| Volume-3 | Issue-4 | Nov-Dec 2021 |

DOI: 10.36346/sarjams.2021.v03i04.001

Original Research Article

Association of Household Hygiene and Sanitation Practices with Odds of Stunting and Underweight Among Infants and Young Children (6-59 Months Old) in Ghana

Siddique Gbanha Bawa^{1*}, Shamsu-Deen Ziblim², Sufyan Bakuri Suara²

¹Kalpohin Senior High School, Science Department, Post Office Box 137, Tamale, Northern Region ²(PhD), Department of Population and Reproductive Health, School of Public Health, University for Development Studies. Box 1883, Tamale, N/R, Ghana

*Corresponding Author Siddique Gbanha Bawa

Article History Received: 29.09.2021 Accepted: 07.11.2021 Published: 11.11.2021

Abstract: *Background*: Globally, very limited studies have explored the unique contributions of hygiene and sanitation practices on the odds for stunting and underweight in children. Hence, the study examined the relationship between environmental hygiene and sanitation practices and odds for stunting and underweight among children underfive years old in rural communities in Ghana. *Methods*: The study was a cross-sectional study, in which study participants were simple randomly selected. All data were gathered from face-to-face interviews and by the use of observational checklist. Data were analysed using statistical product and service solutions software version 21.0. Further, binary logistics regressions model was used to assessed for adjusted odds of stunting and underweight across hygiene and sanitation practice variables. *Results:* Upon adjustment for the effects of covariates, children from households with toilet facilities had lower odds for underweight compared with their counterparts recruited from households without toilet facility [0.2(0.0-0.8); p = 0.031]. Also, lower frequency (1-3 times a week) of cleaning toilet facility per week was associated with higher odds for underweight compared with the higher frequency of cleaning (4 times or more per week) of toilet facility [4.5(1.3-15.3); p = 0.018]. *Conclusions:* The study revealed that both stunting and underweight were prevalent among the children. Also, inappropriate sanitation and hygiene practices were associated with increased odds for child malnutrition. The district health administration and the district assembly ought to intensify education on the importance of kitchen hygiene and the need for households to own toilet facilities.

Keywords: Hygiene, sanitation, stunting, underweight, Sissala West, Ghana.

INTRODUCTION

Malnutrition is a spectrum of several nutrition consequences as a result of imbalances in nutrition requirements [1]. Globally, malnutrition rates in children are high and pose a major public health burden to nations especially, developing countries [2]. Worldwide estimates of malnutrition among children under 5 years suggest that about 165 million, 99 million, and 51 million are stunted, under-weighted, and wasted, respectively [3, 4]. More importantly, Asian and African countries are the hardest hit [5]. In the past few decades, Ghana has experienced a slow decline in stunting, wasting, and underweight rates, however, a high proportion of these children are still confronted with various forms of growth deficits as a result of malnutrition [6]. For instance, results from a nationwide population-based study show that 19.0%, 5.0% and 11.0% of children under-5 years are stunted, wasted and underweight, respectively [6].

Malnutrition accounts for about 35% of the deaths in under-5 year children [7]. Also, early childhood malnutrition is linked with impaired intellectual performance [8], reduced capacity for physical work [9], and complicated deliveries [10] later in adulthood. The causes of malnutrition in children are complex and intertwined [11-16]. The role of socioeconomic factors, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), and infectious diseases have been reported [12-16]. For instance, two previous studies found a positive association between poor child growth and poor sanitation, unhygienic conditions, and the use of unclean drinking water [11, 17]. Also, several studies have been conducted on the relationship between the prevalence of malnutrition and sociodemographic factors among children in

Copyright © **2020** The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0** International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

various parts of Ghana [18-23]. In contrast, studies that adjusted for the effects of sociodemographic variables of motherchild pairs allowing for the assessment of an independent effect of household sanitation practices on stunting are scarce [24].

Moreover, assessment of associations between malnutrition indicators among the under-five year olds and sanitation characteristics of the households are often neglected in Ghana especially in rural communities [22]. Therefore, the objective of the study was to assess an independent association of household sanitation practices by adjusting for mother-child pairs socioeconomic variables, and odds of stunting and underweight among under-5-year-old children in rural communities in Sissala West, Ghana.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a descriptive cross-sectional study in which a total of 260 mother-child pairs were simply randomly selected from rural communities in Sissala West District [Gwollu, Fielmuo, Zini, and Jeffisi]. In the study, sociodemographic data of mothers/caregivers and children as well as household asset ownership and conditions of domestic water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) were assessed using a structured interview guide and an observational checklist. The study was community-based as such, proper community entry protocols were observed with the support of an introductory letter obtained from the Department of Community Health, University for Development Studies, and the District Health Management Team (Sissala West)-Upper West Region. The consent of each of the study respondents was obtained before the commencement of the interview after the purpose of the study was thoroughly explained to them. Further, the respondents were assured of data confidentiality.

