

1 Effectiveness of Interventions to Reduce Household Air Pollution and/or Improve  
2 Health in Homes using Solid Fuel in Low-and-Middle Income Countries: a  
3 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis  
4

5 Reginald Quansah<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Sean Semple<sup>3</sup>, Caroline A Ochieng<sup>4</sup>, Sanjar  
6 Juvekar<sup>5,6</sup>, Frederick Ato Armah<sup>7</sup>, Isaac Luginaah<sup>7</sup> and Jacques Emina<sup>6,8</sup>  
7

8 <sup>1</sup>Biological, Environmental & Occupational Health Sciences, School of Public Health, College of  
9 Health Sciences, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana

10 <sup>2</sup>Department of Immunology, Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research, College of Health  
11 Sciences, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana

12 <sup>3</sup>Respiratory Intervention Group, Institute of Applied Health Science, University of Aberdeen,  
13 Aberdeen, Scotland

14 <sup>4</sup>Stockholm Environment Institute, Stockholm, Sweden

15 <sup>5</sup>KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India.

16 <sup>6</sup>INDEPTH Network, Accra, Ghana

17 <sup>7</sup>Department of Geography, Western University, Ontario, Canada.

18 <sup>8</sup> Department of Population and Development Studies, University of Kinshasa, Kinshasa,  
19 Democratic Republic of Congo

20  
21 **\* Corresponding author:**

22 Dr Reginald Quansah

23 Biological, Environmental & Occupational Health Sciences, School of Public Health, College of  
24 Health Sciences, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana

25 P.O. BOX LG 13, Legon, Ghana

26 **Tel: +233 (0) 234404637**

27 [reginald.quansah@ug.edu.gh](mailto:reginald.quansah@ug.edu.gh)/[yaw121@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:yaw121@yahoo.co.uk)  
28  
29  
30

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Cookstove intervention programs have been increasing over the past two (2) decades in Low  
3 and Middle Income Countries (LMICs) across the globe. However, there remains uncertainty regarding the  
4 effects of these interventions on household air pollution concentrations, personal exposure concentrations  
5 and health outcomes.

6 **Objectives:** The primary objective was to determine if household air pollution (HAP) interventions were  
7 associated with improved indoor air quality (IAQ) in households in LMICs. Given the potential impact of  
8 HAP interventions on health, a secondary objective was to evaluate the effectiveness of HAP interventions to  
9 improve health in populations receiving these interventions.

10 **Data sources:** OVID Medline, Ovid Embase, SCOPUS and PubMed were searched from their inception  
11 until December 2015 with no restrictions on study design. The WHO Global database of household air  
12 pollution measurements and Members' archives were also reviewed together with the reference lists of  
13 identified reviews and relevant articles.

14 **Study eligibility criteria, participants and intervention:**

15 We considered randomized controlled trials, or non-randomized control trials, or before-and-after studies;  
16 original studies; studies conducted in a LMIC (based on the United Nations Human Development Report  
17 released in March 2013 (World Bank, 2013); interventions that were explicitly aimed at improving IAQ  
18 and/or health from solid fuel use; studies published in a peer-reviewed journal or student theses or reports;  
19 studies that reported on outcomes which was indicative of IAQ or/and health. There was no restriction on the  
20 type of comparator (e.g. household receiving *plancha* vs. household using traditional cookstove) used in the  
21 intervention study.

22 **Study appraisal and synthesis methods:** Five review authors independently used pre-designed data  
23 collection forms to extract information from the original studies and assessed risk of bias using the Effective  
24 Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP). We computed standardized weighted mean difference (SMD) using  
25 random-effects models. Heterogeneity was computed using the Q and I<sup>2</sup>-statistics. We examined the  
26 influence of various characteristics on the study-specific effect estimates by stratifying the analysis by  
27 population type, study design, intervention type, and duration of exposure monitoring. The trim and fill  
28 method was used to assess the potential impact of missing studies.

1 **Results:** Fifty-five studies met our *a priori* inclusion criteria and were included in the systematic review.  
2 Fifteen studies provided 43 effect estimates for our meta-analysis. The largest improvement in HAP was  
3 observed for average particulate matter (PM) (SMD=1.57) concentrations in household kitchens (1.03),  
4 followed by daily personal average concentrations of PM (1.18), and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations  
5 in kitchens. With respect to personal PM, significant improvement was observed in studies of children (1.26)  
6 and studies monitoring PM for  $\geq 24$  hrs (1.32). This observation was also noted in terms of studies of kitchen  
7 concentrations of CO. A significant improvement was also observed for kitchen levels of PM in both adult  
8 populations (1.56) and in RCT/cohort designs (1.59) involving replacing cookstoves without chimneys. Our  
9 findings on health outcomes were inconclusive.

10 **Limitations, conclusions and implications of key findings:** We observed high statistical between  
11 study variability in the study-specific estimate. Thus, care should be taken in concluding that HAP  
12 interventions - as currently designed and implemented - support reductions in the average kitchen  
13 and personal levels of PM and CO. Further, there is limited evidence that current stand-alone HAP  
14 interventions yield any health benefits. Post-intervention levels of pollutants were generally still  
15 greatly in excess of the relevant WHO guideline and thus a need to promote cleaner fuels in LMICs  
16 to reduce HAP levels below the WHO guidelines.

17 **Systematic review registration number:** The review has been registered with PROSPERO  
18 (registration number CRD42014009768 )

19

20 **Keywords** Developing country, HAP, health improvement, intervention, meta-analysis, systematic  
21 review

22

23

24

25

26

1 **1. Introduction**

2            Nearly one-third of the world’s population use solid fuels such as wood, animal dung,  
3 and crop residues as their primary source of domestic energy use (e.g. Bonjour et al., 2013;  
4 Balakrishnan et al., 2013; Chafe et al., 2014 ). Cooking and heating with solid fuel on open fires or  
5 traditional stoves emits a complex mixture of organic compounds and gases, which include carbon  
6 monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and sulphur (SO<sub>x</sub>), aldehydes, polycyclic aromatic  
7 hydrocarbons (PAHs), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), chlorinated dioxins, fine particulate  
8 matter (PM), and free radicals (Albalak, 2001; Mishra, 2003). Health problems associated with  
9 household air pollution (HAP) from solid fuel/biomass fuel use includes, but is not limited to,  
10 respiratory tract infection (Mishra, 2003) exacerbation of inflammatory lung conditions (Gordon et  
11 al., 2015), cardiac events (Bruce et al., 2015), asthma (Bruce et al., 2015; Gordon et al., 2015),  
12 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) (Assad et al., 2015; Bruce et al., 2015; Gordon et  
13 al., 2015), low birth weight (Amegah et al., 2014) and tuberculosis (Kurmi et al., 2014).

