## eTable 2. ITT and IV prevalence ratios for school WaSH adherence on pupil STH intensity in eggs per gram (EPG) of feces.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Girls**a | **Boys**a |
| **Outcome** | **Model** | **Num.****EPG**b**,** c | **Denom.****EPG**b**,** c | **EPG ratio****(95% CI)** | **Num.****EPG**b**,** c | **Denom.****EPG**b**,** c | **EPG ratio****(95% CI)** |
| *A. lumbricoides* EPG | ITT model:b  Model 0: HP&WTd + San vs. control arm | 244 | 850 | 0.29 (0.071-1.2) | 631 | 516 | 1.2 (0.33-4.6) |
| Continuous adherence IV model:c Adherence to 2 vs. 0 components Adherence to 3 vs. 0 components | 424322 | 15302144 | 0.28 (0.039-2.0)0.15 (0.00062-36) | 750968 | 589706 | 1.3 (0.12-13)1.4 (0.052-37) |
| Categorical adherence IV model:c Adherence to > 2 vs. 0 or 1 components | 344 | 1286 | 0.27 (0.03-2.1) | 956 | 746 | 1.3 (0.13-13) |
| Hookworm EPG | ITT model:b  Model 0: HP&WTd + San vs. control arm | 35 | 51 | 0.68 (0.13-3.5) | 36 | 49 | 0.73 (0.23-2.4) |
| Continuous adherence IV model:c  Adherence to 2 vs. 0 components Adherence to 3 vs. 0 components | 4242 | 7998 | 0.53 (0.018-15)0.43 (0.0043-43) | 3731 | 8195 | 0.45 (0.18-11)0.33 (0.0024-45) |
| Categorical adherence IV model:c Adherence to > 2 vs. 0 or 1 components | 44 | 69 | 0.64 (0.03-14) | 30 | 54 | 0.56 (0.05-7.0) |
| *T. trichiura* EPG  | ITT model:b  Model 0: HP&WTd + San vs. control arm | 12 | 8 | 1.5 (0.32-6.6) | 6 | 5 | 1.4 (0.49-4.0) |
| Continuous adherence IV model:c Adherence to 2 vs. 0 components Adherence to 3 vs. 0 components | 1317 | 89 | 1.6 (0.059-45)1.9 (0.025-150) | 55 | 31 | 1.8 (0.022-150)4.8 (0.0021-11000) |
| Categorical adherence IV model:c Adherence to > 2 vs. 0 or 1 components | 18 | 12 | 1.5 (0.15-15) | 8 | 4 | 1.8 (0.11-28) |

aWe stratified by sex because sex was observed to be an effect modifier. bThe ITT analysis compares all intervention schools (numerator) to all control schools (denominator). cThe IV analysis compares the mean EPG of feces of pupils attending schools that adhered at a given level (numerator), to what the EPG of feces would have been *in those same schools* had the schools adhered at the referent level (denominator). Adherence was defined by the number of WaSH components to which each school adhered. dHP&WT = hygiene promotion and water treatment; San = sanitation.