Anthropometric Data

Anthropometric measurements [weight (Kg) and length/height (cm)] were taken according to standard procedures [25, 26]. An infantometer was used to measure the length/height of children. Length was measured for children aged less than 2 years whereas and height was measured among those aged 2 years and above. The child's weight was measured using German-made electronic SECA uniscale [maximum allowable load of 150kg, minimum reading of 0.1kg, serial number of 8811021659, and quality control number of 5230]. For the determination of underweight and stunting, the weight-for-age z-scores (WAZ) and height-for-age z-scores (HAZ), respectively. The definitions of underweight and stunting were in accordance with the WHO 2007 growth standards as built into the WHO AnthroPlus software [25]. In the protocol, a z-score < -2 was used to define a height-for-age z-score and a weight-for-age z-score was used to classify children as stunting and underweight, respectively [25-27].

Conditions of WASH and Household Wealth index assessment

The environmental factors assessed in the study include water, sanitation and hygiene-related issues using observational checklist and structured questionnaires. The wealth index of a household was determined by assessing the ownership of their physical assets (durable and semi-durable) [28, 29]. The items assessed were: refrigerator, television, radio/sound system, computer, telephone, mobile phone, bicycle, motorbike, animal-drawn cart, motor tricycle, tractor, and private car/cargo vehicle. To compute a composite index as a proxy for the wealth status of each household, each item owned was assigned a value of one (1) or two (2) depending on its perceived value similar to previous reports [28, 29]. Out of possible total score of 27, the participants were ranked into tertiles: 0-9 [low wealth index (poor)], 9-17 [medium wealth index (moderate wealth)] and 18 - 27 [high wealth index (wealth)]/

Sample Size Computation

Based on standard practices, a sample size was determined from the protocol: $n = [t^2 \times p(1-p)]/m^2$ [30], where *n* is the required sample size, *t* is the confidence level at 95% (standard value of 1.96), *p* is the estimated prevalence of stunting in the study area, which is 20% based on a previous report [31], and *m* is the margin of error set at 5% (standard value of 0.05). Therefore, a total sample size of 260 caregiver/child pairs was recruited for the study.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using two software thus, WHO AnthroPlus [25] and the International Business Machines Corporation's Statistical Product and Service Solutions (IBM SPSS) version 21.0. The Z-scores for the classification of child nutritional status were determined using the WHO AnthroPlus [25, 27]. The IBM SPSS was used to calculate the distribution of socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and their children. The unadjusted odds ratios of stunting and underweight were calculated per the exposure variables (parameters of WASH) in model 1 using the binary logistics regression technique. However, in model 2, the adjusted odds of stunting and underweight were computed by controlling for the effects of the sociodemographic variables (confounding factors) of mothers and their children in the binary logistics regression model. For the test of associations, p-value < 0.05 was considered to be a statistically significant relationship.

Results

The socio-demographic background information of caregivers gathered from the study showed majority (95.4%) of the 260 caregivers interviewed were females. Regarding the age distribution of the respondents, the minimum and maximum ages were 19 and 51 years, respectively, with a mean (\pm standard deviation) of 30.03 \pm 6.55 years. Moreover, majority (58.8%) were within the ages of 25 to 36 years (Table 1). Also, majority of the caregivers interviewed were Muslims (90%) and were from the Sissala ethnic group (88.1%). A large proportion (90%) of the respondents were married. With the household size of respondents, majority (58.1%) within the range of 5-8 persons (Table 1).

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex of respondent		
Male	12	4.6
Female	248	95.4
Total	260	100.0
Age group of respondents		
19 – 24	64	24.6
25 - 30	77	29.6
31 – 36	76	29.2
37-42	34	13.1
43 - 51	9	3.5
Total	260	100.0
Religion of respondent		
ATR	10	3.8
Christianity	21	8.1
Islam	229	88.1
Total	260	100.0
Ethnicity of respondent		
Sissala	229	88.1
Dagaaba	28	10.8
Others	3	1.1
Total	260	100
Marital status of respondent		
Never married	2	0.8
Married/living together	234	90
Divorced/separated	12	4.6
Widow/widower	12	4.6
Total	260	100
Household Size category		
2-4	47	18.1
5-8	151	58.1
9 – 11	54	20.8
12-14	8	3.1
Total	260	100.0

Table 1	: Distribution of Socio-demog	graphic Char	acteristics of Respondents
	Variabla	Engeneration	Democrate as (0/)

Of all the children enrolled in the study, majority (55%) were females, with 6 and 59 months as the minimum and maximum ages, respectively. Also, the mean \pm standard deviation of their ages was 20.89 \pm 12.83 months (Table 2).