14            Cookstove intervention programs have been implemented and studied extensively in  
15 Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs). However, there remains significant uncertainty  
16 regarding the effectiveness of these interventions. Rehfuess et al. (2014) and Thomas et al. (2015)  
17 recently reported reviews on this subject. Rehfuess et al. (2014) conducted a systematic review and  
18 meta-analysis covering the period between 1998 and July 2012. The authors identified 38 studies  
19 published in LMICs and ICs and noted reduction in average daily concentrations of the two most  
20 commonly measured pollutants: PM and CO. Thomas et al. (2015) conducted a systematic review  
21 of studies published up to April 2014. These authors captured almost the same studies previously  
22 reviewed by Rehfuess et al. (2014) but the findings from these two reviews were contradictory. The  
23 household air pollution field is changing rapidly and new evidence has accumulated since the last  
24 review (Thomas et al. 2015). In such a rapidly evolving field there is the need to confirm or refute  
25 previous findings. Also timely evaluation of methods and results of studies can help inform public

1 health policy and future studies. It is from these perspectives that we are conducting this systematic  
2 review to determine if HAP interventions are associated with improved IAQ in households in  
3 LMICs. A secondary objective is to evaluate the effectiveness of HAP interventions to improve  
4 health in populations living in LMICs.

5

## 6 **2. Methods**

### 7 *2.1 Search strategy*

8 This systematic review was carried out according to established methods (NICE,  
9 2012; IRIS, 2012) and reported according to recommendations from the Preferred Reporting Items  
10 for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses statement (PRISMA) (2014). A review protocol is  
11 reported elsewhere (Quansah et al., 2015).

12 We performed a systematic literature search of OVID Medline, Ovid Embase,  
13 SCOPUS and PubMed databases (Supplementary, search strategy) from their inception until  
14 October 2013 and updated our search in December 2015 (Fig.1). Furthermore, the reference lists of  
15 identified articles and that of a recent review (Thomas et al., 2015) were searched. Three authors  
16 (RQ, SS, and CO) carried out the initial screening of titles and abstracts from the searches. Full  
17 papers of potentially relevant publications were located and independently appraised by five  
18 reviewers (RQ, CO, SS, FA and IL) to select those satisfying the inclusion criteria.

19

### 20 *Study selection*

#### 21 ***Population of interest***

22 Studies had to be carried out in populations located within LMICs based on the United  
23 Nations Human Development Report released in March 2013) (World Bank, 2013). There were no  
24 other restrictions on population type.

25

1 ***Type of Intervention***

2 We considered any type of household intervention that was explicitly aimed at  
3 improving indoor air quality and/or health by changing or reducing emissions from solid fuel use  
4 within the home. Such interventions include for example, changes in stove or heating apparatus,  
5 changes in ventilation arrangements and changes in behavior geared towards reducing emission and  
6 exposure to cooking smoke. This allowed us to examine the influence of intervention type on study-  
7 specific estimates. Interventions targeting for example, deforestation, fire wood use, particle size  
8 distribution and cooking time were excluded because they did not address our research questions.

9

10 ***Type of comparisons***

11 Different types of comparators have been used in intervention studies. We aimed to  
12 provide a comprehensive evaluation of the evidence and did not impose any restrictions on the type  
13 of comparator used in the intervention studies (for example, convenience comparison group,  
14 randomized control group, no intervention control, and usual practice control). Studies with and  
15 without comparators were included in the review.

16

17 ***Types of outcomes***

18 We assessed both health and exposure outcomes. The primary outcomes were  
19 measures of indoor air quality (IAQ), e.g. airborne concentrations of carbon monoxide or fine  
20 particulate matter or soot or smoke. We also included biomarkers of exposure to air pollutants in the  
21 form of metabolites of poly-aromatic hydrocarbons. Secondary outcome measures were common  
22 health indicators and included (but again not be limited to) acute lower respiratory infection,  
23 sensory irritation (for example, itchy/watery/sore eyes), cough and high blood pressure (Quansah et  
24 al., 2015). Studies that only reported on fuel use, cooking time, climate, and non-IAQ/health related  
25 outcomes were excluded.

1 *Type of study*

2 We included randomized controlled trials (RCT or quasi-RCT), or non-randomized  
3 control trials (i.e. cohort, case-controlled and cross-sectional studies), or before-and-after studies.  
4 We excluded all controlled experimental studies (i.e. both laboratory and field) because they did not  
5 qualify as interventions. We further excluded studies conducted in developed countries because  
6 they did not answer our research questions.

7  
8 *Types of publications*

9 In order to provide a comprehensive review of the literature we considered both  
10 articles in peer-reviewed journals and student theses. Our search included publications in the  
11 following languages: English, Spanish, and Chinese.

12  
13 *2.2. Data extraction and risk of bias assessment*

14 Relevant characteristics of eligible studies were extracted and recorded independently  
15 by five authors (i.e. RQ, CO, SS, FA and IL). Discrepancies were resolved through discussion.  
16 TABLE 1 displays the main characteristics of the eligible studies. Risk of bias was assessed with  
17 the Effective Public Health Practice Project Quality Assessment Tool (EPHPP) (1998). The results  
18 of the risk of bias assessment tool for each individual study (**Supplemental Table 1**) and the data  
19 extraction forms (**Supplemental Table 2**) are available in the supplementary materials.

20  
21 *2.3. Statistical analysis*

22 We anticipated substantial between study variability and we computed standardized  
23 weighted mean difference (SMD) for each of our outcomes: personal levels of particulate matter (P-  
24 PM) and carbon monoxide (PCO) and kitchen levels of particulate matter (MPM) and carbon  
25 monoxide (MCO) using a random effects model. The studies presented mean differences and  
26 corresponding exact p-values, or mean difference and their 95% confidence interval, or mean and

1 standard deviation. The mean difference and their corresponding standard error were computed in  
2 excel using standard methods (Borenstein et al., 2009; Follmann et al., 1992; Higgins et al., 2010).  
3 Heterogeneity was computed using the Q ( $p < 0.1$  considered significant), and  $I^2$ -statistics ( $I^2$ -  
4 statistic  $> 50\%$  indicates high, 25–50% moderate, and  $< 25\%$  low heterogeneity). We examined the  
5 influence of various characteristics on the study-specific effect estimates by stratifying the analysis  
6 by: a) population type (children vs. female adult vs. both children and female adult); b) study design  
7 (cross-sectional vs. pre-post design vs. RCT); c) intervention type (*plancha* vs. *justa* vs. *patsari* vs.  
8 other); d) duration of exposure monitoring ( $\leq 24$  hours vs.  $> 24$  hours). Publication bias was assessed  
9 using the Egger test of asymmetry (Egger et al., 1998). The trim and fill method was used to assess  
10 the potential impact of missing studies. Statistical analysis was performed using STATA software  
11 version 11 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

12

### 13 **3. Results**

#### 14 *3.1. Literature Search*

15 Our systematic search of the literature is shown in Figure 1. Fifty-five studies met our  
16 *a priori* inclusion criteria and were included in the systematic review. Fifteen studies provided 43  
17 effect estimates for our meta-analysis (Supplementary Table 3). Of the 55 studies, 46 were  
18 identified from the searched databases, three were identified from reference lists of relevant studies,  
19 with a further six retrieved from a recent review (Thomas et al., 2015). Sixty-eight studies were  
20 excluded for reasons given in Supplementary Table 4.

