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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Editor Comments:

Some sections of your manuscript text contain an unacceptable overlap with previously published sources. Please rewrite the following sections in original language: line 70-82, 87-88, 93-97, 99-104, 114-116, 124-126, 331-332, and line 400-402.

Author’s Response: Thank you. These sections have been rewritten in lines: 69-80, 83-88, 91-99, 100-105, 114-119, 123-125, 337-339 and line 405-408.

2. Reviewer reports:

ABSTRACT

1. Although the results section in the abstract has been rewritten, none of the Odd Ratio (OR) reported in the study was mentioned here. Authors should consider including the OR to make the abstract more informative.

Author’s Response: Odds ratio (OR) have been included in the abstract (Line 46-47).
MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Line 156, replace "five" with "three."

Author’s Response: This has been reviewed in Line 154

2. Line 182-187, the sample size estimation is not clear at all, and not fit for replication as it stands. How did the authors spread the adjusted 905 sample size across the 7 communities used?

Author’s Response: Sample size estimation for this study up to how we ended up with 905 has been explained in Lines 171-173. Further Lines 174-177 explains how the 905 households were spread across the 7 villages.

3. In addition, Line 169-181, on the household selection and co, must fall under the subheading "study design and sample size estimation". What informed the decision to pick every third households e.t.c.

Author’s Response: The information has been moved to the section ‘study design and sample size’. Line 178-180 expounds on the systematic random sampling used to reach the study households.

4. Line 191, Authors should just provide information if the assessment of WASH resource was based on just questioning the household head, or visually sighting the resource, e.g. visiting the toilets, e.t.c

Author’s Response: This is outlined in Line 205-207

RESULTS

5. The population figures have been included in the flow chart.

Authors need to provide more details on the relative contribution of each village sample size to the total study population size. The provision of population figures in the flow chart was unsatisfactory for me.

Author’s Response: This is addressed in Lines 174-178