## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

## Extra information gathered during IDI in both settings on time, taste, and cost associated with household treatment of drinking water.

In both settings, most households reporting chlorination (U [N]: 9, R [N]: 6) believed that the time requirement for performing chlorination was acceptable. While in the urban setting people believed that availability was good, this was not so in the rural context, where three of seven households using chlorine reported that the local health clinic was often out of stock. In the rural setting, where a lot of chlorine was provided for free or at reduced costs (\$0.21 per 500 mL bottle), participants were content with the price; in the urban context, however, there were mixed feelings regarding the cost of chlorination, with five of nine chlorine users reporting that the price should be lower or given for free (prices reported were \$0.21-0.32 per 500 mL). In addition, most participants reported to dislike the taste (six of nine chlorine users in the urban setting and three of seven in the rural context). Of interest, in the urban context, a large proportion of the respondents (six out of nine chlorine users) reported that they do not fully trust chlorination as a method to make water safer to drink. In the rural setting, three of the seven chlorine users did not fully trust the method.

Characteristic	Rural		Urban	
	n	%	n	%
Demographics				
Total number of households	276	-	203	-
Total population	1,720	-	862	-
Number of children $< 5$ years of age	260	-	104	-
Mean number of occupants per household (range)	6.2 (1-22)	-	4.2 (1-12)	_
Male-headed households	200	72.5	166	81.8
Education of head of household	233	84.4	_	-
No education	41	14.9	14	6.9
Primary	97	41.6	77	40.7
Secondary	109	46.8	103	54.5
Higher	24	10.3	5	2.7
Own				
Electricity	27	9.8	67	33.0
Radio	179	64.9	121	59.6
TV	133	48.2	99	48.8
Mobile phone	277	82.3	165	81.3
Refrigerator	19	6.9	30	14.8
Mean number of rooms (range)	3.8 (1-16)	_	2.0 (1-7)	_
Mean number of sleeping rooms (range)	2.4 (1–10)	_	1.5 (1-4)	_
Source of drinking water	~ /		~ /	
Piped water into dwelling/yard	0	0.0	1	0.5
Public tap	0	0.0	190	93.6
Protected well/borehole	180	65.2	12	5.9
Unprotected well	91	33.0	0	0.0
Surface water	3	1.1	0	0.0
Change water source in dry season	30	10.9	_	_
Reported HWT use prior drinking	88	31.9	161	79.3
Method of HWT used*				
Boil	11	4.0	23	11.3
Use chlorine or bleach	77	27.9	156	76.9
Solar disinfection	0	0.0	0	0.0
Strain through a cloth	0	0.0	0	0.0
Let stand and settle	1	1.0	0	0.0
Have adequate sanitation facilities <sup>†</sup>	63	22.8	188	92.6
Share toilet facilities‡	98	37.1	191	94.1
Main source of cooking fuel				
Electricity	15	5.4	67	33.0
Charcoal	66	23.9	144	70.9
Firewood	194	70.3	0	0.0

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 1 Demographic characteristics of participating households in the urban and rural communities

HWT = household water treatment; TV = television.

\* Respondents may report multiple treatment methods, so the sum of treatment may exceed 100%

Fincludes flush/pour flush toilet to sewer or pit latrine, ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines, pit latrines with slab, and composting toilets.
‡Only for those households that have access to a facility.

SUPPLEMENTAL 7	Table 2	
----------------	---------	--

Characteristics of supplementation with untreated water among self-reported HWT users identified during the HWT practices survey

Rural U	Urban	
Characteristic n % n	%	
33 – 58	-	
ed water in home (supplements) 16 48.5 23	39.7	
of untreated water in the home		
1 6.3 1	4.4	
9 56.3 8	34.8	
5 31.3 14	60.9	
1 6.3 0	0.0	
plementation:		
ng self-reported non-supplementers* 6 37.5 4	12.9	
reporting to correctly have chlorinated water <sup>†</sup> 9 100.0 16	64.0	
under 5 years 21 – 31	_	
der 5 years drink untreated water in the home 13 65.0 13	41.9	
of untreated water in home		
1 7.7 0	0.0	
6 46.2 4	30.8	
4 30.8 8	61.5	
2 15.4 0	0.0	
on of untreated water‡		
1 6.7 0	0.0	
8 53.3 6	26.1	
6 40.0 10	43.5	
0 0.0 1	4.3	
0 0.0 2	8.7	
0       0.0         Id water treatment.	2	