21

#### 22 *3.2. Study Characteristics*

23 Characteristics of the 55 eligible studies by study design are presented in Tables 1a  
24 and 1b. The interventions identified were carried out in three continents: South America (Guatemala  
25 (n=12); Honduras (n=2); Nicaragua (n=1); Peru (n=6); and Mexico (n=7)); Asia (Bangladesh (n=1);

1 China (n=8); India (n=4); Nepal (n=1); Pakistan (n=1); and Africa (Senegal (n=4); Ghana (n=1);  
2 Nigeria (n=1); Kenya (n=4); South Africa (n=1); Malawi (n=1); and Rwanda (n=1)). Sixteen of the  
3 intervention studies were cross-sectional designs, nineteen were before-and-after designs, eleven  
4 were randomized control trials (RCTs), and eight cohort designs. In two studies, two  
5 complementary study designs were applied. That is, between-group comparisons based on  
6 randomized stove assignment, and before-and-after comparisons within control subjects who used  
7 open fires during the trial and received chimney stoves after the trial. The interventions were carried  
8 out among female adults population or among children or both population groups. Most of the  
9 studies applied a single intervention and these included improved cookstoves, mostly wood burning  
10 stoves such as *patsari* cookstove, *plancha* cookstove, improved *justa* stove, OPTIMA cookstove,  
11 eco-cookstove, *sukhad* cookstove, ONIL stove, *gyapa* cookstove and “smoke free stove”. There was  
12 one study carried out on the use of biogas digesters, three on solar ovens and one on a switch to  
13 ethanol fuel. Other interventions assessed in the studies were: installation of chimneys (n=1); health  
14 education campaign (n=1); and behavioural interventions such as education and counselling on  
15 cooking outdoors, opening windows/doors and reducing the amount of time the child spends in the  
16 kitchen (n=1). The funding model for the intervention was often poorly described. Some studies  
17 indicated that the improved cookstoves were offered for free but most studies failed to report the  
18 delivery mechanism and financing of the intervention.

19           Several outcomes were reported in the intervention studies and we classified them into  
20 personal exposure outcomes and micro-environment exposure outcomes (Table 1a); and health  
21 outcomes (Table 1b). Personal exposure outcomes were outcomes measured at the individual level  
22 using for example, personal monitors attached to individuals clothing, measurement of metabolites  
23 in urine and so on. Micro-environment exposure outcomes refer to particulate matter (PM) and/or  
24 carbon monoxide (CO) measured from a fixed point in the home, most commonly in the kitchen.  
25 Health outcomes reported in the identified studies were generally sparse and heterogeneous.

1 3.3. Personal Exposure Outcomes

2 Twenty-eight studies reported on personal indicators of indoor air quality (IAQ) and  
3 are described below (Table 1a).

4 3.3.1 Studies on Personal Particulate Matter

5 Of the 11 studies that reported on daily average personal particulate matter (P-PM),  
6 five did not provide sufficient data for our quantitative analysis and were therefore analyzed  
7 qualitatively. Cynthia et al. (2008) studied the impact of improved wood burning stove (*Patsari*) in  
8 reducing personal exposure to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and CO in 60 homes in rural Michoacan in Mexico. The daily  
9 average personal 24-hr PM<sub>2.5</sub> was 0.29 mg/m<sup>3</sup> for women using a traditional open fire. Installation  
10 of the *Patsari* cookstove resulted in a 35% reduction in the median 24-hr personal PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The  
11 corresponding reduction in 48-hr personal CO exposure was 77%. Li et al. (2011) investigated  
12 whether replacement of open pit stoves by improved stoves equipped with a chimney reduced  
13 exposure to PAHs, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and CO exposure in rural Peru. Two stove types were evaluated (A, n=30;  
14 B, n=27). Installation of improved cookstoves reduced personal exposures by 47-74% and urinary  
15 hydroxylate PAH metabolites (OH-PAHs) by 19-52%. Mukhopadhyay et al. (2012) assessed two  
16 brands of commercial advanced cookstoves (i.e. Philips and Oorja) with small blowers to improve  
17 combustion. These advanced cookstoves produced reductions in personal PM<sub>2.5</sub> and CO.

18 In total, seven effect estimates were provided by five studies for our quantitative  
19 analysis of P-PM (Supplementary Table 1). Of this, Naeher et al. (2000) provided data on both the  
20 populations of children and their mothers. Fitzgerald et al. (2012) used two different improved  
21 cookstoves, referred to in the forest plot as ICS1 and ICS2. The overall summary SMD was 1.18  
22 (95% CI: 1.05, 1.32) (Fig 1). High between-study variability was observed (I<sup>2</sup>-index=89.7%,  
23 P=0.000, Q-statistics (n=7) =58.17). In the stratified analysis, moderate to large improvements in  
24 average daily personal PM was observed (Fig. 2 and Table 1). With the exception of studies on  
25 *plancha* cookstoves and those studies monitoring personal PM levels for less than 24-hr,

1 heterogeneity persisted (Table 2). The Egger test of small study effects showed no evidence of  
2 publication bias ( $p=0.123$ ). However, adjustment for publication bias by the trim and fill method  
3 imputed three studies and the overall summary SMD was reduced marginally (1.08; 95% CI: 0.95,  
4 1.22) and heterogeneity persisted (91.66 (10),  $p=0.00$ , 99.2%) (Table 2).

5

### 6 3.3.2. *Studies on Personal Carbon monoxide*

7 Twenty-one intervention studies reported daily average personal carbon monoxide  
8 levels (PCO). Clark et al. (2013) examined the impact of a cleaner-burning cookstove intervention  
9 among non-smoking female cooks and measured indoor  $PM_{2.5}$ , CO and PCO concentrations. Large  
10 mean reduction concentrations were observed for all exposure metrics following installation of a  
11 subsidized eco-stove. Diaz et al. (2007) observed a median reduction in exhaled breath CO in the  
12 intervention group compared to the control group following the installation of improved *plancha*  
13 stoves. Rollin et al. (2004) conducted a feasibility study to assess the impact of reduction of IAQ on  
14 acute lower respiratory infection in infants. When mean concentrations of CO were compared  
15 between electrified and un-electrified dwellings, there was strong evidence ( $p=0.0004$ ) that the  
16 mean concentrations of log (CO) in the kitchen was higher in the electrified areas (1.25 vs. 0.69)  
17 and strong evidence ( $p<0.0001$ ) that the mean concentration of log (CO) on the child was higher in  
18 electrified areas (0.83 s. 0.34). Beltramo et al. (2013) did not observe any evidence that solar ovens  
19 reduced exposure to carbon monoxide.

20 Altogether seven studies provided 10 effect estimates for our quantitative analysis of  
21 PCO (Supplemental Material, Table S1). The overall summary SMD was 0.81 (95% CI: 0.63, 1.05)  
22 and substantial heterogeneity was noted ( $I^2=99.8\%$ ,  $p=0.00$ , Q-statistics (11) =5089.79). Slight to  
23 moderate improvement in IAQ related to PCO was observed across study level characteristics (Fig.  
24 3 and Table 2) and substantial heterogeneity persisted. Egger small study effect ( $p=0.415$ ) and the  
25 trim and fill did not show any evidence of publication bias (Table 2).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

3.2. *Micro-environment Exposure Outcomes*

A total of 26 studies reported micro-environment indicators of HAP from solid fuel use and are described below (Table 1a).

