kas (2)	31	101	29	0	130	7	0	43	1	0	15	0	0	80
	Kas (3)	31	140	0	0	140	6	0	24	1	0	12	0	0	66
	Kas (4)	30	144	4	0	148	1	0	56	0	0	9	0	0	52
	Kas (5)	30	147	15	0	162	13	0	72	0	0	8	0	1	56
	Kas (6)	30	135	16	0	151	6	0	50	0	0	13	0	1	67
	Nyala City (1)	30	116	33	0	149	6	0	69	0	0	8	0	1	63
	Belale (1)	30	109	0	0	109	6	0	67	0	0	11	0	2	70
	Belale (2)	31	113	25	0	138	0	0	69	1	0	29	0	0	64
	Belale (3)	29	82	20	0	102	1	0	74	0	0	11	0	0	66
	Belale (4)	30	117	0	0	117	1	0	69	0	0	16	0	1	64
	Unitty (1)	30	122	8	1ª	131	0	0	47	0	0	22	0	0	62
	Unitty (2)	30	98	19	0	117	0	0	43	0	0	15	0	0	59
West Darfur	El Jinaina (1)	30	72	40	0	112	1	0	36	0	0	6	0	0	70
	El Jinaina (2)	30	139	26	0	165	1	0	74	0	0	19	0	0	72
	El Jinaina (3)	30	77	21	0	98	8	0	41	0	0	9	0	0	48
	El Jinaina (4)	30	96	40	0	136	21	0	59	0	0	14	0	0	63
	El Jinaina (5)	30	75	38	0	113	3	0	37	0	0	13	0	1	63
	El Jinaina (6)	29	85	23	0	108	3	0	41	0	0	17	0	0	50
	Kreanik (1)	29	133	8	0	141	0	0	71	0	0	16	0	0	54
	Kreanik (2)	30	103	36	0	139	0	0	65	0	0	13	0	0	61
	Kreanik (3)	30	96	29	0	125	0	0	49	0	0	20	0	1	56
	Kreanik (4)	30	96	7	0	103	0	0	45	0	0	4	0	0	56
Total		1080	3877	675	4	4556	138	1	1823	4	Ő	362	1	16	1692




Figure 1. Internally displaced persons (IDP) camps surveyed as part of the Global Trachoma Mapping Project, Darfur States, Sudan, 2014–2015.

Proportion of TF

Of 1823 children aged 1–9 y examined, 138 (8%) had TF and 4 (0.2%) had trachomatous inflammation—intense (TI). All four cases of TI also had TF. The proportion of children with TF aged 1–9 y in each camp ranged from 0 to 40%. No cases of TF were found in 11 of the 36 camps.

Clustering of TF

A null model for TF adjusted for age and gender showed statistically significant clustering at state, camp and household levels. The adjusted standard deviation in the odds due to between-state clustering was 0.38 (SE 0.20, p=0.01), due to between-camp clustering was 1.54 (SE 0.28, p<0.0001), and due to between-household clustering was 2.35 (SE 0.31, p<0.0001). The model adjusting for clustering at household level only was a better fit than models also accounting for state and camp clustering. All subsequent analyses on TF presented in this paper are from two-level hierarchical models with adjustment for household-level clustering.

Proportion of TT

Of 2139 individuals examined aged \geq 15 y, 16 (0.7%) had TT. The camp-level prevalence of TT ranged from 0% up to a maximum of 7.3% (4/55) of those aged \geq 15 y in an IDP camp in the Azoom district of Central Darfur.

Clustering of TT

A null model for TT adjusted for age and gender showed no statistically significant clustering at state, camp or household levels. All subsequent analyses on TT presented in this paper are from logistic regression models.

Factors associated with TF in children aged 1-9 y

Univariable associations of TF are presented in Table 3. In the final multivariable model, TF was independently associated with being

Parameter	Number, N
States	5
Districts	13
Internally displaced persons camps	36
Households	1080
Population sampled	4556
Female (%)	2548 (56%)
Children aged 1–9 y	1926
Median individuals examined/camp (IQR)	111.5 (98–122)
Median children aged 1–9 y/camp (IQR)	42.5 (23-47.5)
Camp land cover grassland (%)	28 (78%)
Median annual rainfall (mm)	453
Median annual mean temperature (°C)	25.5
Median temperature of hottest month (°C)	38.6
Median individuals/household	3
Median number of 1–9-y-olds/household	2

aged 1–4 y (OR 1.7, 95% CI 1.1 to 2.7); practicing open defecation (OR 3.1, 95% CI 1.1 to 8.6) and accessing a shared (as opposed to a private household) latrine (OR 3.0, 95% CI 1.1 to 8.5). There was also a strong independent association between TF and obtaining household drinking water from a water vendor (OR 9.9, 95% CI 2.1 to 46.8) compared with obtaining water from an improved source (Table 4).

In IDP camps in Sudan it is common for households to rely on delivery of water in recycled oil barrels. Households obtaining water from vendors were present in 6 of the 36 camps surveyed, with 96% (173/181) of households surveyed in these 6 camps identifying such water vendors as their water source. In these 6 camps the proportion of children aged 1–9 y with TF was 21.1% (57/270) compared with 5.2% (81/1472) in the other 30 camps, the difference being highly statistically significant (p<0.0001, χ^2 test).

Factors associated with TT in those aged \geq 15 y

Univariable associations with TT are presented in Table 5. In the final multivariable model, TT was strongly independently associated with being aged \geq 40 y (OR 22.0, 95% CI 2.8 to 171.6) and living alone (OR 6.9, 95% CI 2.1 to 22.7, Table 6).

Discussion

We found clustering of TF at state, IDP camp and household levels. The strongest effect of clustering was found at household level, consistent with the evidence presented by other studies,^{38–42} and a two-level hierarchical model was used to account for this. At an individual level, in IDP camps in Sudan, younger age was strongly associated with TF, another common finding in the trachoma literature from other contexts.^{38,39,42,43} We found no association between TF and gender, in keeping with trachoma's close-contact mode of transmission, in which

Table 3. Univariable associations of trachomatous inflammation-follicular (TF) in children aged 1–9 y, internally displaced persons camps,Darfur States, Sudan, 2014–2015