Variable	Frequency	%
Sex of child		
Male	117	45.0
Female	143	55.0
Total	260	100.0
Age category of the children		
6-8	48	18.5
9 - 11	28	10.8
12 – 17	51	19.6
18-23	32	12.3

Variable	Frequency	%
24 - 35	61	23.5
36-47	28	10.8
48 – 59	12	4.6
Total	260	100.0

The anthropometric data of the under-five year old children gathered helped to determine their nutritional status by computing the two most common indicators with the potential of revealing chronic malnutrition and acute malnutrition (height-for-age, and weight-for-age z-scores). With the height-for-age (HAZ) classification, 85.0% had a normal nutritional status ($-2 \le z$ -score ≤ 2), with 15% being stunted (z-score <-2). With the weight-for-age z-scores (WAZ) classification, 89.6% of the children were found to be normal ($-2 \le z$ -score ≤ 2), whereas, 10.4% were said to be underweight (z-score <-2) (Table 2).

Table 3: Distribution of Nutritional Status	of Under-five	Childre	en
Variabla	Frequency	0/	

Variable	Frequency	%
Height-for-age Z-score (HAZ)		
$-2 \le z$ -score ≤ 2 (normal)	221	85.0
$-3 \le z$ -score <-2 (moderate stunting)	30	11.5
x < -3 (severe stunting)	9	3.5
Total	260	100.0
Weight-for-age Z-score (WAZ)		
$-2 \le z$ -score ≤ 2 (normal)	233	89.6
$-3 \le z$ -score <-2 (moderate underweight)	25	9.6
x <- 3 (severe underweight)	2	0.8
Total	260	100.0

Table 4 below illustrates the results for the odds of stunting according to WASH variables. In the unadjusted model, the use of unclean cooking utensils compared with the use of clean cooking utensils was associated with higher odds of stunting [2.2(1.3-4.5); p = 0.047]. However, the relationship was no more significant [1.9(0.7-4.8); p = 0.206] upon an adjustment for the effects of sociodemographic covariates [maternal age, religion, ethnicity, marital status, sex of child, household size, maternal educational status occupation, and household wealth index]. Conversely, the odds of stunting were not significantly associated with the other environment and sanitation variables (see Table 4).