3.2.1. *Studies on Micro-environment Particulate Matter*

With respect to particulate matter (PM), 10 studies provided 13 effect estimates for our quantitative analysis. Masera et al. (2007) evaluated the impact of improved *patsari* cookstoves in the Purepecha region of Michoacin state in Mexico. Average concentrations of CO and PM<sub>2.5</sub> were measured both before and after the introduction of the improved cookstove at 1- minute intervals for 48 hrs. PM<sub>2.5</sub> and CO were reduced by 67% and 66% respectively. In the study by Chowdury et al. (2013), 24-hr PM<sub>2.5</sub> and CO concentrations in the kitchen ranged between 0.15-0.71 ppm for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and 3.0-11 ppm for CO when using the traditional cookstove; and between 0.08-0.18 ppm for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and 0.7-5.5 ppm for CO when using improved cookstoves. In three Andean communities within the Santiago de Chuco province of Peru, two different models of improved cookstoves (i.e. stove 1 and stove 2) were installed in 64 homes. In the community receiving stove 1, baseline 48-hr personal exposure and kitchen concentrations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> were 116.4 and 207.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, respectively; and 48-hr hour personal and kitchen CO levels were 1.2 and 3.6 ppm respectively. After introducing the new stove to this community, personal exposure and kitchen concentrations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> reduced to 68.4 and 84.7 µg/m<sup>3</sup> respectively; and that of personal and kitchen CO levels to 0.4 and 0.8 ppm respectively, representing reductions of 41.3%, 59.2%, 69.6% and 77.7%. In the two communities receiving stove 2, corresponding levels were 126.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, 173.4 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, 0.9 ppm , and 2.6 ppm before the installation of the stoves, and they reduced to 58.3, 51.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and 0.6, 1.0 ppm. Overall, homes receiving stove 2 saw reductions of 53.8, 70.5, 25.8 and 63.6%.

1            In the meta-analysis of 13 effect estimates from 10 studies (Supplementary Table 3),  
2 the overall summary SMD was 1.57 (1.22, 2.01). High statistical heterogeneity was observed  
3 ( $I^2=98.2\%$ ,  $p=0.00$ ,  $Q$ -statistics (13) =661.63). A slight to large improvement in average kitchen  
4 levels of PM (MPM) was noted across study level characteristics and with the exception of studies  
5 looking at the exposure of children substantial between-study variability persisted (Table 2). A test  
6 of publication bias showed no evidence of small study effects ( $p=0.184$ ). Again this was not  
7 confirmed by the trim and fill method which showed a decline in the summary SMD (1.16; 0.85,  
8 1.53) (Table 2).

### 10 3.2.2. *Micro-environment Carbon Monoxide*

11            In the study by Chengappaa et al. (2007) in the Bundelkund region of India, CO was  
12 measured for a 48-hr period in 60 rural kitchens before and after installation of a *sukhad* improved  
13 cookstove. One year after the intervention, CO concentrations were reduced by 70% ( $p<0.001$ ) and  
14 44% ( $p<0.01$ ) respectively. Khushk et al. (2005) reported levels of 15.4 ppm for smoke-free stoves  
15 compared to 28.5 ppm for traditional cookstoves. A 3-stage risk reduction program was applied by  
16 Torres-Dorsal et al (2007). These steps included (i) removal of indoor soot adhered to roofs and  
17 internal walls (ii) paving dirty floors and (iii) introduction of a new wood stove with a metal  
18 chimney. Blood caroxyhaemoglobin (% COHb) and urinary 1-OHP levels were measured before  
19 and after the intervention. In the 20 participants the levels of COHb reduced by an average of 2.5%  
20 one month after the intervention. A similar observation was noted for 1-OHP levels.

21            In all, eleven studies provided 13 effect estimates for our quantitative analysis of  
22 kitchen levels of CO. The overall summary SMD was 1.21 (0.89, 1.66;  $I^2=99.5\%$ ,  $p=0.00$ ,  $Q$ -  
23 statistics (13) =2578.71) (Fig 4). A slight to large improvement in indoor air quality (IAQ) related  
24 to average kitchen levels of CO (MCO) was noted across study level characteristics and, except for  
25 studies scoring weak on the Effective Public Health Practice Project Quality Assessment Tool

1 (EPHPP), substantial heterogeneity persisted. There was no evidence of the small study effect  
2 ( $p=0.154$ ) and this was confirmed by the trim and fill method (1.03; 0.76, 1.41) (Table 2).

3

### 4 3.3. Health Outcomes

5 A total of twenty-nine studies reported health outcomes. Of these, 10 studies reported  
6 on respiratory health problems alone, 10 studies on non-respiratory health problems, and 8 studies  
7 on both respiratory and non-respiratory health problems (Table 1b). Due to the sparse nature of  
8 individual health outcomes, it was not possible to conduct a meta-analysis. These studies are  
9 discussed below.

10

#### 11 3.3.1. Respiratory Health Problems

12 Different definitions of asthma were applied in the studies and this included asthma based on  
13 lung function measurements and self-reported symptoms of asthma such as wheezing, cough,  
14 phlegm production, difficulty breathing, runny or stuffy nose and chest tightness. Beltramo and  
15 Levine (2013) compared respiratory symptoms in 465 women who purchased solar ovens and 325  
16 control women. The authors did not observe any evidence that the use of solar ovens reduced the  
17 incidence of cough and/or sore throat. They concluded that their study was a policy success because  
18 it halted a nationwide proposal to roll-out solar ovens. Women who reported using *patsari*  
19 cookstoves most of the time compared to those using open fire experienced significantly lower  
20 levels of cough and wheezing (Romieu et al., 2009). Significant reductions in several respiratory  
21 symptoms such as dry cough, chest tightness, difficulty breathing and runny nose were observed in  
22 mothers and children in homes that used improved cookstoves compared to those that used  
23 traditional cookstoves in Guatemala (Albalak et al., 2001). These findings were confirmed by  
24 Ludwinski et al. (2011) who reported a 48.6% and a 63.3% reduction in respiratory symptoms in  
25 mothers and children respectively, and in Romieu et al. (2009) and Dohoo et al. (2012). However,

1 no significant improvement in measures of lung function was observed in users of *plancha* (Smith-  
2 Sivertsen et al., 2009), *justa* (Clark et al., 2009) and *Gram vikas* (Hanna et al., 2012) cookstoves. In  
3 a parallel randomized controlled trial in Guatemala, Smith et al. (2011) investigated whether an  
4 intervention to lower indoor wood smoke emissions would reduce pneumonia in children.  
5 Pneumonia was defined as physician-diagnosed pneumonia, without use of a chest radiograph or  
6 fieldworker-assessed pneumonia (all and severe) and seven other conditions of physician-diagnosed  
7 pneumonia. Significant reductions in the intervention group for three severe outcomes: fieldworker-  
8 assessed, physician-diagnosed, and RSV-negative pneumonia were noted. In the exposure-response  
9 analysis, a 50% exposure reduction was significantly associated with a reduction in physician-  
10 diagnosed pneumonia (RR 0.82; 0.70, 0.98). Hosgood et al. (2002) evaluated lung cancer mortality  
11 reduction after changing from a traditional smoky stove to an improved cookstove in China. A  
12 significant reduction in lung cancer mortality was observed in women and men who changed to  
13 improved cookstoves compared to those who did not change. Reductions in lung cancer incidence  
14 (Lan et al. 2002) and pneumonia mortality (Shen et al. 2009) were also observed in similar  
15 populations following a switch to an improved cookstove .