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Individual	TF (%)	N (%)	OR (95% CI) ^a	p-value ^b
5-9 y 57 (6.3) 911 (50) Male 68 (7.4) 923 (50.6) 1 0.754 Female 70 (7.8) 900 (49) 1.28 (0.49-3.38) 0.613 1-7 members 19 (8.0) 236 (13.0) 1.28 (0.49-3.38) 0.613 1-7 members 19 (8.0) 236 (13.0) 1.28 (0.49-3.38) 0.613 1-7 members 19 (8.0) 206 (11.0) 0.61 (0.19-1.91) 0.395 1-4 20 (10.0) 0.61 (0.19-1.91) 0.395 1-4 12 (6.0) 200 (11.0) 0.61 (0.19-1.91) 0.395 1-4 0.200 (11.0) 0.61 (0.19-1.91) 0.395 1-4 12 (0.5) 343 (18.8) 0.4 (0.1-2.3) Water access ⁶ 1 0.0095 Uningrowed source ⁶ 131 (12.8) 0.4 (0.1-1.8) Water acces 131 (12.8) 0.4 (0.1-1.8) 230 min round trip 35 (6.5) 1311 (28.8) 0.4 (0.1-2.2) Water acces 57 (12.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.2-3.4) Uningrowed source ⁶ 10 (0.356.5) 539 (29.6) 0.4 (0.1-2.0) Water acces	Age				
Gendar Male 68 (7A) 993 (50.6) 1 0.754 Household 70 (7.8) 900 (49.4) 1.07 (0.69-1.68) 0.613 Household size 28 members 19 (8.0) 236 (13.0) 1.28 (0.49-3.33) 0.613 1-7 members 19 (8.0) 236 (13.0) 1.28 (0.49-3.33) 0.613 1-7 members 19 (8.0) 236 (13.0) 1.28 (0.49-3.33) 0.613 Number of resident children aged 1-9 y 25 1.26 (7.8) 1623 (89.0) 1 0.395 1-4 12 (6.0) 200 (16.4) 1 0.0095 0.395 Mini source of water for drinking T T 0.40 (1-2.3) 0.0095 Mini source of water for washing T 0.40 (1-1.2) 0.40 (1-1.2) 0.0094 Mini source of water for washing water T 0.395 (6.5) 1311 (28.8) 0.4 (0.1-2.2) Mole source of water for washing water T 0.0094 1.00094 0.0094 Improved source' 103 (8.0) 2454 (70.4) <td>1–4 y</td> <td>81 (8.9)</td> <td>912 (50.0)</td> <td>1.71 (1.07-2.72)</td> <td><0.0001</td>	1–4 y	81 (8.9)	912 (50.0)	1.71 (1.07-2.72)	<0.0001
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	5–9 y	57 (6.3)	911 (50.0)		
Ferrade70 (7.8)900 (49.4)1.07 (0.69-1.68)Household size9 \geq 8 members19 (8.0)236 (13.0)1.28 (0.49-3.3)0.6131-7 members119 (7.5)1587 (87.0)1Number of resident children aged 1-9 y210.613 (0.19-1.91)0.3951-4126 (7.8)1623 (89.0)10.613 (0.19-1.91)0.3951-4126 (7.8)1623 (89.0)10.00951-4126 (7.8)1210 (66.4)10.0095Water access*12 (2.5)3.43 (18.8)0.4 (0.1-2.3)0.613Water vendor57 (21.1)270 (14.8)7.8 (1.7-34.9)0.613Unimproved source*103 (8.0)3.245 (71.2)10.208823.0 min cound-trip103 (8.0)3.245 (71.2)10.0094Unimproved source*12 (2.5)3.44 (16.8)0.4 (0.1-2.2)Water vendor57 (21.1)2.200 (14.8)2.4 (0.4)1Unimproved source*12 (3.5)3.44 (16.8)0.4 (0.1-2.2)Water vendor57 (21.1)2.200 (14.8)2.6 (1.0.2,05)1Unimproved source*103 (8.0)12.84 (70.4)10.0357Unimproved source*38 (5.2)7.44 (40.8)10.0357Unimer vendis discussent (open defecation)3.8 (5.2)7.44 (40.8)10.0357Shored latine access36 (6.4)7.43 (7.4)10.0357Private latine with sold (improved pit latine)7.3 (10.0)7.8 (59.2)1.60 (-9.5) <td>Gender</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Gender				
Household sizeHousehold size19 (8.0)236 (13.0)1.28 (0.49–3.33)0.613 2^{-1} nembers19 (7.5)128 (0.49)1Number of reident children aged 1–9 y12 (6.0)200 (11.0)0.61 (0.19–1.91)0.395 2^{-5} 12 (6.0)1623 (89.0)10.3951-412 (5.7)1423 (89.0)10.095Water access ⁶ 10.00950.43 (18.8)0.4 (0.1–2.3)Water access ⁷ 7 (21.1)270 (14.8)7.8 (1.7–34.9)0.61Uninproved source ⁸ 103 (8.0)234 (18.8)0.4 (0.1–2.3)0.40Water vedor53 (5.5)1311 (28.8)0.4 (0.1–2.3)0.61Source of drinking water103 (8.0)234 (18.9)0.4 (0.1–2.3)0.61Up to 30 min round-trip103 (8.0)1311 (28.9)10.0095Improved source ⁶ 12 (3.5)344 (18.9)0.4 (0.1–2.7)0.61Water vedor57 (21.1)700 (14.8)10.61Up to 30 min round-trip103 (8.0)128 (70.4)10.0095Uninproved source ⁶ 12 (3.5)344 (18.9)0.4 (0.1–2.7)0.61Water vedor57 (21.1)700 (14.8)10.0095Up to 30 min round-trip103 (8.0)128 (70.4)10.0357Up to 30 min round-trip103 (8.0)128 (70.4)10.0357Up to 30 min round-trip38 (6.5)549 (29.6)0.4 (0.1–2.0)0.651Up to 30 min round-trip38 (6.2) <td>Male</td> <td>68 (7.4)</td> <td>923 (50.6)</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.754</td>	Male	68 (7.4)	923 (50.6)	1	0.754
Household size Set members 19 (8.0) 236 (13.0) 1.28 (0.49–3.33) 0.13 1–7 members 119 (7.5) 1587 (87.0) 1 0.33 Number of resident children oged 1–9 y 25 12 (6.0) 200 (11.0) 0.61 (0.19–1.91) 0.395 1–4 126 (7.8) 1623 (89.0) 1 0.395 1–4 126 (7.8) 1623 (89.0) 1 0.0095 Water access ⁶ 69 (5.7) 1210 (66.4) 1 0.0095 Unimproved source ⁶ 57 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.7-34.9) 0.4 (0.1-3.3) Water vendor 57 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.7-34.9) 0.0094 Valur vendor 65 (5.7) 12.09 (66.3) 1 0.0094 Valur vendor 57 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.7-34.8) 0.4 (0.1-2.2) Water vendor 57 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.7-34.8) 0.0094 Unimproved source ⁶ 10 3 (8.0) 1244 (70.4) 1 0.0514 Lot no mound-trip 103 (8.0) 1244 (70.4)	Female	70 (7.8)	900 (49.4)	1.07 (0.69-1.68)	
≥8 members19 (8.0)236 (13.0)1.28 (0.49-3.33)0.6131-7 members119 (7.5)157 (87.0)1Number of resident children aged 1-9 y>≥512 (6.0)200 (11.0)0.61 (0.19-1.91)0.3951-4126 (7.8)1203 (89.0)10.0095Water access ⁶ 12 (3.5)343 (18.8)0.4 (0.1-2.3)Water access ⁶ 57 (21.1)270 (14.8)7.8 (1.7-34.9)0.0095Unimproved source ⁶ 69 (5.7)1210 (66.4)10.0095Unimproved source ⁶ 12 (3.5)343 (18.8)0.4 (0.1-2.3)0.4 (0.1-2.3)Water vendor57 (21.1)270 (14.8)7.8 (1.7-34.9)0.0094Unimproved source ⁶ 12 (3.5)344 (18.9)0.4 (0.1-2.0)0.0094Unimproved source ⁶ 12 (3.5)344 (18.9)0.4 (0.1-2.2)0.0094Unimproved source ⁶ 103 (8.0)1284 (70.4)10.2514≥30 min round-trip103 (8.0)1284 (70.4)10.2514≥30 min round-trip103 (8.0)1284 (70.4)10.0357Latrine sources for100 (7.1)2.6 (1.02-8.05)3.5 (5.5)3.9 (2.9.6)0.4 (0.1-2.0)Water vendor36 (5.2)744 (4.0.8)10.0357Latrine facilities absent (open defecation)43 (6.4)674 (37.0)2.8 (1.02-8.05)Shared latrine access71 (4.1)450 (2.2)3.27 (1.15-9.25)Latrine facilities absent (pen defecation)43 (6.2)744 (4.0.8)10.	Household				
1-7 members 119 (7.5) 1587 (87.0) 1 Number of resident children aged 1-9 y 2 200 (11.0) 0.61 (0.19-1.91) 0.395 1-4 126 (7.8) 200 (11.0) 0.61 (0.19-1.91) 0.395 1-4 126 (7.8) 1623 (89.0) 1 0.0095 Unimproved source ⁴ 69 (5.7) 1210 (66.4) 1 0.0095 Unimproved source ⁴ 103 (8.0) 3245 (71.2) 1 0.2088 ≥30 min source of water for washing 11 0.2088 230 min 0.4 (0.1-1.8) 0.0094 Wains source of water for washing 12 (3.5) 3245 (71.2) 1 0.2088 230 min 0.4 (0.1-2.0) 0.0094 Unimproved source ⁶ 69 (5.7) 1209 (66.3) 1 0.0094	Household size				
Number of resident children aged 1–9 y ≥5 12 (6.0) 200 (11.0) 0.61 (0.19–1.91) 0.395 $1-4$ 126 (7.8) 1623 (89.0) 1 0.395 Main source of water for drinking Improved source ⁴ 9 (5.7) 1210 (66.4) 1 0.0095 Unimproved source ⁶ 12 (3.5) 343 (18.8) 0.4 (0.1–2.3) Water vendor 75 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.7–34.9) Time to main source of drinking water Up to 30 min round-trip 103 (8.0) 3245 (71.2) 1 0.2088 ≥30 min 33 (6.5) 1311 (28.8) 0.4 (0.1–2.3) Water vendor 0.0094 Unimproved source ⁶ 12 (3.5) 344 (18.9) 0.4 (0.1–2.2) Water vendor 75 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.7–34.8) 1 0.0094 Up to 30 min round-trip 103 (8.0) 1284 (70.4) 1 0.2514 2.0 Water vendor 57 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 1 0.0357 Unimproved source ⁶ 103 (8.0) 1284 (70.4) 1 0.2514 ≥00 minutes 36 (6.5) 539 (29.6) 0.4 (0.1–2.0) 2.0 2.1	≥8 members	19 (8.0)	236 (13.0)	1.28 (0.49-3.33)	0.613
$\begin{array}{cccc} \geq 5 & 12 (6.0) & 200 (11.0) & 0.61 (0.19-1.91) & 0.395 \\ 1-4 & 126 (7.8) & 1623 (89.0) & 1 \\ \hline \\ Wotter access^6 \\ \hline \\ Min source of water for drinking \\ \hline \\ Improved source^8 & 12 (3.5) & 343 (18.8) & 0.4 (0.1-2.3) \\ Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.9) \\ \hline \\ Time to moin source of drinking water \\ \hline \\ Up to 30 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 3245 (71.2) & 1 & 0.2088 \\ \geq 30 min & 35 (6.5) & 1311 (28.8) & 0.4 (0.1-2.8) \\ \hline \\ Min source of water for vashing \\ \hline \\ Improved source^8 & 69 (5.7) & 1209 (66.3) & 1 & 0.0094 \\ Unimproved source^9 & 12 (3.5) & 344 (18.9) & 0.4 (0.1-2.8) \\ \hline \\ Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) \\ \hline \\ Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) \\ \hline \\ Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) \\ \hline \\ Time to moin source of washing water \\ Up to 30 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ \geq 30 min.tes & 35 (6.5) & 539 (29.6) & 0.4 (0.1-2.0) \\ \hline \\ Water vendor & 57 (12.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) \\ \hline \\ Up to 30 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.0357 \\ Latrine togetime & 38 (5.2) & 744 (40.8) & 1 & 0.0357 \\ Latrine facilities absent (open defecation) & 43 (6.4) & 674 (37.0) & 2.86 (1.02-8.05) \\ Shared latrine access & 57 (14.1) & 405 (22.2) & 3.27 (1.15-9.25) \\ Latrine toget & & & & \\ Pit latrine with balb (improved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (39.9) & 1.3 (0.4-4.0) \\ No focilities bush or field & 0 (0.0) & 10 (0.5) & - \\ \hline \\ Camp & & & & & \\ Camp & & & & & \\ Desert (annual rainfell < 500 mm) & 43 (6.4) & 670 (36.8) & 1 \\ \hline \\ Mean temperature annually' & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & &$	1–7 members	119 (7.5)	1587 (87.0)	1	