OR [95%CI]OR[95%CI]Indiscriminate waste disposal: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.1[0.6-1.6]$ 0.748 $0.9[0.4-2.1]$ 0.896 Has toilet in the house: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.4[0.7-2.8]$ 0.506 $1.3[0.3-6.0]$ 0.722 Practicing open defecation: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.4[0.7-2.8]$ 0.857 $0.8[0.2-3.6]$ 0.735 Handwashing practice: [Sparingly/Habitual; Yes (1); No (0)] $1.4[0.7-2.8]$ 0.486 $1.1[0.4-2.8]$ 0.854 Daily handwashing with soap under running water: [Yes (1); No $0.7[0.4-1.5]$ 0.506 $0.5[0.2-1.2]$ 0.129 (0)] $0.7[0.4-1.5]$ 0.506 $0.5[0.2-1.2]$ 0.129 (1); more than once (0)] $1.8[0.8-4.0]$ 0.193 $1.8[0.6-5.1]$ 0.875 Immediate surrounding is dirty: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.8[0.8-4.0]$ 0.193 $1.8[0.6-5.1]$ 0.280 No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0) $2.4[1.2-5.0]$ 0.024 $1.8[0.7-4.5]$ 0.194 Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more; $1.5[0.4-5.8]$ 0.792 $1.5[0.3-7.5]$ 0.637 once (0)]. $1.0[0.5-2.1]$ 1.000 $0.4[0.1-1.2]$ 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] $2.2[1.3-4.5]$ 0.047 $1.9[0.7-4.8]$ 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463 times or more per week (0)] 0.161 's bathing frequency in a day: [Once (1); Twice or more (0)] $1.3[0.5-3.6]$ 0.845 $1.5[0.5-5.0]$ 0.477 <	-2.1] 0.890 -6.0] 0.722 -3.6] 0.733 -2.8] 0.854 -1.2] 0.122
Has toilet in the house: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.4[0.7-2.8]$ 0.506 $1.3[0.3-6.0]$ 0.722 Practicing open defecation: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.1[0.6-2.3]$ 0.857 $0.8[0.2-3.6]$ 0.735 Handwashing practice: [Sparingly/Habitual; Yes (1); No (0)] $1.4[0.7-2.8]$ 0.486 $1.1[0.4-2.8]$ 0.854 Daily handwashing with soap under running water: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.4[0.7-2.8]$ 0.486 $1.1[0.4-2.8]$ 0.854 (0)] $0.7[0.4-1.5]$ 0.506 $0.5[0.2-1.2]$ 0.129 (1); more than once (0)] $1.3[0.6-2.9]$ 0.613 $1.1[0.4-3.1]$ 0.875 Immediate surrounding is dirty: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.8[0.8-4.0]$ 0.193 $1.8[0.6-5.1]$ 0.280 No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0) $2.4[1.2-5.0]$ 0.024 $1.8[0.7-4.5]$ 0.194 Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more; $1.5[0.4-5.8]$ 0.792 $1.5[0.3-7.5]$ 0.637 Mitchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)] $1.0[0.5-2.1]$ 1.000 $0.4[0.1-1.2]$ 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] $2.2[1.3-4.5]$ 0.047 $1.9[0.7-4.8]$ 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463	-6.0] 0.722 -3.6] 0.733 -2.8] 0.854 -1.2] 0.129
Practicing open defecation: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.1[0.6-2.3]$ 0.857 $0.8[0.2-3.6]$ 0.735 Handwashing practice: [Sparingly/Habitual; Yes (1); No (0)] $1.4[0.7-2.8]$ 0.486 $1.1[0.4-2.8]$ 0.854 Daily handwashing with soap under running water: [Yes (1); No $0.7[0.4-1.5]$ 0.506 $0.5[0.2-1.2]$ 0.129 (0)] $0.7[0.4-1.5]$ 0.613 $1.1[0.4-3.1]$ 0.875 (1); more than once (0)] $1.8[0.8-4.0]$ 0.193 $1.8[0.6-5.1]$ 0.280 No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0) $2.4[1.2-5.0]$ 0.024 $1.8[0.7-4.5]$ 0.194 Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more; $1.5[0.4-5.8]$ 0.792 $1.5[0.3-7.5]$ 0.637 Kitchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)] $1.0[0.5-2.1]$ 1.000 $0.4[0.1-1.2]$ 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] $2.2[1.3-4.5]$ 0.047 $1.9[0.7-4.8]$ 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463	-3.6] 0.73: -2.8] 0.854 -1.2] 0.129
Handwashing practice: [Sparingly/Habitual; Yes (1); No (0)] $1.4[0.7-2.8]$ 0.486 $1.1[0.4-2.8]$ 0.854 Daily handwashing with soap under running water: [Yes (1); No $0.7[0.4-1.5]$ 0.506 $0.5[0.2-1.2]$ 0.129 (0)]Frequency of sweeping immediate surroundings in a day: [once $1.3[0.6-2.9]$ 0.613 $1.1[0.4-3.1]$ 0.875 (1); more than once (0)]Insection of the surrounding is dirty: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.8[0.8-4.0]$ 0.193 $1.8[0.6-5.1]$ 0.280 No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0) $2.4[1.2-5.0]$ 0.024 $1.8[0.7-4.5]$ 0.194 Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more; once (0)]. $1.5[0.4-5.8]$ 0.792 $1.5[0.3-7.5]$ 0.637 Kitchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)] $1.0[0.5-2.1]$ 1.000 $0.4[0.1-1.2]$ 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] $2.2[1.3-4.5]$ 0.047 $1.9[0.7-4.8]$ 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463	-2.8] 0.854 -1.2] 0.129
