Enhancing LPG Adoption in Ghana (ELAG): A trial testing policy-relevant interventions to increase sustained use of clean fuels

Supplementary materials

Carrión, et al.

Figure S1: Map of the study region.



Table S1: Prognostic covariates included in cluster-randomization procedure.

Variable	Rationale
Community Asset Index	Studies have shown that differential access to resources can be predictive in the uptake of new cookstove technologies [41,42].
Average Household Size	Studies have shown that household size can be predictive in the uptake of new cookstove technologies [41,42].
Distance to Refueling Station	Participant communities are scattered throughout the region at varying distances from the refueling center. Further distances are likely a deterrent to refuel for non-Agent delivery households, Supplemental Figure 1 .
Households per cluster	To ensure roughly equal number of participating households per arm.

Table S2. Missingness by ann. Participants for whom there are at least so days worth of stove use monitoring data.				
	Control	RANAS Education	Direct Delivery	Dual
Participants with 30+	201	184	155	140
days of observations				
Total enrolled	217	196	193	172
Percent for main analysis	92.6%	93.9%	80.3%	81.4%

Table S2: Missingness by arm. Participants for whom there are at least 30 days' worth of stove use monitoring data.

 Table S3:
 Characteristics of participants with less than one month's worth of data in the latter six-month period.

	Missing (N=98)	Not Missing (N=680)	Total (N=778)	p value
Participant's Age				0.049
Mean (SD)	30.1 (7.2)	31.6 (7.3)	31.4 (7.3)	
Ethnicity				0.312
Akan	27 (27.6%)	150 (22.1%)	177 (22.8%)	
Other	15 (15.3%)	97 (14.3%)	112 (14.4%)	
Grushi	10 (10.2%)	51 (7.5%)	61 (7.8%)	
Dagarti	28 (28.6%)	184 (27.1%)	212 (27.2%)	
Мо	11 (11.2%)	105 (15.4%)	116 (14.9%)	
Konkomba	7 (7.1%)	93 (13.7%)	100 (12.9%)	
Religion				0.705
Christian	71 (72.4%)	480 (70.6%)	551 (70.8%)	
Non-Christian	27 (27.6%)	200 (29.4%)	227 (29.2%)	
Household size				< 0.001
2-5 persons	53 (54.1%)	217 (31.9%)	270 (34.7%)	
6-10 persons	41 (41.8%)	374 (55.0%)	415 (53.3%)	
More than 10 persons	4 (4.1%)	89 (13.1%)	93 (12.0%)	
Profession				0.352
Professional	0 (0.0%)	5 (0.9%)	5 (0.8%)	
Secretarial	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Trader	26 (32.1%)	207 (36.1%)	233 (35.6%)	
Seamstress	4 (4.9%)	39 (6.8%)	43 (6.6%)	
Farmer	50 (61.7%)	321 (56.0%)	371 (56.7%)	
Other	1 (1.2%)	1 (0.2%)	2 (0.3%)	
Participant's Education (years)				0.009
Mean (SD)	8.1 (5.4)	6.5 (5.7)	6.7 (5.7)	
Wealth Index quintile				0.744
1 (very poor)	21 (21.4%)	133 (19.6%)	154 (19.8%)	
2	17 (17.3%)	140 (20.6%)	157 (20.2%)	
3	17 (17.3%)	141 (20.7%)	158 (20.3%)	
4	23 (23.5%)	132 (19.4%)	155 (19.9%)	
5 (least poor)	20 (20.4%)	134 (19.7%)	154 (19.8%)	

Table S4: Univariable linear regressions of participant and intervention characteristics on total RANAS score change from the pre to post tests. Positive estimates indicate an increase in the RANAS post-test score.

Term	Estimate	P value
Number of visits from community-based surveillance volunteer	0.10	0.02
Religion: Non-Christian	-0.77	0.42
Participant's age	0.04	0.50
Participant's years of education	-0.05	0.49

Figure S2: Time series of use over the entire study period, relative to date of enrollment, including imputed values. Dashed line = 6 months.



Table S5: Cost of a 14.5 kg cylinder refill at local refilling station.

Month/Year	LPG Price (GH¢)
September 2017	65.00
May 2018	69.00
June 2018	70.00
August 2018	72.00

Term	Delivery	Dual	Education
Participant's Age	-0.01 (-0.03-0.01)	-0.02 (-0.04-0.01)	0 (-0.02-0.03)
Asset index	-0.06 (-0.14-0.03)	0.04 (-0.04-0.13)	-0.04 (-0.12-0.04)
Ethnicity (reference = Akan)			
Dagarti	-0.01 (-0.63-0.61)	0.53 (-0.21-1.27)	-0.14 (-0.91-0.63)
Grushi	0.57 (-0.28-1.42)	0.34 (-0.78-1.45)	-0.22 (-1.17-0.74)
Konkomba	-0.36 (-1.16-0.45)	0.05 (-0.76-0.87)	-1 (-1.890.11)
Мо	-0.17 (-1.17-0.84)	-0.17 (-1.33-0.98)	-0.39 (-1.53-0.74)
Other	0.23 (-0.54-1.01)	0.28 (-0.47-1.03)	-0.17 (-1.03-0.7)
Household Size (reference = 2-5 people)			
HHSize6-10 people	0.25 (-0.13-0.62)	0.16 (-0.23-0.55)	0.25 (-0.14-0.65)
HHSize>10 people	0.26 (-0.33-0.86)	0.54 (-0.11-1.19)	0.36 (-0.22-0.95)
Relationship Score	0 (-0.04-0.03)	0 (-0.04-0.03)	0.01 (-0.03-0.04)
Religion (reference = Christian)			
Non-Christian	0.13 (-0.27-0.52)	-0.15 (-0.61-0.31)	-0.04 (-0.45-0.37)
Profession (reference = Professional)			
Farmer/Domestic Worker	-0.09 (-0.63-0.44)	-1 (-3.12-1.13)	-0.79 (-2.54-0.96)
Secretarial	-0.14 (-0.69-0.41)	-1.44 (-3.57-0.69)	-0.58 (-2.34-1.18)
Trader	0.69 (-0.21-1.6)	-1.12 (-3.43-1.19)	0.1 (-1.82-2.01)
Unknown/No Response	NA	-0.68 (-2.86-1.5)	-0.74 (-2.53-1.04)

Table S6: Subgroup analysis of treatment effect via log linear regression with interactions between socio-demographic variable (term) and treatment arm on cooking time in the final 6 months of ELAG. Values = point estimate (95% confidence intervals).