$\begin{array}{ccccc} 1-4 & 126 (7.8) & 1623 (89.0) & 1 \\ Water access^{5} \\ Wains ource of water for drinking \\ Improved source^{6} & 96 (5.7) & 1210 (66.4) & 1 & 0.0095 \\ Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 0.4 (0.1-2.3) \\ Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.9) \\ \end{array} \\ Time to main source of drinking water \\ Up to 30 min round-trip & 35 (6.5) & 1311 (28.8) & 0.4 (0.1-1.8) \\ Water vendor & 35 (6.5) & 1311 (28.8) & 0.4 (0.1-1.8) \\ Water vendor & 35 (6.5) & 1311 (28.8) & 0.4 (0.1-2.7) \\ Water vendor & 7 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) \\ Umingroved source^{6} & 12 (3.5) & 344 (18.9) & 0.4 (0.1-2.7) \\ Water vendor & 7 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) \\ Ub 130 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 230 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ 100 minte sources & 57 (14.1) & 405 (22.2) & 3.27 (1.15-9.5) \\ 100 minte sources & 57 (14.1) & 405 (22.2) & 3.27 (1.15-9.5) \\ 100 minte sources & 57 (14.1) & 0.28 (3.9) & 1.3 (0.4-4.0) \\ 100 minter without slob (improved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (3.9) & 1.3 (0.4-4.0) \\ 110 miter without slob (improved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (3.9) & 1.3 (0.4-9.0) \\ 120 minter without slob (improved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (3.9) & 1.3 (0.4-9.0) \\ 120 minter without slob (mintervoved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (3.9) & 1.3 (0.4-9.0) \\ 120 minter without slob (improved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (3.9) & 1.3 (0.4-9.0) \\ 120 minter without slob (mintervoved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (3.9) &$	Number of resident children aged 1–9 y				
Water access ⁶ Main source of water for drinking Description Improved source ⁶ 12 (3.5) 343 (18.8) 0.4 (0.1–2.3) Water vendor 77 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.7–34.9) Time to moin source of drinking water Up to 30 min round-trip 103 (8.0) 3245 (71.2) 1 0.2088 ≥30 min source of water for washing 0.4 (0.1–1.8) 0.4 (0.1–1.8) 0.0094 Main source of water for washing 1 0.0094 0.4 (0.1–2.2) 0.4 (0.1–2.2) Water vendor 57 (21.1) 270 (14.8) 7.8 (1.7–34.8) 0.0094 Unimproved source ⁶ 12 (3.5) 344 (18.9) 0.4 (0.1–2.2) Water vendor 0.0094 Unimproved source ⁶ 13 (3.6.0) 1284 (70.4) 1 0.2514 ≥30 minutes 35 (6.5) 539 (29.6) 0.4 (0.1–2.0) 1 Latrine access 57 (14.1) 405 (22.2) 3.27 (1.15–9.25) 1 Latrine access 57 (14.1) 405 (22.2) 3.27 (1.15–9.25) 1 Latrine access 57 (14.1) 405 (22.2) 3.27 (1.15–9.25) 1	≥5	12 (6.0)	200 (11.0)	0.61 (0.19-1.91)	0.395
$\begin{array}{l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l $	1-4	126 (7.8)	1623 (89.0)	1	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } Improved source^{d} & 69 (5.7) & 1210 (6.4) & 1 & 0.0095 \\ Unimproved source^{d} & 12 (3.5) & 343 (18.4) & 0.4 (0.1-2.3) \\ Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.9) \\ \hline \end{tite} \end{ti}$	Water access ^c				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c } & 12 (3.5) & 343 (18.8) & 0.4 (0.1-2.3) \\ Water vendor 720 (1.4) & 7.8 (1.7-34.9) \\ Time to moin source of drinking water \\ Up to 30 min round-trip 103 (8.0) & 3245 (71.2) & 1 & 0.2088 \\ \geq 30 min round-trip 103 (8.0) & 3245 (71.2) & 1 & 0.2088 \\ \geq 30 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 3245 (71.2) & 1 & 0.0094 \\ \hline Moin source of water for washing \\ Improved sourced 69 (5.7) & 1209 (66.3) & 1 & 0.0094 \\ Unimproved sourced 12 (3.5) & 344 (18.9) & 0.4 (0.1-2.2) \\ Water vendor 75 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 0.4 (0.1-2.2) \\ Water vendor 75 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 0.4 (0.1-2.0) \\ Unimproved sourced 13 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ \geq 30 min round-trip 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ \geq 30 min toutes 13 (5.5) & 539 (29.6) & 0.4 (0.1-2.0) \\ Latrine access^{c} \\ \hline \\ Private latrine access 5 (6.4) & 674 (37.0) & 2.86 (1.02-8.05) \\ Shared latrine access 5 (714.1) & 405 (22.2) & 3.27 (1.15-9.25) \\ Latrine typed \\ Pit latrine with slob (improved pit latrine) 73 (10.0) 728 (39.9) & 1.3 (0.4-4.0) \\ No focilities, bush or field 45 (6.8) & 660 (36.2) & 2.9 (0.9-9.5) \\ Othera 0 (0.0) & 10 (0.5) & - \\ \hline \\ Climate/environmentk \\ Rainfoll' \\ Desert (annuol rainfoll <500 mm) & 95 (8.2) & 1153 (63.3) & 1.5 (0.7-3.2) & 0.2445 \\ \geq 500 mm & 43 (6.4) & 670 (36.8) & 1 \\ Mean temperature annually' \\ & \geq 25^{c} & 57 (7.6) & 1256 (68.9) & 1.1 (0.2-5.9) & 0.9067 \\ < 25^{c} & 34 (7.6) & 567 (31.1) & 1 \\ Moximum temperature of hottest month1 \\ & \geq 40^{c} & 123 (7.4) & 165 (90.7) & 1 \\ \end{array}$	Main source of water for drinking				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.9) \\ \hline Time to main source of drinking water \\ Up to 30 min nound-trip & 103 (8.0) & 3245 (71.2) & 1 & 0.2088 \\ $\geq 30 min & 35 (6.5) & 1311 (28.8) & 0.4 (0.1-1.8) \\ \hline Main source of water for washing & & & & & & \\ Improved source4 & 69 (5.7) & 1209 (66.3) & 1 & 0.0094 \\ Unimproved source6 & 12 (3.5) & 344 (18.9) & 0.4 (0.1-2.2) \\ Water vendor & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) \\ \hline Time to main source of washing water & & & & \\ Up to 30 min round-trip & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ $\geq 30 minutes & 35 (6.5) & 539 (29.6) & 0.4 (0.1-2.0) \\ Latrine access6 & & & & \\ Private latrine access6 & & & & \\ Private latrine access & 57 (14.1) & 405 (22.2) & 3.27 (1.15-9.25) \\ Latrine facilities absent (open defecation) & 43 (6.4) & 674 (37.0) & 2.86 (1.02-8.05) \\ Shored latrine oxcess & 57 (14.1) & 405 (22.2) & 3.27 (1.15-9.25) \\ Latrine type4 & & & \\ Pit latrine with slab (improved pit latrine) & 20 (4.7) & 425 (23.3) & 1 & 0.1691 \\ Pit latrine with slab (improved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (39.9) & 1.3 (0.4-4.0) \\ No facilities, bush or field & 45 (6.8) & 660 (36.2) & 2.9 (0.9-9.5) \\ Other3 & 0 (0.0) & 10 (0.5) & - \\ \hline Comp & & & \\ Climate/environmentk \\ Rainfall & & & \\ Pesert (annual roinfall <500 mm) & 95 (8.2) & 1153 (63.3) & 1.5 (0.7-3.2) & 0.2445 \\ $\geq 500 mm & 43 (6.4) & 670 (31.1) & 1 \\ Mean temperature annually1 \\ & $\geq 25^{\circ}C & 95 (7.6) & 1256 (68.9) & 1.1 (0.2-5.9) & 0.9067 \\ $< 25^{\circ}C & 30 (7.6) & 15 (8.9) & 169 (9.3) & 1.3 (0.4-3.9) & 0.6945 \\ $\leq 40^{\circ}C & 123 (7.4) & 1654 (90.7) & 1 & \\ \end{array}$	Improved source ^d	69 (5.7)	1210 (66.4)	1	0.0095
Time to main source of drinking waterUp to 30 min round-trip103 (8.0) 3245 (71.2)10.2088 ≥ 30 min35 (6.5)1311 (28.8)0.4 (0.1–1.8)Main source of water for washing11209 (66.3)10.0094Unimproved source ⁶ 12 (3.5)344 (18.9)0.4 (0.1–2.2)Water vendor57 (21.1)270 (14.8)7.8 (1.7–34.8)Time to main source of washing water10.2514Up to 30 min round-trip103 (8.0)1284 (70.4)10.2514 ≥ 30 minutes35 (6.5)539 (29.6)0.4 (0.1–2.0)1Latrine access ⁶ 10.03570.46 (1.02–8.05)0.45 (1.02–8.05)Private latrine38 (5.2)744 (40.8)10.0357Latrine focilities absent (open defecation)43 (6.4)674 (37.0)2.86 (1.02–8.05)Shored latrine access57 (14.1)405 (22.2)3.27 (1.15–9.25)Latrine trip type ⁴ 0 (0.0)10 (0.5)-Pit latrine with slab (improved pit latrine)73 (10.0)728 (39.9)1.3 (0.4–4.0)No facilities, bush or field45 (6.8)660 (36.2)2.9 (0.9–9.5)0.2445Other ⁹ 0 (0.0)10 (0.5)Eliminful21153 (63.3)1.5 (0.7–3.2)0.2445Solo mm43 (6.4)670 (36.8)1Desert (annual rainfall <500 mm)	Unimproved source ^e	12 (3.5)	343 (18.8)	0.4 (0.1–2.3)	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c } \mbox{lphi} & 103 (8.0) & 3245 (71.2) & 1 & 0.2088 \\ \begin{timediateskip}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Water vendor	57 (21.1)	270 (14.8)	7.8 (1.7-34.9)	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } & 35 (6.5) & 1311 (28.8) & 0.4 (0.1-1.8) \\ \\ \mbox{Mein source of water for washing } & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	Time to main source of drinking water				