Daily handwashing with soap under running water:[Yes (1); No $0.7[0.4-1.5]$ 0.506 $0.5[0.2-1.2]$ 0.129 (0)](0)](0)](0) $1.3[0.6-2.9]$ (0.613 $1.1[0.4-3.1]$ 0.875 (1); more than once (0)](0)](0)] $1.8[0.8-4.0]$ (0.193) $1.8[0.6-5.1]$ 0.280 No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0) $2.4[1.2-5.0]$ (0.024) $1.8[0.7-4.5]$ 0.194 Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily:[once (1); Twice or more; $1.5[0.4-5.8]$ 0.792 $1.5[0.3-7.5]$ 0.637 Kitchen environment:[Clean (1); dirty (0)] $1.0[0.5-2.1]$ 1.000 $0.4[0.1-1.2]$ 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean:[Yes (1); No (0)] $2.2[1.3-4.5]$ 0.047 $1.9[0.7-4.8]$ 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: $[1-3$ times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463	-1.2] 0.129
(0)]Image: Constraint of the end of the	-
Frequency of sweeping immediate surroundings in a day: [once $1.3[0.6-2.9]$ 0.613 $1.1[0.4-3.1]$ 0.875 (1); more than once (0)]Immediate surrounding is dirty: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.8[0.8-4.0]$ 0.193 $1.8[0.6-5.1]$ 0.280 No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0) $2.4[1.2-5.0]$ 0.024 $1.8[0.7-4.5]$ 0.194 Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more; $1.5[0.4-5.8]$ 0.792 $1.5[0.3-7.5]$ 0.637 once (0)]. $1.0[0.5-2.1]$ 1.000 $0.4[0.1-1.2]$ 0.096 Witchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)] $2.2[1.3-4.5]$ 0.047 $1.9[0.7-4.8]$ 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463	
(1); more than once (0)]1.8[0.8-4.0]0.1931.8[0.6-5.1]0.280Immediate surrounding is dirty: [Yes (1); No (0)]1.8[0.8-4.0]0.1931.8[0.6-5.1]0.280No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0)2.4[1.2-5.0]0.0241.8[0.7-4.5]0.194Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more;1.5[0.4-5.8]0.7921.5[0.3-7.5]0.637once (0)].1.0[0.5-2.1]1.0000.4[0.1-1.2]0.096Kitchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)]2.2[1.3-4.5]0.0471.9[0.7-4.8]0.206Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 41.3[0.6-2.5]0.6241.4[0.6-3.4]0.463	
Immediate surrounding is dirty: [Yes (1); No (0)] $1.8[0.8-4.0]$ 0.193 $1.8[0.6-5.1]$ 0.280 No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0) $2.4[1.2-5.0]$ 0.024 $1.8[0.7-4.5]$ 0.194 Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more; $1.5[0.4-5.8]$ 0.792 $1.5[0.3-7.5]$ 0.637 once (0)]. $1.0[0.5-2.1]$ 1.000 $0.4[0.1-1.2]$ 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] $2.2[1.3-4.5]$ 0.047 $1.9[0.7-4.8]$ 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463	-3.1] 0.87
No good drainage System: Yes (1); No (0) 2.4[1.2-5.0] 0.024 1.8[0.7-4.5] 0.194 Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more; 1.5[0.4-5.8] 0.792 1.5[0.3-7.5] 0.637 once (0)]. 1.0[0.5-2.1] 1.000 0.4[0.1-1.2] 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] 2.2[1.3-4.5] 0.047 1.9[0.7-4.8] 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 1.3[0.6-2.5] 0.624 1.4[0.6-3.4] 0.463	
Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more; $1.5[0.4-5.8]$ 0.792 $1.5[0.3-7.5]$ 0.637 once (0)].Kitchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)] $1.0[0.5-2.1]$ 1.000 $0.4[0.1-1.2]$ 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] $2.2[1.3-4.5]$ 0.047 $1.9[0.7-4.8]$ 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463	-5.1] 0.28
once (0)]. Kitchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)] 1.0[0.5-2.1] 1.000 0.4[0.1-1.2] 0.096 Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] 2.2[1.3-4.5] 0.047 1.9[0.7-4.8] 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 1.3[0.6-2.5] 0.624 1.4[0.6-3.4] 0.463	-4.5] 0.19
Kitchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)]1.0[0.5-2.1]1.0000.4[0.1-1.2]0.096Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)]2.2[1.3-4.5]0.0471.9[0.7-4.8]0.206Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 41.3[0.6-2.5]0.6241.4[0.6-3.4]0.463times or more per week (0)]0.0100.0000.0000.0000.000	-7.5] 0.63
Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)] 2.2[1.3-4.5] 0.047 1.9[0.7-4.8] 0.206 Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4 1.3[0.6-2.5] 0.624 1.4[0.6-3.4] 0.463 times or more per week (0)] 0.100 0.100 0.100 0.463	
Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: $[1-3$ times a week (1); 4 $1.3[0.6-2.5]$ 0.624 $1.4[0.6-3.4]$ 0.463 times or more per week (0)]0.463	-1.2] 0.090
times or more per week (0)]	-4.8] 0.200
	-3.4] 0.46
Child's bathing frequency in a day: [Once (1); Twice or more (0)] 1.3[0.5-3.6] 0.845 1.5[0.5-5.0] 0.477	
	-5.0] 0.47
P: statistical significance level; Model 1: unadjusted. Model 2: adjusted for maternal age category [19-30 (1); (31-	6- 5-

