

Note to readers with disabilities: *EHP* strives to ensure that all journal content is accessible to all readers. However, some figures and Supplemental Material published in *EHP* articles may not conform to [508 standards](#) due to the complexity of the information being presented. If you need assistance accessing journal content, please contact ehp508@niehs.nih.gov. Our staff will work with you to assess and meet your accessibility needs within 3 working days.

Supplemental Material

Household Air Pollution Concentrations after Liquefied Petroleum Gas Interventions in Rural Peru: Findings from a One-Year Randomized Controlled Trial Followed by a One-Year Pragmatic Crossover Trial

Magdalena Fandiño-Del-Rio, Josiah L. Kephart, Kendra N. Williams, Timothy Shade, Temi Adekunle, Kyle Steenland, Luke P. Naeher, Lawrence H. Moulton, Gustavo F. Gonzales, Marilu Chiang, Shakir Hossen, Ryan T. Chartier, Kirsten Koehler, William Checkley, and Cardiopulmonary outcomes and Household Air Pollution (CHAP) Trial Investigators

Table of Contents

Table S1. CONSORT checklist of information to include when reporting a randomized trial assessing nonpharmacologic treatments.

Table S2. Number and percent of cumulative PM and BC samples below the detection limit in rural Peru (n=180 participants).

Table S3. Percent of CO direct-reading measurements below the instrument detection limit during most common cooking times of the day in rural Peru (5 AM to 9:30 AM and 6 PM to 7 PM).

Table S4. Household air pollution exposure summary statistics for all follow-up visits comparing maximum hourly means of control and intervention groups in rural Peru.

Table S5. Percent of time PM_{2.5} personal monitors were worn by study participants during typical morning and evening cooking times in rural Peru.

Table S6. Time trends of pollutant concentration over time using daily means in rural Peru.

Table S7. Percent of daily mean samples below World Health Organization interim targets ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for PM_{2.5} by intervention group in rural Peru (n=180 participants).

Table S8. Correlation coefficients for household air pollution concentrations for different pollutants, different exposures and intraclass correlations between consecutive sampling days for year one follow-up visits 3-, 6- and 12-months in rural Peru (n=180 participants).

Figure S1. Screening, randomization and follow-up diagram in rural Peru.

Figure S2. Black carbon box plots of 48-hr mean kitchen area and personal exposure concentrations at each follow-up visit (baseline, 3-, 6-, 12-, 18-, and 24-months) for LPG stove intervention participants (LPG) and control participants (Control). During the second year (follow-up visits: 18- and 24 months) the control participants received the LPG stove intervention and vouchers for one year supply of free fuel and intervention participants stopped receiving free fuel but kept the LPG stove. Interquartile ranges of the box plots represent the 25th and the 75th percentiles of the daily means for each group; the middle line of the box represents the 50th percentile. Numeric data is provided in Table 2.