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline Main source of water for washing $$$$ Interval to the the term of term of the term of the term of the term of the term of ter$	Up to 30 min round-trip	103 (8.0)	3245 (71.2)	1	0.2088
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } Improved source^{d} & 69 (5.7) & 1209 (66.3) & 1 & 0.0094 \\ Unimproved source^{a} & 12 (3.5) & 344 (18.9) & 0.4 (0.1-2.2) \\ Water vendor & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) & 7$	≥30 min	35 (6.5)	1311 (28.8)	0.4 (0.1–1.8)	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } \mbox{Unimproved source}^e & 12 (3.5) & 344 (18.9) & 0.4 (0.1-2.2) \\ \mbox{Water vendor} & 57 (21.1) & 270 (14.8) & 7.8 (1.7-34.8) \\ \mbox{Time to main source of washing water} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$					
Water vendor57 (21.1)270 (14.8)7.8 (1.7-34.8)Time to main source of washing water003 (8.0)1284 (70.4)10.2514 ≥ 30 minutes35 (6.5)539 (29.6)0.4 (0.1-2.0)0.2514 ≥ 30 minutes38 (5.2)7.44 (40.8)10.0357Latrine access ⁶ 90.22110.0357Latrine facilities absent (open defecation)43 (6.4)6.74 (37.0)2.86 (1.02-8.05)Shared latrine access57 (14.1)405 (22.2)3.27 (1.15-9.25)Latrine trype ⁷ 9110.00728 (39.9)1.3 (0.4-4.0)Pit latrine with slab (improved pit latrine)20 (4.7)425 (23.3)10.1691Pit latrine without slab (unimproved pit latrine)73 (10.0)728 (39.9)1.3 (0.4-4.0)No facilities, bush or field45 (6.8)660 (36.2)2.9 (0.9-9.5)0.1691Other ⁴ 00.0010 (0.5)CampClimate/environment ^k Rainfall95 (8.2)1153 (63.3)1.5 (0.7-3.2)0.2445≥500 mm43 (6.4)670 (36.8)1Mean temperature annually ¹ ≥25°C95 (7.6)1256 (68.9)1.1 (0.2-5.9)0.9067-<25°C		69 (5.7)	1209 (66.3)	1	0.0094
$\begin{array}{ c c c } \mbox{Time to main source of washing water} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Unimproved source ^e	12 (3.5)	344 (18.9)	0.4 (0.1–2.2)	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c } \mbox{Up to 30 min round-trip} & 103 (8.0) & 1284 (70.4) & 1 & 0.2514 \\ \hline \ge 30 \mbox{min utes} & 35 (6.5) & 539 (29.6) & 0.4 (0.1-2.0) \\ \mbox{Latrine access}^{c} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Water vendor	57 (21.1)	270 (14.8)	7.8 (1.7–34.8)	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c } & 35 (6.5) & 539 (29.6) & 0.4 (0.1-2.0) \\ \hline Latrine access^c & & & & & & & & & \\ Private latrine & 38 (5.2) & 744 (40.8) & 1 & 0.0357 \\ Latrine facilities absent (open defecation) & 43 (6.4) & 674 (37.0) & 2.86 (1.02-8.05) \\ Shored latrine access & 57 (14.1) & 405 (22.2) & 3.27 (1.15-9.25) \\ \hline Latrine type^{f} & & & & & & \\ Pit latrine with slab (improved pit latrine) & 20 (4.7) & 425 (23.3) & 1 & 0.1691 \\ Pit latrine without slob (unimproved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (39.9) & 1.3 (0.4-4.0) \\ No facilities, bush or field & 45 (6.8) & 660 (36.2) & 2.9 (0.9-9.5) \\ Other9 & 0 (0.0) & 10 (0.5) & - & & \\ \hline Camp & & & & & \\ \hline Climate / environment^k \\ Rainfall^l & & & & & \\ Desert (annual rainfall <500 mm) & 95 (8.2) & 1153 (63.3) & 1.5 (0.7-3.2) & 0.2445 \\ \ge 500 mm & 43 (6.4) & 670 (36.8) & 1 & \\ Mean temperature annually^l & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ 225^{\circ} C & 33 (7.6) & 1256 (68.9) & 1.1 (0.2-5.9) & 0.9067 \\ <25^{\circ} C & 33 (7.6) & 169 (9.3) & 1.3 (0.4-3.9) & 0.6945 \\ & & & & & & \\ 40^{\circ} C & 123 (7.4) & 1654 (90.7) & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}$	Time to main source of washing water				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } Latrine access^{C} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Up to 30 min round-trip	103 (8.0)	1284 (70.4)	1	0.2514
$\begin{array}{ c c c c } \hline Private latrine & 38 (5.2) & 744 (40.8) & 1 & 0.0357 \\ \hline Latrine facilities absent (open defecation) & 43 (6.4) & 674 (37.0) & 2.86 (1.02-8.05) \\ \hline Shared latrine access & 57 (14.1) & 405 (22.2) & 3.27 (1.15-9.25) \\ \hline Latrine type f & & & & & & & & & \\ \hline Pit latrine with slab (improved pit latrine) & 20 (4.7) & 425 (23.3) & 1 & 0.1691 \\ \hline Pit latrine without slab (unimproved pit latrine) & 73 (10.0) & 728 (39.9) & 1.3 (0.4-4.0) \\ No facilities, bush or field & 45 (6.8) & 660 (36.2) & 2.9 (0.9-9.5) \\ \hline Other9 & 0 (0.0) & 10 (0.5) & - & & & & \\ \hline Cimate/environment^k \\ Rainfall1 & & & & & & & & \\ Posert (annual rainfall <500 mm) & 95 (8.2) & 1153 (63.3) & 1.5 (0.7-3.2) & 0.2445 \\ & \geq 500 mm & 43 (7.6) & 567 (31.1) & 1 & & & \\ Mean temperature annually1 & & & & & & \\ & \geq 25^{\circ}C & 95 (7.6) & 1256 (68.9) & 1.1 (0.2-5.9) & 0.9067 \\ & <25^{\circ}C & 43 (7.6) & 567 (31.1) & 1 & & & \\ \hline Maximum temperature of hottest month1 & & & & & & \\ & \geq 40^{\circ}C & 15 (8.9) & 169 (9.3) & 1.3 (0.4-3.9) & 0.6945 \\ & <40^{\circ}C & 123 (7.4) & 1654 (90.7) & 1 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	≥30 minutes	35 (6.5)	539 (29.6)	0.4 (0.1-2.0)	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Latrine access ^c				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Private latrine	38 (5.2)	744 (40.8)	1	0.0357
Latrine type ^f 20 (4.7)425 (23.3)10.1691Pit latrine without slab (improved pit latrine)73 (10.0)728 (39.9)1.3 (0.4-4.0)0.1691No facilities, bush or field45 (6.8)660 (36.2)2.9 (0.9-9.5)0Other ^g 0 (0.0)10 (0.5)CampClimate/environment ^k Rainfall ¹ 95 (8.2)1153 (63.3)1.5 (0.7-3.2)0.2445≥500 mm43 (6.4)670 (36.8)1Mean temperature annually ¹ 225°C95 (7.6)1256 (68.9)1.1 (0.2-5.9)0.9067<25°C	Latrine facilities absent (open defecation)	43 (6.4)	674 (37.0)	2.86 (1.02-8.05)	
Pit latrine with slab (improved pit latrine)20 (4.7)425 (23.3)10.1691Pit latrine without slab (unimproved pit latrine)73 (10.0)728 (39.9)1.3 (0.4-4.0)1.3 (0.4-4.0)No facilities, bush or field45 (6.8)660 (36.2)2.9 (0.9-9.5)1.4 (0.5)Other ⁹ 0 (0.0)10 (0.5)CampClimate/environment ^k Rainfall ¹ 95 (8.2)1153 (63.3)1.5 (0.7-3.2)0.2445≥500 mm43 (6.4)670 (36.8)1-Mean temperature annually ¹ 225°C95 (7.6)1256 (68.9)1.1 (0.2-5.9)0.9067<25°C		57 (14.1)	405 (22.2)	3.27 (1.15–9.25)	
Pit latrine without slab (unimproved pit latrine)73 (10.0)728 (39.9)1.3 (0.4-4.0)No facilities, bush or field45 (6.8)660 (36.2)2.9 (0.9-9.5)Other ⁹ 0 (0.0)10 (0.5)-CampClimate/environment ^k Rainfall ¹ Desert (annual rainfall <500 mm)					
No facilities, bush or field45 (6.8)660 (36.2)2.9 (0.9-9.5)Other ⁹ 0 (0.0)10 (0.5)-CampClimate/environment ^k Rainfall ¹ Desert (annual rainfall <500 mm)		20 (4.7)		1	0.1691
Other90 (0.0)10 (0.5)-CampClimate/environmentkRainfall1Desert (annual rainfall <500 mm)			728 (39.9)		
Camp Climate/environmentk Rainfall95 (8.2)1153 (63.3)1.5 (0.7-3.2)0.2445 $\geq 500 \text{ mm}$ 95 (8.2)1153 (63.3)10.2445 $\geq 500 \text{ mm}$ 43 (6.4)670 (36.8)1Mean temperature annually $= 225^{\circ}\text{C}$ 95 (7.6)1256 (68.9)1.1 (0.2-5.9)0.9067 $< 25^{\circ}\text{C}$ 43 (7.6)567 (31.1)11Maximum temperature of hottest monthl $= 240^{\circ}\text{C}$ 15 (8.9)169 (9.3)1.3 (0.4-3.9)0.6945 $< 40^{\circ}\text{C}$ 123 (7.4)1654 (90.7)111				2.9 (0.9–9.5)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c } Climate/environment^k \\ Rainfall^l \\ \hline Desert (annual rainfall <500 mm) & 95 (8.2) & 1153 (63.3) & 1.5 (0.7-3.2) & 0.2445 \\ \geq 500 mm & 43 (6.4) & 670 (36.8) & 1 \\ \hline Mean temperature annually^l \\ \geq 25^{\circ}\text{C} & 95 (7.6) & 1256 (68.9) & 1.1 (0.2-5.9) & 0.9067 \\ <25^{\circ}\text{C} & 43 (7.6) & 567 (31.1) & 1 \\ \hline Maximum temperature of hottest month^l \\ & & & & & \\ \geq 40^{\circ}\text{C} & 15 (8.9) & 169 (9.3) & 1.3 (0.4-3.9) & 0.6945 \\ <40^{\circ}\text{C} & 123 (7.4) & 1654 (90.7) & 1 \\ \end{array}$	Other ^g	0 (0.0)	10 (0.5)	-	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c } Rainfall^{l} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Camp				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
≥500 mm 43 (6.4) 670 (36.8) 1 Mean temperature annually ¹ 25°C 95 (7.6) 1256 (68.9) 1.1 (0.2–5.9) 0.9067 <25°C					
Mean temperature annually ¹ ≥25°C 95 (7.6) 1256 (68.9) 1.1 (0.2–5.9) 0.9067 <25°C					0.2445
≥25°C95 (7.6)1256 (68.9)1.1 (0.2–5.9)0.9067<25°C		43 (6.4)	670 (36.8)	1	
<25°C43 (7.6)567 (31.1)1Maximum temperature of hottest monthl≥40°C15 (8.9)169 (9.3)1.3 (0.4–3.9)0.6945<40°C					
Maximum temperature of hottest month ¹ ≥40°C 15 (8.9) 169 (9.3) 1.3 (0.4–3.9) 0.6945 <40°C					0.9067
≥40°C15 (8.9)169 (9.3)1.3 (0.4-3.9)0.6945<40°C		43 (7.6)	567 (31.1)	1	
<40°C 123 (7.4) 1654 (90.7) 1					
				, ,	0.6945
Continued	<40°C	123 (7.4)	1654 (90.7)	1	
					Continued