married (0), sex of child: [male (1); female (0), child's age category: [6-23 (1); 24-59 (0)], household size: (2-4 (1); 5-14 (0), maternal educational status: [JHS & above 1); No formal or primary (0)], occupational status mother: professional & skilled manual (1); farming & unskilled manual (0), household wealth index: high wealth index (0); Low wealth index (0)]. Coding for stunting: [present (1); absent (0)].

Table 5 below illustrates the results for the odds of underweight according to WASH variables. Upon the adjustment for the covariates [maternal age, religion, ethnicity, marital status, sex of child, household size, maternal educational status occupation, and household wealth index], the odds of underweight were significantly lower among households with a toilet facility compared with those without a toilet facility [0.2(0.0-0.8); p = 0.031]. Similarly, a lower frequency (1-3 times per week) of cleaning toilet facility compared with the higher frequency of cleaning (4 times or more per week) was associated with higher odds for underweight in both the unadjusted [2.9[1.2-6.9); 0.022] and the adjusted [4.5(1.3-15.3); p = 0.018] models. The other variables of sanitation did not show a significant relationship with the odds of being underweight.

Table 5: Odds of underweight according to WASH variables.				
Variable	Unadjusted	Р	Adjusted	Р
	OR [95%CI]		OR[95%CI]	
Indiscriminate waste disposal: [Yes (1); No (0)]	0.9[0.4-2.1]	0.991	0.5[0.2-1.6]	0.262
Has toilet in the house: [Yes (1); No (0)]	1.1[0.5-2.4]	1.000	0.2[0.0-0.8]	0.031
Practicing open defecation: [Yes (1); No (0)]	2.0[0.8-5.2]	0.209	4.6[0.7-29.2]	0.109
Handwashing practice: [Sparingly; Habitual;	1.1[0.5-2.6]	1.000	0.6[0.1-2.1]	0.390
Yes (1)/No (0)]				
Mode of handwashing: with soap under running water/anyhow:	1.8[0.8-4.1]	0.193	1.6[0.5-5.1]	0.392
[Yes (1); No (0)]				
Frequency of sweeping immediate surroundings in a day: [(1);	1.7[0.7-4.2]	0.343	1.2[0.3-4.6]	0.833
more than once (0)]				
Immediate surrounding is dirty: [Yes (1); No (0)]	1.3[0.5-3.3]	0.831	1.1[0.3-4.7]	0.902
No good drainage System: [Yes (1); No (0)]	2.4[1.0-5.6]	0.075	3.4[0.9-12.0]	0.061
Frequency of cleaning kitchen daily: [once (1); Twice or more/once	2.5[0.7-9.7]	0.346	2.4[0.3-18.3]	0.400
(0)].				
Kitchen environment: [Clean (1); dirty (0)]	1.7[0.7-3.8]	0.332	0.8[0.2-3.2]	0.788
Utensils are not kept clean: [Yes (1); No (0)]	1.9[0.8-4.3]	0.171	1.1[0.3-4.0]	0.910
Frequency of cleaning bathroom/toilet: [1-3 times a week (1); 4	2.9[1.2-6.9]	0.022	4.5[1.3-15.3]	0.018
times or more per week (0)].				
Child's bathing frequency in a day: [Once (1); Twice or more (0)]	1.6[0.5-5.0]	0.643	1.3[0.3-5.7]	0.736

P: statistical significance level; Model 1: unadjusted. Model 2: adjusted for maternal age category [19-30 (1); (31-51 (0)], religious status: [Islam (1); Christianity (0)], ethnicity: (Sissala (1); Dagaaba & others (0)] marital Status: [married or living together (1); not married (0), sex of child: [male (1); female (0), child's age category: [6-23 (1); 24-59 (0)], household size: (2-4 (1); 5-14 (0), maternal educational status: [JHS & above 1); No formal or primary (0), occupational status mother: professional & skilled manual (1); farming & unskilled manual (0), household wealth index: high wealth index (0); Low wealth index (0)]. Coding for underweight:

[present (1); absent (0)].

DISCUSSION

Globally, malnutrition rates are high [2]. For example, about 165 million stunted, 99 million under-weighted, and 51 million wasted children [3, 4], including Africa [5]. In this study, the indicator with the highest prevalence was stunting followed by underweight, as 15% of the under-five children enrolled in the study were found to be stunted, 10.4% being underweight. Compared with previous findings from other countries in Africa, the present prevalence of stunting (15%) and underweight (10.4%) are relatively low. For example, previously, a relatively higher prevalence of stunting was found in Democratic Republic of Congo (42.7%), Mali (38.3%), Burundi (57.7%), Niger (43.9%), Sierra Leone (37.9%), Malawi (47.1%), Nigeria (36.8%), and Chad (39.9%) [5]. Also, compared with the present prevalence of underweight (10.4%), a more higher prevalence was reported in Ethiopia (25.2%), Nigeria (28.7%), and Burkina Faso (25.7%) [5]. However, the rates of stunting (15%) and underweight (10.4%) in the present study were higher than the results of the most recent national data for stunting (19%) underweight (11%) [6]. The conflicting results as outlined above may partly be accounted for by variations in the study designs particularly, the sample size.

Sociodemographic characteristics of mother-child pairs are important determinants of the child's health and nutritional status [1, 11, 24]. Therefore, adjustment for the effects of sociodemographic factors of mothers and their children may be the best approach to evaluating the unique relationship between hygiene and sanitation factors and children's nutritional status [24]. This is because the importance of environmental factors on the nutritional status of under-five children cannot be downplayed as seen in several researches [32]. In the present study, in the unadjusted model, unhygienic cooking utensils are associated with higher odds of stunting. However, upon adjustment for the effects of mother-child pair sociodemographic characteristics, the relationship was not more significant although the unhygienic utensil use was still associated with higher odds for stunting. After the adjustment for covariates, the odds of being underweight among children from households without toilet facilities were higher compared with those from households with toilet facilities. Similarly, in three previous observational studies household access to toilet facilities was said to

have a statistically significant association with the stunting of children under-two years, this study found the availability of toilet facilities in the household not to have any statistically significant influence on stunting [33, 34] and other malnutrition indicators [35]. In another observation study, after the authors' adjustment for covariates open defecation was associated with increased risk for stunting [24]. Further, several other studies (Rah *et al.*, 2015; Ngure, 2014; Dangour *et al.*, 2013; Liu *et al.*, 2012) have linked unhygienic practices with child malnutrition [32, 33, 36, 37].