16

### 17 3.3.2. Non-respiratory Health Problems

18 Household air pollution (HAP) intervention studies on non-respiratory symptoms have  
19 been inconclusive. Whereas Jary et al. (2014) did not observe any significant improvement in  
20 headache and back pain following the use of wood burning clay improved cookstove for 7 days,  
21 Burwen and Levine (2012), Diaz et al. (2008) and Alam et al. (2006) noted marginal to significant  
22 improvements in these indicators. A small number of studies have observed improvements in blood  
23 pressure (Hanna et al., 2002; McCracken et al., 2007) and low birth weight (Thompson et al., 2011)  
24 following the use of improved cookstoves.

25

1 **4. Discussion**

2           This systematic review and meta-analysis of HAP interventions conducted in Low and  
3 Middle Income Countries (LMICs) aims to address the question, whether HAP interventions to  
4 improve indoor air quality (IAQ) and/or health in homes using solid fuel for cooking and heating  
5 are effective. Fifteen of the 55 studies were eligible for quantitative analysis. The largest reduction  
6 in HAP was particulate matter (PM) levels in the kitchen, followed by daily personal average levels  
7 of PM, levels of carbon monoxide (CO) in the kitchen and daily personal average levels of CO.  
8 Slight to large improvement related to study level characteristics in average kitchen levels of PM  
9 and CO as well as average daily levels of PM and CO. The findings from the qualitative analysis  
10 corroborate that of the quantitative analysis. Findings on health outcomes were inconclusive. We  
11 also observed high statistical between study variability in the study-specific estimates and this  
12 persisted in most cases in the stratified analysis. Thus, caution is warranted in concluding that HAP  
13 interventions - as currently designed and implemented – support reductions in the average kitchen  
14 and personal levels of PM and CO.

15

16 *4.1. Validity issues*

17           Our study has a number of strengths. We searched several databases and used  
18 secondary references that were cited in the original articles and a recent review. Five reviewers  
19 independently assessed the articles based on *a priori* eligibility criteria. We also followed the  
20 methods of the National Institute of Healthcare Excellence (NICE) and the National Academy of  
21 Science review of the EPA Integrated Risk Information System process; and reported the findings  
22 according to recommendations by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-  
23 analysis statement. We also evaluated the possibility of publication bias using Egger’s test of  
24 asymmetry and the trim and fill method.

1           We acknowledge a number of limitations in our study. We applied the Effective  
2 Public Health Practice Project Quality Assessment Tool (EPHPP) to assess the risk of bias, but due  
3 to a lack of data we were unable to explore the influence of each of the six domains on our overall  
4 summary SMD. Nevertheless, we applied a single global rating score to assess the influence of risk  
5 of bias on overall summary SMD and the majority of the studies were rated as weak on this scale.  
6 How well a study fairs on the scale is dependent on the amount of information available in the  
7 article for evaluation. Thus, a well conducted study may score poorly on the scale because the  
8 author(s) failed to provide adequate information when writing up their manuscript. As a result,  
9 interpretation on how well a study does on the EPHPP should be carried out with caution. We also  
10 observed high statistical between study variability in the study-specific estimates and this persisted  
11 in most cases in the stratified analysis. Thus, caution may be warranted in concluding that HAP  
12 interventions as currently designed and implemented support reductions in the average kitchen and  
13 personal levels of PM and CO.

14           Furthermore, of the studies meeting our *a priori* inclusion criteria, the majority came  
15 from cross-sectional studies in which it was not possible to judge the temporal relation between  
16 HAP intervention and our outcomes of interest. However, the generally consistent results from the  
17 different study designs and study level characteristics support the hypothesis that HAP interventions  
18 reduce average kitchen levels of PM/CO and daily average personal levels of PM/CO. A variety of  
19 exposure outcomes and interventions were reported in the original studies. With respect to the  
20 outcomes we carefully segregated them into average daily PM/CO personal levels and levels of  
21 PM/CO in the kitchen and this allowed us to study the impact of HAP intervention on each  
22 outcome. Due to practical, ethical and budgetary constraints the studies have typically been small in  
23 size with a very small proportion of them being RCT design. The monitoring period tended to be  
24 short and the duration of measurement was inconsistent across the studies making comparison  
25 difficult. We also carefully categorized the monitoring period into 2 levels (i.e. <24hrs vs ≥24hrs) to

1 understand how daily exposure variability impacts on the overall SMD. Most of the studies also had  
2 qualitative components and these did not contribute to the evaluation of the impact of HAP  
3 intervention on our outcome of interest. The studies generally differed on baseline indoor PM/CO  
4 and in most cases post-intervention measurements were above the WHO guideline.

5

#### 6 *4.2. Comparison with previous studies*

7 Two previous reviews: a WHO report (Rehfuess et al., 2014) and a systematic review  
8 by Thomas et al. (2015) were available on this subject. In the first study, Rehfuess et al. (2014)  
9 conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to answer the question whether improved  
10 cookstoves in everyday use, compared to traditional cookstoves are effective in reducing average  
11 concentrations of, or exposure to, particulate matter and carbon monoxide among households in.  
12 The authors identified 38 studies and reported average kitchen levels of PM and CO reducing by 38  
13 to 82%. Reductions of average personal levels of PM and CO ranging between 47 to 76% were also  
14 observed. In the second study, Thomas et al. (2015) conducted a qualitative review of  
15 epidemiologic evidence that improved cookstove interventions reduced household air pollution and  
16 improved health. They searched 10 databases and identified almost the same studies included in  
17 Rehfuess et al. (2014) but failed to reach any conclusion. .

18 We identified **55** studies, and across these household air pollution (HAP) interventions  
19 resulted in improvement in daily average personal and average kitchen levels of particulate matter  
20 by 24% and 18% respectively. A much smaller (3%) improvement in average kitchen levels of  
21 carbon monoxide was observed.

22 This observation was also observed across different study designs, population types  
23 and monitoring duration. Our findings are consistent with the WHO report (Rehfuess et al., 2014),  
24 although ours is more comprehensive as we include 17 additional studies. We observed that the  
25 performance of the *Plancha* and the *Justa* on average daily personal levels of PM was broadly

1 similar. However, both the *Justa* and the *Patsari* outperformed the *Plancha* in reducing average  
2 kitchen levels of PM/CO. The reason for this later observation is not clear, but the former  
3 observation corroborates the finding of a WHO report (Ruhfuess et al., 2014) which suggests a  
4 substantial improvement of personal PM levels with stoves with chimneys. In spite of the observed  
5 improvement in average PM and CO levels, post-intervention concentrations of PM/CO are much  
6 higher than the WHO guidelines for these air pollutants.