Table 3. Continued

Individual	TF (%)	N (%)	OR (95% CI) ^a	p-value ^b
Major land cover type				
Open shrubland	34 (14.1)	241 (13.2)	4.1 (0.6-29.5)	0.4371
Grassland	100 (6.9)	1444 (79.2)	1	
Croplands/natural vegetation mosaic	2 (2.1)	94 (5.2)	0.3 (0.1-8.9)	
Barren or sparsely vegetated	2 (4.6)	44 (2.4)	1.3 (0.1–87.8)	

^aUnadjusted OR and 95% CI from two-level mixed effects logistic regression

^bp-value from Wald's χ^2 , statistically significant associations highlighted in bold (p \leq 0.05)

^cfrom focused interview with head of household

^dImproved water source—piped water into dwelling, piped water to yard/plot, public tap or standpipe, tubewell or borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, rainwater; 15 households had different washing/drinking water sources

^eUnprotected spring, unprotected dug well, surface water

^fdirect observation by researchers

^gLatrine subtype not specified further

^kextracted from 2.5 arc-min (~5 km at the equator) raster data from worldclim.org

ⁱNo association in linear model, categorical data presented here

^hOpen shrublands, cropland/natural vegetation mosaic, barren or sparsely vegetated

 Table 4.
 Multivariable logistic regression model of trachomatous inflammation—follicular (TF) in children aged 1–9 y, internally displaced persons camps, Darfur States, Sudan, 2014–2015

Variable	OR (95% CI) ^a	p-value ^b
Individual		
Age 1–4 y (compared with 5–9 y)	1.7 (1.0–2.7)	0.027
Household		
Main source of water for drinking ^c		
Improved source ^d	1	0.0136
Unimproved source ^e	0.4 (0.2–1.2)	
Water vendor	8.5 (4.1-21.0)	
Latrine access ^d		
Private latrine	1	0.024
Latrine facilities absent (use of open defecation)	3.1 (1.1-8.6)	
Shared latrine access	3.0 (1.1–8.5)	

^aAdjusted OR and 95% CI from two-level mixed effects logistic regression; sex included in model a priori

^bp-value from likelihood ratio test for variable nested in full model

^cfrom focused interview with head of household

^dPiped water into dwelling, piped water to yard/plot, public tap or standpipe, tubewell or borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, rainwater; 15 households had different washing/drinking water sources.