Strategic interventions for the prevention of malnutrition targeting various segments of the national population including children under-five years old ought to be a national priority. This could reverse the consequences of childhood malnutrition.For instance, malnutrition of under-5 year children is one of the main causes of the deaths of children in developing countries [38] as it accounts for about 35% deaths among this age group [7]. Nutritional inadequacies at early at stages of life are also linked to growth impairment and adverse health status. Stunting is the result of malnutrition in the first two years of life, with with subsequent short stature in adulthood [39]. It has been proven that adults who have impaired intellectual performance had suffered malnutrition in early childhood [8]. Such adults in other reports may also have reduced strength for physical activities [9], poor reproductive capacity, and unfavorable birth outcomes including low birth weight [10].

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study revealed that stunting and underweight were prevalent among the children. Moreover, insanitary conditions were found to be associated with higher odds of child malnutrition. The district health administration and the district assembly ought to intensify education on the importance of kitchen hygiene and the need for households to own toilet facilities.

Acknowledgements: We are so thankful to all the study participants and their children.

Conflict of Interest Statement: We declare that there are no competing interests.

REFERENCES

- 1. Black, R. E., Victora, C. G., Walker, S. P., Bhutta, Z. A., Christian, P., De Onis, M., ... & Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group. (2013). Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *The lancet*, *382*(9890), 427-451.
- 2. Solis-Soto, M. T., Paudel, D., & Nicoli, F. (2020). Relationship between vaccination and nutritional status in children. *Demographic Research*, 42, 1-14.
- Black, R. E., Victora, C. G., Walker, S. P., Bhutta, Z. A., Christian, P., De Onis, M., ... & Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group. (2013). Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *The lancet*, 382(9890), 427-451.
- 4. UNICEF/WHO/World Bank. (2014). Joint Child Malnutrition Estimates by UNICEF, WHO & World Bank. 2014. http://data.worldbank.org/child-malnutrition.
- 5. Akombi, B. J., Agho, K. E., Merom, D., Renzaho, A. M., & Hall, J. J. (2017). Child malnutrition in sub-Saharan Africa: A meta-analysis of demographic and health surveys (2006-2016). *PloS one*, *12*(5), e0177338.
- 6. Ghana Statistical Service. (2015). Ghana Demographic and Health Survey Key Indicators. In: Accra, Ghana: Ghana Statistical Service, Ghana Health Service, Ghana, The DHS Program, ICF International, Rockville, Maryland, USA.
- 7. WHO. (2010). Communicable disease and severe food shortage technical note. Geneva.
- 8. Pollitt, E., Gorman, K. S., Engle, P. L., Rivera, J. A., & Martorell, R. (1995). Nutrition in early life and the fulfillment of intellectual potential. *The Journal of nutrition*, *125*(suppl_4), 1111S-1118S.
- 9. Grantham-McGregor, S. M., & Cumper, G. (1992). Jamaican studies in nutrition and child development, and their implications for national development. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 51(1), 71-79.
- 10. Martin, R. M., Smith, G. D., Frankel, S., & Gunnell, D. (2004). Parents' growth in childhood and the birth weight of their offspring. *Epidemiology*, 308-316.
- 11. De Vita, M. V., Scolfaro, C., Santini, B., Lezo, A., Gobbi, F., Buonfrate, D., ... & Morino, G. (2019). Malnutrition, morbidity and infection in the informal settlements of Nairobi, Kenya: An epidemiological study. *Italian journal of pediatrics*, 45(1), 1-11.
- 12. Jesmin, A., Yamamoto, S. S., Malik, A. A., & Haque, M. A. (2011). Prevalence and determinants of chronic malnutrition among preschool children: a cross-sectional study in Dhaka City, Bangladesh. *Journal of health, population, and nutrition*, 29(5), 494.
- 13. Ferdousi, J., & Alamgir, A. K. M. (2011). Prevalence and determinants of overweight in schools students: A developing country perspective. *Canadian Journal of Diabetes*, 35(2), 195.
- Lozano, R., Naghavi, M., Foreman, K., Lim, S., Shibuya, K., Aboyans, V., ... & Remuzzi, G. (2012). Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The lancet*, 380(9859), 2095-2128.
- 15. Clasen, T. F., Bostoen, K., Schmidt, W. P., Boisson, S., Fung, I. C. H., Jenkins, M. W., ... & Cairncross, S. (2010). Interventions to improve disposal of human excreta for preventing diarrhoea. *Cochrane database of systematic reviews*,

(6).