7           Our findings have important public health implications for populations living in Low  
8 and middle-income countries (LMICs) given the tremendous health burden of household air  
9 pollution (HAP) (Amegah and Jaakkola, 2015) and the fact that the total number of users of  
10 solid/biomass fuels in these countries have not declined (Bonjour et al., 2013). Our findings further  
11 suggest that current stand-alone HAP interventions yield little if any health benefit. Thus, there is  
12 the need to re-examine the ways in which interventions are designed and implemented in homes in  
13 LMICs. Multi-faceted HAP interventions could offer an opportunity to reduce exposures to HAP  
14 that could have marked public health impact in LMICs. Cleaner fuels such as liquid petroleum gas,  
15 ethanol, solar and electrification may reduce indoor emission levels substantially. However, to date  
16 only five qualitative studies (1 on LPG, 2 on ethanol, 1 on electrification and 1 on solar) have  
17 evaluated the impact of cleaner fuel on HAP or health. An ongoing HAP randomized trial in Ghana  
18 may shed light on the impact of cooking with cleaner fuels on health/IAQ (Jack et al., 2015).

19           Our findings on health outcomes were inconclusive, supporting the findings of a  
20 previous systematic review (Thomas et al., 2015) and recent large intervention studies (Bensch and  
21 Peters, 2012; Hanna et al., 2012). The exposure-response (E-R) curve for most health effects is  
22 poorly understood but data for cardio-pulmonary and cardiovascular effects from outdoor air  
23 pollution, second-hand tobacco smoke and smoking studies tend to suggest that the curve, at least  
24 for PM, is steep and may plateau at moderate PM doses (Pope, 2009). Such an E-R curve would  
25 then suggest that minimal or no health improvements may accrue from the moderate HAP

1 improvements seen by some of the studies reported in this review especially when the  
2 improvements achieved are within the upper, plateau part of the curve. Behavioral change  
3 interventions have the potential to reduce average concentrations of particulate matter and carbon  
4 monoxide by 20-98% in laboratory settings and by 31-94% in field setting (Barnes, 2014).  
5 Behavioral strategies may include cooking outdoors, reducing time spent in the cooking area,  
6 keeping the kitchen door/windows open while cooking, avoiding leaning over the fire while cooking,  
7 avoiding carrying children while cooking and keeping children away from the cooking area.  
8 Opportunities to educate communities on reducing household air pollution exposure include  
9 durbars, festival celebrations, religious meetings and child welfare outreach clinics. Community  
10 health workers are the fulcrum of the health system in many developing countries and represent  
11 important change agents (Leon et al., 2015). Adoption and sustainability are big issues for most  
12 HAP interventions. There is a need for qualitative research on the barriers and facilitators for  
13 adoption and continued use. There is also a clear need for a standard method to evaluate HAP  
14 interventions. A Standard Operating Procedure for stove evaluation programs that included sections  
15 on HAP assessment, health assessment and intervention adoption/use assessment is required for the  
16 HAP research community.

17

## 18 **5. Conclusions**

19 Our study suggests improvement in average PM/CO concentrations at the personal  
20 and micro-environment level occur following HAP interventions. Despite this, post-intervention  
21 levels are generally still far above the WHO guidelines for PM and CO, and perhaps because of  
22 these continued high exposures, the study finds little evidence of improvements in health outcomes.  
23 There is a need to develop effective interventions in LMICs that are capable of reducing HAP levels  
24 below the WHO guidelines, particularly in many communities in the developing world where  
25 adoption of improved cookstoves continues to prove challenging. There is also a need for a

1 Standard Operating Procedure for stove evaluation programs that include sections on HAP  
2 assessment, health assessment and intervention adoption/use assessment for the HAP research  
3 community.

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 **References**

2 1. Accinelli, R.A., Llanos, O., López, L.M., Pino, M.I., Bravo, Y.A., Salinas, V., Lazo,  
3 M., Noda, J.R., Sánchez-Sierra, M., Zárate, L., da Silva, J., Gianella, F., Kheirandish-Gozal,  
4 L., Gozal, D., 2014. Adherence to reduced-polluting biomass fuel stoves improves  
5 respiratory and sleep symptoms in children. *BMC Pediatr.* 14,1-5.  
6 2. Alam, S.A.M., Chowdhury, S.J., Begum, A., Rahman, M., 2006. Effect of improved earthen  
7 stoves: improving health for rural communities in Bangladesh. *Energy Sustain. Dev.* 10,46-  
8 53 .  
9 3. Albalak, R., Bruce, N., McCracken, J.P., Smith, K.R., De Gallardo, T., 2001. Indoor  
10 respirable particulate matter concentrations from an open fire, improved cookstove, and  
11 LPG/open fire combination in a rural Guatemalan community. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*35,  
12 2650-2655.  
13 4. Amegah, A.K., Jaakkola, J.J., 2016. Household air pollution and the sustainable  
14 development goals. *Bull World Health Organ.* 94,215-221.  
15 5. Amegah, A.K., Quansah, R., Jaakkola, J.J., 2014. Household air pollution from solid fuel  
16 use and risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the  
17 empirical evidence. *PLoS One.*9,1-23.  
18 6. Assad, N.A., Balmes, J., Mehta, S., Cheema, U., Sood, A., 2015. Chronic obstructive  
19 pulmonary disease secondary to household air pollution. *Semin. Respir. Crit. Care Med.*  
20 36,408-421.  
21 7. Balakrishnan, K., Ghosh, S., Ganguli, B., Sambandam, S., Bruce, N., Barnes, D.F., Smith,  
22 K.R., 2013. State and national household concentrations of PM2.5 from solid cookfuel use:  
23 results from measurements and modeling in India for estimation of the global burden of  
24 disease. *Environ. Health.* 11,:77  
25 8. Barnes, B.R., 2014. Behavioural change, indoor air pollution and child respiratory health in  
26 developing countries: a review. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 11, 4607–4618.  
27 9. Barnes, B., Mathee, A., Thomas, E., 2011. The impact of health behaviour change  
28 intervention on indoor air pollution indicators in the rural North West Province, South  
29 Africa. *J. energy South Afr.* 22,35-44.  
30 10. Bates, E., Bruce, N., Doig, A., Gitonga, A., 2002. Participatory approaches for alleviating  
31 indoor air pollution in rural Kenyan kitchens. *Boiling Point* 48,12-15.  
32 11. Beltramo, T.,Levine, D.I., 2013. The effect of solar ovens on fuel use, emissions and health:  
33 results from a randomised controlled trial. *J. Develop. Effect.*5, 178-207.  
34 12. Bensch, G., Grimm, M., Peter, K., Peters, J., Tasciotti, L., 2013. Impact Evaluation of  
35 Improved Stove Use in Burkina Faso – FAFASO. International Institute of Social Studies,  
36 Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands  
37 13. Bonjour, S., Adair-Rohani, H., Wolf, J., Bruce, N.G., Mehta, S., Prüss-Ustün, A., Lahiff,  
38 M., Rehfuess, E.A., Mishra, V., Smith, K.R., 2013. Solid fuel use for household cooking:  
39 country and regional estimates for 1980-2010. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 121,784-790.  
40 14. Borenstein, M., Hedges, L.V., Higgins, J.P.T., Rothstein, H.R., 2009. *Introduction to Meta-*  
41 *Analysis.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.  
42 15. Bruce, N., Dherani, M., Liu, R., Hosgood, H.D., 3rd, Sapkota, A., Smith, K.R., Straif,  
43 K., Lan, Q., Pope, D., 2015. Does household use of biomass fuel cause lung cancer? A  
44 systematic review and evaluation of the evidence for the GBD 2010 study. *Thorax* 70,433-  
45 441.