^eUnprotected spring, unprotected dug well, surface water

exposure would be expected to be similar in children of both genders; $^{44-46}$ however, we included gender in all models a priori.

Household access to a private latrine of any kind was associated with decreased odds of TF. This could be considered a small validation of the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene's definition of an improved latrine as one used by a single household (among

several other criteria). Private latrine ownership is believed to confer a greater incentive to keep the latrine clean and well maintained, which in turn encourages more consistent use. However, the literature to support this having a protective association against trachoma is lacking: a number of studies suggest that the use of any latrine is protective, without identifying any additional benefit conferred by the latrine being private.^{47–49} In **Table 5.** Univariable associations of trachomatous trichiasis (TT) in those aged ≥15 y, internally displaced persons camps, Darfur States, Sudan, 2014–2015

Individual	TT (%)	N (%)	OR (95% CI) ^a	p-value ^b
Age				
≥40 y	15 (2.6)	575 (34.0)	31.9 (4.2-244.3)	0.0009
15–39 y	1 (0.1)	1117 (66.0)	1	
Gender				
Female	13 (1.1)	1183 (69.9)	1.9 (0.5-6.6)	0.3284
Male	3 (0.6)	509 (30.1)	1	
Household				
Household members				
At least one other person	10 (0.6)	1609 (95.0)	1	
Lives alone	6 (7.2)	83 (4.9)	14.6 (4.8–44.5)	<0.0001
Number of children aged 1–9 y in the household				
≥1	5 (0.4)	1236 (73.0)	1	0.0007
0	11 (2.4)	456 (27.0)	6.5 (2.2-19.2)	
Water access ^c				
Main source of water for drinking				
Improved source ^d	13 (1.1)	1131 (66.8)	1	0.4893
Unimproved source ^e	1 (0.3)	313 (18.5)	0.3 (0.0-2.4)	
Water vendor	2 (0.8)	248 (14.7)	0.7 (0.1-3.7)	
Time to main source of drinking water				
Up to 30 min round-trip	8 (0.7)	1241 (73.4)	1	
≥30 min	8 (1.8)	451 (26.7)	2.7 (0.9–7.8)	0.0683
Main source of water for washing				
Improved source ^d	13 (1.1)	1131 (66.8)	1	0.4894
Unimproved source ^e	1 (0.3)	313 (18.5)	0.3 (0.0-2.4)	
Water vendor	2 (0.8)	248 (14.7)	0.7 (0.1-3.7)	
Time to main source of washing water				
Less than 30 min round-trip	8 (0.6)	1247 (73.7)	1	0.062
≥30 min	8 (1.8)	445 (26.3)	2.8 (0.9-8.0)	
Latrine access ^c				
Private latrine	6 (0.8)	723 (42.7)	1	0.6169
Shared latrine access	5 (1.3)	388 (22.9)	1.7 (0.5–6.5)	
Latrine facilities absent (use of open defecation)	5 (0.9)	581 (34.3)	0.8 (0.2-3.4)	
Latrine type ^f				
Pit latrine with slab (improved pit latrine)	3 (0.7)	417 (24.7)	1	0.737
Pit latrine without slab (unimproved pit latrine)	8 (1.1)	706 (41.7)	1.5 (0.4-6.4)	
No facilities, bush or field	5 (0.9)	569 (33.6)	0.9 (0.2–5.0)	
Other ^g	0 (0.0)	9 (0.5)	-	
Camp				
Climate/environment ^k				
Rainfall ^l				
Desert (annual rainfall <500 mm)	6 (0.6)	1095 (64.7)	0.3 (0.1–0.9)	
≥500 mm	10 (1.7)	597 (35.3)	1	0.0296
Mean temperature annually ^l				
≥25°C	11 (0.9)	1168 (69.0)	0.9	
<25°C	5 (0.9)	524 (31.0)	1	0.9443
Maximum temperature of hottest month ^l				
≥38°C	11 (1.0)	574 (33.9)	1.1 (0.3–3.8)	0.8746
<38°C	5 (0.9)	1118 (66.1)	1	
				Continued
				continueu

Table 5. Continued

Individual	TT (%)	N (%)	OR (95% CI) ^a	p-value ^b
Major land cover type Grasslands Other ^g	12 (0.9) 4 (1.0)	1311 (77.5) 381 (22.5)	1 1.3 (0.3–4.8)	0.7379

^aUnadjusted OR and 95% CI from logistic regression

^bp-value from Wald's χ^2 , statistically significant associations highlighted in bold (p \leq 0.05)

^cFocused interview with head of household

^dImproved water source—piped water into dwelling, piped water to yard/plot, public tap or standpipe, Tubewell or borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, rainwater; 15 households had different washing/drinking water sources

^eUnprotected spring, unprotected dug well, surface water

^fDirect observation by data recorders

^gNot specified; no TT outcome in group, so excluded from univariable analysis.

^kExtracted from 2.5 arc-min (~5 km at equator) raster data from worldclim.org

ⁱNo association in linear model, categorical data presented here

⁹Open shrublands, cropland/natural vegetation mosaic, barren or sparsely vegetated

Table 6. Multivariable logistic regression model of trachomatoustrichiasis (TT) in those aged ≥ 15 y, internally displaced personscamps, Darfur States, Sudan, 2014–2015

Variable	OR (95% CI) ^a	p-value ^b
Age ≥40 y	25.4 (3.2-200.0)	0.002
Living alone	6.9 (2.1-22.7)	0.001

^aAdjusted OR and 95% CI from two-level mixed effects logistic regression; sex included a priori

^bp-value from likelihood ratio test for variable nested in full model

addition, several studies have suggested that community WASH coverage thresholds, rather than household-level WASH outcomes, are a better indicator of the protective association of access to sanitation, probably because of the decreased availability of feces in open areas to facilitate the spread of *Musca* spp. flies.^{50,51} In our data, similar odds of TF were observed between residents of households that practiced open defecation and residents of households using shared latrines. It is of course possible that the protective association of private latrine access here is mediated through other (unmeasured) factors, such as the health or educational advantages enjoyed by those with sufficient resources to enable maintenance of a private latrine.

At household level, sourcing drinking water primarily from a water vendor was strongly independently associated with TF in children. This relationship was also seen using the main source of washing water as the explanatory variable, although both source of drinking water and source of washing water were not included in the full model due to collinearity between the two variables (as most households' sources of drinking and washing water were the same). A higher number of people living in the household was not associated with TF. Anecdotally, oil barrels for holding water are stored in the home and water from them is used for all drinking, cooking and cleaning by the household; in this context it would be understandable if use of the water for personal hygiene purposes was not prioritized because of the associated cost. However, the relationship between water cost or distance-to-source and use is known to be complex, and so we are wary of overinterpreting these data.^{52,53}

IDP camps present a difficulty for trachoma elimination ambitions. There is relatively little experience in the implementation of the SAFE strategy in conflict-related settings such as these, and the question of whether decisions regarding interventions in these camps should be considered under the same guidance as non-IDP populations arises. Despite the IDP camps being seen as relative hotspots for trachoma, existing WHO guidelines make no recommendations as to how healthcare providers should respond. Understanding how best to undertake trachoma elimination interventions in these areas has to be a priority on disease control (as well as humanitarian) grounds.

