Participant Flow:



Baseline Characteristics:

Table 1: Household respondent characteristics at baseline and follow-up

Characteristic	Baseline	Follow-up interview	
	n (%)	n (%)	
Respondent Age:			
18-29 years	75 (32.1%)	79 (34.4%)	
30-39 years	85 (36.3%)	71 (30.9%)	
40-49 years	36 (15.4%)	43 (18.7%)	
50-59 years	21 (9.0%)	17 (7.4%)	

>=60 years	17 (7.3%)	20 (8.7%)
Female Respondent	197 (84.2%)	189 (82.2%)
Household Sanitation:		
Pit latrine with slab	154 (66.1%)	193 (83.9%)
Pit latrine without slab	14 (6.0%)	7 (3.0%)
Bush (no facility)	54 (23.2%)	22 (9.57%)
Ventilated improved pit latrine	12 (5.2%)	15 (6.5%)
Soap observed in home	83 (41.1%)	119 (58.9%)
Source of drinking-water stored in the		
home		
Piped / kiosk water	8 (3.4%)	62 (27.0%)
Rainwater	218 (93.2%)	104 (45.2%)
Borehole / well / spring	2 (0.9%)	12 (5.2%)
Surface water (stream / lake / river /	4 (1.7%)	32 (13.9%)
dam / pond)		
Not known	2 (0.9%)	20 (8.7%)
Reported treating stored drinking-	128 (54.7%)	91 (39.6%)
water (e.g. through boiling or home		
chlorination)		

Outcome Measures:

Table 2: Number and percentage of point-of-use water samples with low, medium and high *E. coli* contamination, cross-tabulated against contamination risk factors associated with animal contact for baseline and follow-up visits

Risk factors	Low contamination (< 10 cfu /100 mL)	Medium contamination (10-99 cfu / 100mL)	High contamination (>= 100 cfu /100mL)	Total
	E. coli	E. coli	E. coli	
Animals observed in househol	ld compound:			
- Goats	52 (31.9%)	58 (35.6%)	53 (32.5%)	163
- Cattle	100 (40.2%)	87 (34.9%)	62 (24.9%)	249
- Dogs	86 (38.4%)	72 (32.1%)	66 (29.5%)	224
- Cats	88 (41.3%)	66 (31.0%)	59 (27.7%)	213
- Poultry	166 (39.5%)	146 (34.8%)	108 (25.7%)	420
- Chicken confined	130 (37.6%)	119 (34.4%)	97 (28.0%)	346
- Signs of livestock in home	142 (38.7%)	126 (34.3%)	99 (27.0%)	367
Chicken spend night by stored water	83 (34.2%)	89 (36.6%)	71 (29.2%)	243
Water storage and handling:				
Storage container accessible to animals	108 (35.4%)	102 (33.4%)	95 (31.2%)	305
All samples	184 (39.7%)	157 (33.9%)	122 (26.4%)	463

Table 3: Number and percentage of point-of-use water samples with low, medium and highintestinal enterococci contamination, cross-tabulated against contamination risk factors associatedwith animal contact for baseline and follow-up visits

Risk factors	Low contamination (< 10 cfu /100 mL)	Medium contamination (10-99 cfu / 100mL)	High contamination (>= 100 cfu /100mL)	Total
	Intestinal enterococci	Intestinal enterococci	Intestinal enterococci	
Animals observed in hou	sehold compound:			
- Goats	29 (17.8%)	59 (36.2%)	75 (46.0%)	163
- Cattle	52 (20.9%)	86 (34.5%)	111 (44.6%)	249
- Dogs	45 (20.1%)	72 (32.1%)	107 (47.8%)	224
- Cats	33 (15.5%)	75 (35.2%)	105 (49.3%)	213
- Poultry	75 (17.9%)	152 (36.2%)	193 (46.0%)	420
- Chicken confined	52 (15.0%)	114 (33.0%)	180 (52.0%)	346
- Signs of livestock in home	65 (17.7%)	124 (33.8%)	178 (48.5%)	367
Chicken spend night by stored water	37 (15.2%)	97 (39.9%)	109 (44.9%)	243
Water storage and hand	lling:			
Storage container accessible to animals	48 (15.7%)	110 (36.1%)	147 (48.2%)	305
All samples	86 (18.6%)	172 (37.2%)	205 (44.3%	463

Adverse Events:

There were no adverse events associated with this study.