Field Code Changed

- 1 16. Bruce, N., McCracken, J., Albalak, R., Schei, M.A., Smith, K.R., Lopez, V., West, C.,  
2 2004. Impact of improved stoves, house construction and child location on levels of indoor  
3 air pollution exposure in young Guatemalan children. *J. Expo. Anal. Environ.*  
4 *Epidemiol.* 14S:26-33.
- 5 17. Bruce, N., Perez-Padilla, R., Albalak, R., 2000. Indoor air pollution in developing countries:  
6 a major environmental and public health challenge. *Bull World Health Organ.* 78,1078–  
7 1092.
- 8 18. Burwen, J., Levine, D. I., 2012. A rapid assessment randomized-controlled trial of improved  
9 cookstoves in rural Ghana. *Energy Sustain. Dev.* 16, 328–338.
- 10 19. Castañeda, J.L., Kheirandish-Gozal, L., Gozal, D., Accinelli, R.A., Pampa Cangallo Instituto  
11 de Investigaciones de la Altura Research Group. 2013. Effect of reductions in biomass fuel  
12 exposure on symptoms of sleep apnea in children living in the peruvian andes: a preliminary  
13 field study. *Pediatr. Pulmonol.* 48,996-999.
- 14 20. Chafe, Z.A., Brauer, M., Klimont, Z., Van Dingenen, R., Mehta, S., Rao, S., Riahi, K.,  
15 Dentener, F., Smith, K.R., 2014. Household cooking with solid fuels contributes to ambient  
16 PM<sub>2.5</sub> air pollution and the burden of disease. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 122, 1314-1320.
- 17 21. Chapman, R.S., He, X., Blair, A.E., Lan, Q., 2005. Improvement in household stoves and  
18 risk of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in Xuanwei, China: retrospective cohort  
19 study. *BMJ.* 331,1-6.
- 20 22. Chengappa, C., Edwards, R., Bajpaic, R., Shields, N.K., Smith, K.R., 2007. Impact of  
21 improved cookstoves on indoor air quality in the Bundelkhand region in India. *Energy*  
22 *Sustain. Dev.* 11,33-44.
- 23 23. Chowdhury, Z., Campanella, L., Gray, L., Masud, A.A., Marter-Kenyon, J., Pennise, D.,  
24 Charronb., D, Zuzhang, X., 2013. Measurement and modeling of indoor air pollution in  
25 rural households with multiple stove interventions in Yunnan, China. *Atmos. Environ.*  
26 67,161-169.
- 27 24. Clark, M.L., Bachand, A.M., Heiderscheidt, J.M., Yoder, S.A., Luna, B., Volckens, J.,  
28 Koehler, K.A., Conway, S., Reynolds, S.J., Peel, J.L., 2013. Impact of a cleaner-burning  
29 cookstove intervention on blood pressure in Nicaraguan women. *Indoor Air.* 23,105-114.
- 30 25. Clark, M.L., Reynolds, S.J., Burch, J.B., Conway, S., Bachand, A.M., Peel, J.L., 2010.  
31 Indoor air pollution, cookstove quality, and housing characteristics in two Honduran  
32 communities. *Environ. Res.* 110,12-18
- 33 26. Clark, M.L., Peel, J.L., Burch, J.B., Nelson, T.L., Robinson, M.M., Conway S, Bachand,  
34 A.M., Reynolds, S.J., 2009.. Impact of improved cookstoves on indoor air pollution and  
35 adverse health effects among Honduran women. *Int. J. Environ. Health Res.* 19,357-368.
- 36 27. Commodore, A.A., Zhang, J.J., Chang, Y., Hartinger, S.M., Lanata, C.F., Mäusezahl,  
37 D., Gil, A.I., Hall, D.B., Aguilar-Villalobos, M., Vena, J.E., Wang, J.S., Naeher, L.P., 2013.  
38 Concentrations of urinary 8-hydroxy-2'-deoxyguanosine and 8-isoprostane in women  
39 exposed to woodsmoke in a cookstove intervention study in San Marcos, Peru. *Environ Int*  
40 60,112-122
- 41 28. Cynthia, A.A., Edwards, R.D., Johnson, M., Zuk, M., Rojas, L., Jiménez, R.D., Riojas-  
42 Rodriguez, H., Masera, O., 2008. Reduction in personal exposures to particulate matter and  
43 carbon monoxide as a result of the installation of a Patsari improved cook stove in  
44 Michoacan Mexico. *Indoor Air* 18,93-105.

Field Code Changed

- 1 29. Díaz, E., Bruce, N., Pope, D., Díaz, A., Smith, K.R., Smith-Sivertsen, T., 2008. Self-rated  
 2 health among Mayan women participating in a randomised intervention trial reducing indoor  
 3 air pollution in Guatemala. *BMC Int. Health Hum. Rights* 8,1-8.
- 4 30. Díaz, E., Smith-Sivertsen, T., Pope, D., Lie, R.T., Díaz, A., McCracken, J., Arana,  
 5 B., Smith, K.R., Bruce, N., 2007. Eye discomfort, headache and back pain among Mayan  
 6 Guatemalan women taking part in a randomised stove intervention trial. *J. Epidemiol.*  
 7 *Comm. Health* 61,74-79.
- 8 31. Dohoo, C., Guernsey, J.R., Critchley, K., Van Leeuwen, J., 2012. Pilot study on the impact  
 9 of biogas as a fuel source on respiratory health of women on rural Kenyan smallholder dairy  
 10 farms. *J. Environ. Public Health*. 2012,63-71.
- 11 32. Duttaa, K., Shields, N.K., Edwards, R., Smith, K.R., 2007. Impact of improved biomass  
 12 cookstoves on indoor air quality near Pune, India. *Energy Sustain. Dev.* 11,19-32.
- 13 33. Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) (1998). Quality Assessment Tool for  
 14 Quantitative Studies. Hamilton, ON: Effective Public Health Practice Project. Available  
 15 from: <http://www.ephpp.ca/index.html>
- 16 34. Egger, M., Davey, S. G., Schneider, M., Minder, C., 1997. Bias in meta-analysis detected by  
 17 a simple, graphical test. *Br. Med. J.* 315,629–634.
- 18 35. Ezzati, M., Kammen, D.M., 2002a. The health impacts of exposure to indoor air pollution  
 19 from solid fuels in developing countries: knowledge, gaps, and data needs. *Environ. Health*  
 20 *Perspect.* 110,1057–1068.
- 21 36. Ezzati, M., Lopez, A.D., Rodgers, A., Vander Hoorn, S., Murray, C.J., 2002b. Comparative  
 22 Risk Assessment Collaborating Group. Selected major risk factors and global and regional  
 23 burden of disease. *Lancet.* 360,1347-1360.
- 24 37. Follmann, D., Elliott, P., Suh, I., Cutler, J., 1992. Variance imputation for overviews of  
 25 clinical trials with continuous response. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* 45,769–773.
- 26 38. Fitzgerald, C., Aguilar-Villalobos, M., Eppler, A.R., Dorner, S.C., Rathbun, S.L., Naeher,  
 27 L.P., 2012. Testing the effectiveness of two improved cookstove interventions in the  
 28 Santiago de Chuco Province of Peru. *Sci. Total Environ.* 420,54-64.
- 29 39. Gordon, S.B., Bruce, N.G., Grigg, J., Hibberd, P.L., Kurmi, O.P., Lam, K.B., Mortimer K,  
 30 Asante, K.P., Balakrishnan, K., Balmes, J., Bar-Zeev, N., Bates, M.N., Breyse, P.N., Buist,  
 31 S., Chen, Z., Havens, D., Jack, D., Jindal, S., Kan, H., Mehta, S., Moschovis, P., Naeher, L.,  
 32 Patel, A., Perez-Padilla, R., Pope, D., Rylance, J., Semple, S., Martin, W.J., 2nd.. 2014.  
 33 Respiratory risks from household air pollution in low and middle income countries. *Lancet*  
 34 *Respir. Med.* 2,823-860.
- 35 40. Guarnieri, M.J., Diaz, J.V., Basu, C., Diaz, A., Pope, D., Smith, K.R., Smith-Sivertsen,  
 36 T., Bruce, N., Solomon, C., McCracken, J., Balmes, J.R., 2014. Effects of woodsmoke  
 37 exposure on airway inflammation in rural Guatemalan women. *PLoS One.* 9,1-9.
- 38 41. Hartinger, S.M., Commodore, A.A., Hattendorf, J., Lanata, C.F., Gil, A.I., Verastegui,  
 39 H., Aguilar-Villalobos, M., Mäusezahl, D., Naeher, L.P., 2013. Chimney stoves modestly  
 40 improved indoor air quality measurements compared with traditional open fire stoves:  
 41 results from a small-scale intervention study in rural Peru. *Indoor Air* 23,342-352
- 42 42. Hanna, R., Duflo, E., Greenstone, M., 2012. Up in Smoke: The Influence of Household  
 43 Behavior on the Long-Run Impact of Improved Cooking Stoves. NBER Working Paper No.  
 44 2012.
- 45 43. Henkle, J., Mandzuk, C., Emery, E., Schrowe, L., Sevilla-Martir, J., 2010. Global Health  
 46 and International Medicine: Honduras Stove Project. *Hisp. Health Care Int.* 8.