Studies on the efficacy of health outcomes of hygiene and sanitation interventions in humanitarian crises are lacking, with published studies usually presenting data on the incidence of diarrheal illness. Few studies look at specific WASH interventions, including the fidelity of implementation and levels of utilization, so that to date, evidence of the impact of such interventions in this setting is scarce.^{54–61}

In the case of trachoma, the association between disease and limited water access has been described before,^{45,62,63} but with notable exceptions where such a relationship was not evident;⁶⁴⁻⁶⁷ the disparity probably relates to the fact that ready access to water does not necessarily mean frequent use of water for personal hygiene.⁶⁸ Beyond associated data, studies that demonstrate a significant impact of water or sanitation interventions on trachoma prevalence are still needed. Implementing sanitation interventions, like implementing the other components of the SAFE strategy, is likely to present specific challenges in the IDP camp setting, although this should not discourage us from working towards achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals for equitable and sustainable access to water and sanitation.

Authors' contributions: CKM, KHM, BEE, BC and AWS contributed to study design; KHM, BEE, HES, NC, RW, BC and AWS were responsible for study implementation; CKM, KHM, BEE, AH, NC, RW and AWS carried out analysis and interpretation of data; CKM, KHM, BEE, AH, BC and AWS made major contributions to writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final draft.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Yael Velleman (WaterAid UK, London) and Sophie Boisson (World Health Organization, Geneva) for their guidance and review of the draft manuscript.

Funding: This study was principally funded by the Global Trachoma Mapping Project (GTMP) grant from the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID; ARIES: 203145) to Sightsavers, which led a consortium of non-governmental organizations and academic institutions to support health ministries to complete baseline trachoma mapping worldwide. The GTMP was also funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), through the ENVISION project implemented by RTI International under cooperative agreement number AID-OAA-A-11-00048, and the END in Asia project implemented by FHI360 under cooperative agreement number OAA-A-10-00051. A committee established in March 2012 to examine issues surrounding completion of global trachoma mapping was initially funded by a grant from Pfizer to the International Trachoma Initiative. AWS was a Wellcome Trust Intermediate Clinical Fellow (098521) at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, and is now a staff member of the World Health Organization. The authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the views, decisions or policies of the institutions with which they are affiliated. None of the funders had any role in project design, in project implementation or analysis or interpretation of data, in the decisions on where, how or when to publish in the peer-reviewed press, or in preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests: The authors report no conflicts of interest. The authors alone are responsible for the writing and content of this article.

Ethical approval: The study was conducted in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki, with the protocol for primary data collection approved by the Sudanese Federal Ministry of Health Ethics committee, and the ethics committee of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (Refs: 6319 and 8355).

Verbal informed consent was obtained from community leaders and all study participants. Parents or guardians provided consent if participants were aged <18 y. The use of a smartphone application to record consent was considered acceptable in this setting by each ethics committee. These secondary analyses of anonymized data were considered by the ethics committee of the World Health Organization (0002988) to be exempt from full review.

References

1 United Nations Refugee Agency. UNHCR Statistical Yearbook 2014. Geneva: UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); 2015.

- 2 Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. Internal displacement: global overview of trends and developments. Geneva: Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC); 2015.
- 3 Feikin DR, Adazu K, Obor D, et al. Mortality and health among internally displaced persons in western Kenya following post-election violence, 2008: novel use of demographic surveillance. Bull World Health Organ. 2010;88(8):601–8.
- 4 Petersen E, Baekeland S, Memish ZA, et al. Infectious disease risk from the Syrian Conflict. Int J Infect Dis. 2013;17:e666-e667.
- 5 Sharara SL, Kanj SS. War and infectious diseases: challenges of the Syrian civil war. PLoS Pathog. 2014;10(10):e1004438.
- 6 Guerrier G, Zounoun M, Delarosa O, et al. Malnutrition and mortality patterns among internally displaced and non-displaced population living in a camp, a village or a town in Eastern Chad. PLoS One. 2009; 4(11):e8077.
- 7 Olwedo MA, Mworozi E, Bachou H, et al. Factors associated with malnutrition among children in internally displaced person's camps, northern Uganda. Afr Health Sci. 2008;8(4):244–52.
- 8 Singh KP, Bhoopathy SV, Worth H, et al. Nutrition among men and household food security in an internally displaced persons camp in Kenya. Public Health Nutr. 2016;19(4):723–31.
- 9 Sheikh TL, Abdulaziz M, Agunbiade S, et al. Correlates of depression among internally displaced persons after post-election violence in Kaduna, North Western Nigeria. J Affect Disord. 2015;170:46–51.
- 10 Sheikh TL, Mohammed A, Agunbiade S, et al. Psycho-trauma, psychosocial adjustment, and symptomatic post-traumatic stress disorder among internally displaced persons in Kaduna, Northwestern Nigeria. Front Psychiatry. 2014;5:127.
- 11 Siriwardhana C, Stewart R. Forced migration and mental health: prolonged internal displacement, return migration and resilience. Int Health. 2013;5(1):19–23.
- 12 Haggaz AA, Radi EA, Adam I. High maternal mortality in Darfur, Sudan. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2007;98(3):252–3.
- 13 Hynes M, Sakani O, Spiegel P, et al. A study of refugee maternal mortality in 10 countries, 2008–2010. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2012;38(4):205–13.
- 14 Wirtz AL, Pham K, Glass N, et al. Gender-based violence in conflict and displacement: qualitative findings from displaced women in Colombia. Confl Health. 2014;8:10.
- 15 Amowitz LL, Reis C, Lyons KH, et al. Prevalence of war-related sexual violence and other human rights abuses among internally displaced persons in Sierra Leone. JAMA. 2002;287(4):513–21.
- 16 Grayston JT, Wang SP, Yeh LJ, et al. Importance of reinfection in the pathogenesis of trachoma. Rev Infect Dis. 1985;7(6):717–25.
- 17 Gambhir M, Basáñez M-G, Burton MJ, et al. The development of an age-structured model for trachoma transmission dynamics, pathogenesis and control. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2009;3(6):e462.
- 18 Bourne RRA, Stevens GA, White RA, et al. Causes of vision loss worldwide, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis. Lancet Glob Health. 2013; 1(6):e339–49.
- 19 Habtamu E, Wondie T, Aweke S, et al. Trachoma and relative poverty: a case-control study. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015;9(11):e0004228.
- 20 Emerson PM, Bailey RL, Walraven GE, et al. Human and other faeces as breeding media of the trachoma vector Musca sorbens. Med Vet Entomol. 2001;15:314–20.
- 21 Mabey DCW, Solomon AW, Foster A. Trachoma. Lancet. 2003;362 (9379):223–9.
- 22 World Health Organization. WHO Strategic and Technical Advisory Group for Neglected Tropical Diseases. Accelerating Work to Overcome the Global Impact of Neglected Tropical Diseases. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2012.

- 23 Francis V, Turner V. Achieving Community Support for Trachoma Control (WHO/PBL/93.36). Geneva: World Health Organization; 1993.
- 24 Solomon A, Mabey D. Trachoma. BMJ Clin Evid. 2007;2007:0706.
- 25 West SK, Congdon N, Katala S, et al. Facial cleanliness and risk of trachoma in families. Arch Ophthalmol. 1991;109(6):855–7.
- 26 Emerson PM, Lindsay SW, Alexander N, et al. Role of flies and provision of latrines in trachoma control: cluster-randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2004;363(9415):1093–8.
- 27 Evans JR, Solomon AW. Antibiotics for trachoma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2011;3:CD001860.
- 28 Rabiu M, Alhassan MB, Ejere HOD, et al. Environmental sanitary interventions for preventing active trachoma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2012;2:CD004003.
- 29 Ejere H, Alhassan MB, Rabiu M. Face washing promotion for preventing active trachoma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2004;3:CD003659.
- 30 United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA). Humanitarian Bulletin Sudan. March 2016, Issue 13; 2016.
- 31 Central Bureau of Statistics. Sudan Census Report 2008—Total Population Expected to States for the Period 2009–2018. Republic of Sudan: Central Bureau of Statistics (Sudan); 2013.
- 32 Elshafie BE, Osman KH, Macleod C, et al. The epidemiology of trachoma in Darfur States and Khartoum State, Sudan: results of 32 population-based prevalence surveys. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 2016; 23(6):381–91.
- 33 Solomon AW, Pavluck A, Courtright P, et al. The Global Trachoma Mapping Project: methodology of a 34-country population-based study. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 2015;22(3):214–25.
- 34 Solomon AW, Willis R, Pavluck AL, et al. Quality assurance and quality control in the Global Trachoma Mapping Project. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2018;99(4):858–63.
- 35 World Health Organisation(WHO)/UNICEF. Improved and unimproved water sources and sanitation facilities. WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme(JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation. http://www.wssinfo. org/definitions-methods/watsan-categories/ (accessed 26 October 2015).
- 36 Exley JLR, Liseka B, Cumming O, et al. The sanitation ladder, what constitutes an improved form of sanitation? Environ Sci Technol. 2015;49(2):1086-94.
- 37 Leyland A, Goldstein H. Multilevel Modelling of Health Statistics. Chichester, UK: Wiley; 2001.
- 38 Last AR, Burr SE, Weiss HA, et al. Risk factors for active trachoma and ocular chlamydia trachomatis infection in treatment-naïve trachoma-hyperendemic communities of the Bijagós Archipelago, Guinea Bissau. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014;8(6):e2900.
- 39 Bailey R, Osmond C, Mabey DC, et al. Analysis of the household distribution of trachoma in a Gambian village using a Monte Carlo simulation procedure. Int J Epidemiol. 1989;18(4):944–51.
- 40 Blake IM, Burton MJ, Bailey RL, et al. Estimating household and community transmission of ocular Chlamydia trachomatis. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2009;3(3):e401.
- 41 Katz J, Zeger SL, Tielsch JM. Village and household clustering of xerophthalmia and trachoma. Int J Epidemiol. 1988;17(4):865–9.
- 42 Hägi M, Schémann J-F, Mauny F, et al. Active trachoma among children in Mali: clustering and environmental risk factors. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2010;4(1):e583.
- 43 Abdou A, Nassirou B, Kadri B, et al. Prevalence and risk factors for trachoma and ocular Chlamydia trachomatis infection in Niger. Br J Ophthalmol. 2007;91(1):13–7.
- 44 Harding-Esch EM, Edwards T, Sillah A, et al. Risk factors for active trachoma in The Gambia. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2008;102(12): 1255–62.