- 16. Engell, R. E., & Lim, S. S. (2013). Does clean water matter? An updated meta-analysis of water supply and sanitation interventions and diarrhoeal diseases. *The Lancet*, *381*, S44.
- 17. Dangour, A. D., Watson, L., Cumming, O., Boisson, S., Che, Y., Velleman, Y., ... & Uauy, R. (2013). Interventions to improve water quality and supply, sanitation and hygiene practices, and their effects on the nutritional status of children. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (8).
- 18. Agbozo, F., Atito, P., & Abubakari, A. (2016). Malnutrition and associated factors in children: a comparative study between public and private schools in Hohoe Municipality, Ghana. *BMC Nutrition*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Owusu, W. B., Lartey, A., De Onis, M., Onyango, A. W., & Frongillo, E. A. (2004). Factors associated with unconstrained growth among affluent Ghanaian children. *Acta paediatrica*, 93(8), 1115-1119.
- 20. Atsu, B. K., Guure, C., & Laar, A. K. (2017). Determinants of overweight with concurrent stunting among Ghanaian children. *BMC pediatrics*, 17(1), 1-12.
- 21. Saaka, M., & Galaa, S. Z. (2016). Relationships between wasting and stunting and their concurrent occurrence in Ghanaian preschool children. *Journal of nutrition and metabolism*, 2016.
- Suara, S. B., & Aryee, P. A. (2018). Growth Faltering And Inadequate Dietary Intake Among Children (6-23 Months Old) In Sissala East District, Ghana. UDS International Journal of Development, 5(1), 75-87.
- 23. Hong, R. (2007). Effect of economic inequality on chronic childhood undernutrition in Ghana. *Public health nutrition*, *10*(4), 371-378.
- Spears, D., Ghosh, A., & Cumming, O. (2013). Open defecation and childhood stunting in India: an ecological analysis of new data from 112 districts. *PloS one*, 8(9), e73784.
- 25. WHO. (2009). WHO AnthroPlus for personal computers Manual: Software for assessing growth of the world's children and adolescents. Geneva. http://www.who.int/growthref/tools/en/.
- 26. Eveleth, P. B. (1996). Physical Status: The Use and Interpretation of Anthropometry. Report of a WHO Expert Committee. *Am J Hum Biol*, 8, 786-787. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6300(1996)8:6<786::AID-AJHB11>3.0.CO;2-I.
- Ziegler, E. E., & Nelson, S. E. (2012). The WHO growth standards: strengths and limitations. *Current Opinion in Clinical* Nutrition & Metabolic Care, 15(3), 298-302.
- Suara, S. B., Siassi, F., Saaka, M., Foroshani, A. R., & Sotoudeh, G. (2019). Association between Carbohydrate Quality Index and general and abdominal obesity in women: a cross-sectional study from Ghana. *BMJ open*, 9(12), e033038.
- 29. Suara, S. B., Siassi, F., Saaka, M., Foroshani, A. R., Asadi, S., & Sotoudeh, G. (2020). Dietary fat quantity and quality in relation to general and abdominal obesity in women: a cross-sectional study from Ghana. *Lipids in health and disease*, *19*(1), 1-13.
- 30. Charan, J., & Biswas, T. (2013). How to calculate sample size for different study designs in medical research?. *Indian journal of psychological medicine*, 35(2), 121.
- 31. SWDHMT. (2013). Sissala West-District Health Management Team (SWDHMT) annual health report.
- 32. Ngure, F. M., Reid, B. M., Humphrey, J. H., Mbuya, M. N., Pelto, G., & Stoltzfus, R. J. (2014). Water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), environmental enteropathy, nutrition, and early child development: making the links. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1308(1), 118-128.
- Rah, J. H., Cronin, A. A., Badgaiyan, B., Aguayo, V. M., Coates, S., & Ahmed, S. (2015). Household sanitation and personal hygiene practices are associated with child stunting in rural India: a cross-sectional analysis of surveys. *BMJ* open, 5(2), e005180.
- 34. Kamal, S. M. (2011). Socio-economic determinants of severe and moderate stunting among under-five children of rural Bangladesh. *Malaysian journal of nutrition*, 17(1).
- Alom, J., Islam, M. A., & Quddus, M. (2009). Socioeconomic factors influencing nutritional status of under-five children of agrarian families in Bangladesh: a multilevel analysis. *Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 32(454-2016-36445), 63-74.
- Dangour, A. D., Watson, L., Cumming, O., Boisson, S., Che, Y., Velleman, Y., ... & Uauy, R. (2013). Interventions to improve water quality and supply, sanitation and hygiene practices, and their effects on the nutritional status of children. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (8).
- Liu, L., Johnson, H. L., Cousens, S., Perin, J., Scott, S., Lawn, J. E., ... & Child Health Epidemiology Reference Group of WHO and UNICEF. (2012). Global, regional, and national causes of child mortality: an updated systematic analysis for 2010 with time trends since 2000. *The lancet*, 379(9832), 2151-2161.
- 38. WHO. (2000). Malnutrition-the global picture 2000. Geneva: WHO; 2000.
- Martorell, R., Khan, L. K., & Schroeder, D. G. (1994). Reversibility of stunting: epidemiological findings in children from developing countries. *European journal of clinical nutrition*, 48, S45-57.

Citation: Siddique Gbanha Bawa *et al* (2021). Association of Household Hygiene and Sanitation Practices with Odds of Stunting and Underweight Among Infants and Young Children (6-59 Months Old) In Ghana. *South Asian Res J App Med Sci*, 3(4), 18-24.