Field Code Changed





- 1 63. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Methods for the development of NICE  
2 public health guidance. Thirdth ed. London: National Institute for Health and Clinical  
3 Excellence; 2012.
- 4 64. National Research Council. 2004. Review of EPA’s Integrated Risk Information System  
5 (IRIS) Process. Washington, DC:National Academies Press.
- 6 65. Oluwole O, Ana GR, Arinola GO, Wiskel T, Falusi AG, Huo D, et al. Effect of stove  
7 intervention on household air pollution and the respiratory health of women and children in  
8 rural Nigeria. *Air Qual Atmos Health* 2013; 6:553-561
- 9 66. Ochieng CA, Vardoulakis S, Tonne C. Are rocket mud stoves associated with lower indoor  
10 carbon monoxide and personal exposure in rural Kenya? *Indoor Air* 2013;23:14-24.
- 11 67. Pennise D, Brant S, Agbeve SM, Quaye W, Mengesha F, Tadele W, et al. Indoor air quality  
12 impacts of an improved wood stove in Ghana and an ethanol stove in Ethiopia. *Energy*  
13 *Sustain Dev* 2009; 13:71–76
- 14 68. Person B, Loo JD, Owuor M, Ogange L, Jefferds ME, Cohen AL. "It is good for my  
15 family's health and cooks food in a way that my heart loves": qualitative findings and  
16 implications for scaling up an improved cookstove project in rural Kenya. *Int J Environ Res*  
17 *Public Health* 2012;9:1566-80.
- 18 69. Rehfuess E, Pope D, Bruce N, Dherani M, Jagoe K, Naeher L, et al. Impacts of interventions  
19 on household air pollution concentrations and personal exposure
- 20 70. Romieu I, Riojas-Rodríguez H, Marrón-Mares AT, Schilmann A, Perez-Padilla R, and  
21 Masera O. Improved biomass stove intervention in rural Mexico: impact on the respiratory  
22 health of women. *Am J Resp Critic Med* 2009; 180: 649-56.
- 23 71. Rosa G, Majorin F, Boisson S, Barstow C, Johnson M, Kirby M, et al. Assessing the impact  
24 of water filters and improved cook stoves on drinking water quality and household air  
25 pollution: a randomised controlled trial in Rwanda. *PLoS One* 2014;9:1-9.
- 26 72. Riojas-Rodríguez H, Schilmann A, Marron-Mares AT, Masera O, Li Z, Romanoff L, et al.  
27 Impact of the improved patsari biomass stove on urinary polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon  
28 biomarkers and carbon monoxide exposures in rural Mexican women. *Environ Health*  
29 *Perspect* 2011; 119:1301-7.
- 30 73. Shen M, Chapman RS, Vermeulen R, Tian L, Zheng T, Chen BE, et al. Coal use, stove  
31 improvement, and adult pneumonia mortality in Xuanwei, China: a retrospective cohort  
32 study. *Environ Health Perspect* 2009;117:261-6.
- 33 74. Smith KR, McCracken JP, Weber MW, Hubbard A, Jenny A, Thompson LM, et al. Effect  
34 of reduction in household air pollution on childhood pneumonia in Guatemala (RESPIRE): a  
35 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2011;378:1717-26
- 36 75. Singh A, Tuladhar B, Bajracharya K, and Pillarisetti A. Assessment of effectiveness of  
37 improved cook stoves in reducing indoor air pollution and improving health in Nepal.  
38 *Energy Sustain Dev* 2012;16: 406–414
- 39 76. Smith KR, McCracken JP, Thompson L, Edwards R, Shields KN, Canuz E, et al.  
40 Personal child and mother carbon monoxide exposures and kitchen levels: methods and resu  
41 lts from a randomized trial of wood fire chimney cookstoves in Guatemala (RESPIRE). *J*  
42 *Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 2010;20:406-16
- 43 77. Thompson LM, Bruce N, Eskenazi B, Diaz A, Pope D, Smith KR. Impact of Reduced  
44 Maternal Exposures to Wood Smoke from an Introduced Chimney Stove on Newborn Birth  
45 Weight in Rural Guatemala. *Environ Health Perspect* 2011; 119:1489-94.

Field Code Changed

- 1 78. Torres-Dosal A, Pérez-Maldonado IN, Jasso-Pineda Y, Martínez Salinas RI, Alegría-Torres  
2 JA, Díaz-Barriga F. Indoor air pollution in a Mexican indigenous community: evaluation of  
3 risk reduction program using biomarkers of exposure and effect. *Sci Total Environ*  
4 2008;390:362-8.
- 5 79. Zhou Z, Jin Y, Liu F, Cheng Y, Liu J, Kang J, et al. Community effectiveness of stove and  
6 health education interventions for reducing exposure to indoor air pollution from solid fuels  
7 in four Chinese provinces. *Environ Res Lett* 2006; 1:1-12.
- 8 80. Zuk M, Rojas L, Blanco S, Serrano P, Cruz J, Angeles F, et al. The impact of improved  
9 wood-burning stoves on fine particulate matter concentrations in rural Mexican homes. *J*  
10 *Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 2007;17:224-32.
- 11 81. World Bank. World development indicators. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2013
- 12

13