- 45 Golovaty I, Jones L, Gelaye B, et al. Access to water source, latrine facilities and other risk factors of active trachoma in Ankober, Ethiopia. PLoS One. 2009;4(8):e6702.
- 46 Yalew KN, Mekonnen MG, Jemaneh AA. Trachoma and its determinants in Mojo and Lume districts of Ethiopia. Pan Afr Med J. 2012;13 (Suppl 1):8.
- 47 Heijnen M, Cumming O, Peletz R, et al. Shared sanitation versus individual household latrines: a systematic review of health outcomes. PLoS One. 2014;9(4):e93300.
- 48 Montgomery MA, Desai MM, Elimelech M. Assessment of latrine use and quality and association with risk of trachoma in rural Tanzania. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2010;104(4):283–9.
- 49 Montgomery MA, Desai MM, Elimelech M. Comparing the effectiveness of shared versus private latrines in preventing trachoma in rural Tanzania. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2010;82(4):693–5.
- 50 Oswald WE, Stewart AE, Kramer MR, et al. Active trachoma and community use of sanitation, Ethiopia. Bull World Health Organ. 2017;95 (4):250–60.
- 51 Garn JV, Boisson S, Willis R, et al. Sanitation and water supply coverage thresholds associated with active trachoma: modeling crosssectional data from 13 countries. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2018;12(1): e0006110.
- 52 White G, Bradley D, White A. Drawers of Water: Domestic Water Use in East Africa. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1972.
- 53 Feachem R, Burns E, Cairncross S, et al. Water, Health and Development: An Interdisciplinary Evaluation. London: Tri-Med Books; 1978.
- 54 Doocy S, Burnham G. Point-of-use water treatment and diarrhoea reduction in the emergency context: an effectiveness trial in Liberia. Trop Med Int Health. 2006;11(10):1542–52.
- 55 Elsanousi S, Abdelrahman S, Elshiekh I, et al. A study of the use and impacts of LifeStraw in a settlement camp in southern Gezira, Sudan. J Water Health. 2009;7(3):478–83.
- 56 Moll DM, McElroy RH, Sabogal R, et al. Health impact of water and sanitation infrastructure reconstruction programmes in eight Central American communities affected by Hurricane Mitch. J Water Health. 2007;5(1):51–65.
- 57 Peterson EA, Roberts L, Toole MJ, et al. The effect of soap distribution on diarrhoea: Nyamithuthu Refugee Camp. Int J Epidemiol. 1998;27 (3):520–4.
- 58 Roberts L, Chartier Y, Chartier O, et al. Keeping clean water clean in a Malawi refugee camp: a randomized intervention trial. Bull World Health Organ. 2001;79(4):280–7.
- 59 Walden VM, Lamond E-A, Field SA. Container contamination as a possible source of a diarrhoea outbreak in Abou Shouk camp, Darfur province, Sudan. Disasters. 2005;29(3):213–21.
- 60 Ramesh A, Blanchet K, Ensink JHJ, et al. Evidence on the effectiveness of WAter, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) interventions on health outcomes in humanitarian crises: a systematic review. PLoS One. 2015;10(9):e0124688.
- 61 Garn JV, Sclar GD, Freeman MC, et al. The impact of sanitation interventions on latrine coverage and latrine use: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2017;220(2): 329-40.
- 62 Burton MJ, Hu VH, Massae P, et al. What is causing active trachoma? The role of nonchlamydial bacterial pathogens in a low prevalence setting. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2011;52(8):6012–17.
- 63 Baggaley RF, Solomon AW, Kuper H, et al. Distance to water source and altitude in relation to active trachoma in Rombo district, Tanzania. Trop Med Int Health. 2006;11(2):220–7.

- 64 de Abreu Freitas HS, Medina NH, de Fátima Costa Lopes M, et al. Trachoma in indigenous settlements in Brazil, 2000–2008. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 2016:23:354–9.
- 65 Sokana O, Macleod C, Jack K, et al. Mapping trachoma in the Solomon Islands: results of three baseline population-based prevalence surveys conducted with the Global Trachoma Mapping Project. Ophthalmic Epidemiol. 2016;23(supp 1):15–21.
- 66 Ward B. The prevalence of active trachoma in Fiji. Am J Ophthalmol. 1965;59:458–63.
- 67 Mathew AA, Keeffe JE, Le Mesurier RT, et al. Trachoma in the Pacific Islands: evidence from Trachoma Rapid Assessment. Br J Ophthalmol. 2009;93(7):866–70.
- 68 Bailey R, Downes B, Downes R, et al. Trachoma and water use; a case control study in a Gambian village. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 1991;85(6):824–8.

Appendix

The Global Trachoma Mapping Project Investigators are: Agatha Aboe (1,11), Liknaw Adamu (4), Wondu Alemayehu (4,5), Menbere Alemu (4),

Neal D. E. Alexander (9), Ana Bakhtiari (2,9), Berhanu Bero (4), Sarah Bovill (8), Simon J. Brooker (1,6), Simon Bush (7,8), Brian K. Chu (2,9), Paul Courtright (1,3,4,7,11), Michael Dejene (3), Paul M. Emerson (1,6,7), Rebecca M. Flueckiger (2), Allen Foster (1,7), Solomon Gadisa (4), Katherine Gass (6,9), Teshome Gebre (4), Zelalem Habtamu (4), Danny Haddad (1,6,7,8), Erik Harvey (1,6,10), Dominic Haslam (8), Khumbo Kalua (5), Amir B. Kello (4,5), Jonathan D. King (6,10,11), Richard Le Mesurier (4,7), Susan Lewallen (4,11), Thomas M. Lietman (10), Chad MacArthur (6,11), Colin Macleod (3,9), Silvio P. Mariotti (7,11), Anna Massey (8), Els Mathieu (6,11), Siobhain McCullagh (8), Addis Mekasha (4), Tom Millar (4,8), Caleb Mpyet (3,5), Beatriz Muñoz (6,9), Jeremiah Ngondi (1,3,6,11), Stephanie Ogden (6), Alex Pavluck (2,4,10), Joseph Pearce (10), Serge Resnikoff (1), Virginia Sarah (4), Boubacar Sarr (5), Alemayehu Sisay (4), Jennifer L. Smith (11), Anthony W. Solomon (1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11), Jo Thomson (4); Sheila K. West (1,10,11), Rebecca Willis (2.9).

1. Advisory Committee; 2. Information Technology, Geographical Information Systems and Data Processing; 3. Epidemiological Support; 4. Ethiopia Pilot Team; 5. Master Grader Trainers; 6. Methodologies Working Group; 7. Prioritisation Working Group; 8. Proposal Development, Finances and Logistics; 9. Statistics and Data Analysis; 10. Tools Working Group; 11. Training Working Group.