



**ENVIRONMENTAL
HEALTH
PERSPECTIVES**

<http://www.ehponline.org>

**Enablers and Barriers to Large-Scale Uptake of Improved
Solid Fuel Stoves: A Systematic Review**

**Eva A. Rehfuess, Elisa Puzzolo, Debbi Stanistreet, Daniel Pope,
and Nigel G. Bruce**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1306639>

Received: 11 February 2013

Accepted: 3 December 2013

Advance Publication: 3 December 2013

Enablers and Barriers to Large-Scale Uptake of Improved Solid Fuel Stoves: A Systematic Review

Eva A. Rehfuss,¹ Elisa Puzzolo,² Debbi Stanistreet,² Daniel Pope,² and Nigel G. Bruce²

¹Institute for Medical Informatics, Biometry and Epidemiology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich, Germany; ²Department of Public Health and Policy, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom

Address correspondence to Eva A. Rehfuss, Institute for Medical Informatics, Biometry and Epidemiology, Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Marchioninstr. 15, 81377 Munich, Germany. Telephone: +49 (0)89 7095 7494. Fax: +49 (0)89 7095 7491. E-mail: rehfuss@ibe.med.uni-muenchen.de

Running title: Enablers and barriers to uptake of improved stoves

Acknowledgments: We are most grateful to the Department for International Development, United Kingdom for having funded this systematic review. We would also like to thank staff at the EPPI-Centre for their continuous technical support during the past 18 months. Eva Rehfuss would like to acknowledge financial support from the Munich Center of Health Sciences.

Competing financial interests: None declared.

Abstract

Background: Globally, 2.8 billion people rely on household solid fuels. Reducing the resulting adverse health, environmental and development consequences will involve transitioning through a mix of clean fuels and improved solid fuel stoves (IS) of demonstrable effectiveness. To date, achieving uptake of IS has presented significant challenges.

Objectives: Conduct a systematic review of factors enabling or limiting large-scale uptake of IS.

Methods: Systematic searches were conducted through multi-disciplinary databases, specialist websites and contacting experts. The review drew on qualitative, quantitative and case studies, with standardized methods for screening, data extraction, critical appraisal and synthesis. Findings were summarized as “factors”, each relating to one of seven domains (households and settings; knowledge and perceptions; fuel and technology; finance, tax and subsidy; market development; regulation and standards; programmatic and policy mechanisms). Issues impacting equity were recorded.

Results: A total of 31 factors influencing uptake were identified from 57 studies conducted in Asia, Africa and Latin America. All domains matter: while factors such as offering technologies that meet household needs and save fuel, user training and support, effective financing and facilitative government action appear critical for success, none guarantee this, and all factors can be influential depending on context. The nature of available evidence did not permit further prioritization.

Conclusions: Achieving adoption and sustained use of IS at scale requires that all factors, spanning household/community and programme/societal levels, be assessed and supported by policy; proposals are made for a planning tool to aid this process and for further research which should incorporate effectiveness evaluation.

Introduction

Household air pollution – a major global health problem

More than 40% of the world's population rely for their everyday energy needs on fuels and stove technologies that have changed little since prehistoric times. Transition to modern fuels has been slow in most low-income countries, and because of population growth the number of people using solid fuels (including biomass such as wood, charcoal, dung or crop residues as well as coal) for cooking has remained at around 2.8 billion since 1990 (Rehfuess et al. 2006; Bonjour et al., 2013). This household energy poverty has multiple consequences for development and particularly for health through exposure to very high levels of household air pollution (HAP). Burning solid fuels in open fires or traditional inefficient stoves generates hundreds of pollutants from incomplete combustion, including particulate matter (PM), carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulphur oxides, polyaromatic and other hydrocarbons and various organic substances (Naeher et al. 2007). A majority of studies in this field use PM₁₀ (PM of less than 10 micrometres in diameter) as an indicator pollutant; these show that average 24-hour concentrations of PM₁₀ in solid fuel-using households range from 300 to 3,000 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) (Saksena et al. 2003), greatly exceeding current WHO air quality guidelines for 24-hour and annual mean concentrations of PM₁₀ of 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and 20 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively (WHO 2006).

In terms of PM₁₀ exposure, HAP can thus be placed somewhere between passive and active smoking and, unsurprisingly, most of the well-known health effects associated with tobacco smoking have also been documented for HAP. Recent systematic reviews show substantially increased risks for acute lower respiratory infections in children (Dherani et al. 2008), low birth weight and still birth (Pope et al. 2010), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (Kurmi et al.

2010) and lung cancer (Hosgood et al. 2011). An increasing number of studies also report a link with cataracts (Pokhrel et al. 2005) and tuberculosis (Sumpter and Chandramohan 2012). Generalized exposure-response functions for combustion-derived PM_{2.5} (Pope et al. 2011; Smith et al. 2010) present a strong case for HAP also causing ischemic heart disease and stroke. According to the Global Burden of Disease Project 2010, HAP globally accounted for 3.5 (2.7-4.4) million deaths and 4.3% (3.4-5.3) of disability-adjusted life years in the year 2010 (Lim et al. 2012). An additional 16% of the 3.1 million deaths from outdoor air pollution are also attributable to HAP, due to the impact of household emissions on ambient air (Lim et al. 2012). Based on comparative estimations of the contributions of 67 risk factors in 21 world regions, HAP ranked 4th in terms of global burden (2nd among women, 5th among men) and accounted for very large fractions of burden in Sub-Saharan Africa, Oceania and several Asian regions.

Although the last 30 years have seen a variety of efforts aimed at improving household energy, ranging from small scale NGO-led projects to the vast Chinese National Improved Stoves Programme (NISP; Sinton et al. 2004), most were directed at saving fuel and protecting forests rather than protecting health. In 2012, recognition by the United Nations that energy access is critical for achieving the Millennium Development Goals led to the launch of the Sustainable Energy for All (SEFA) Initiative, with ambitious targets for universal access to electricity and modern cooking energy systems by 2030 (<http://www.sustainableenergyforall.org>). Complementing and contributing to this global initiative are a range of national, regional and international strategies, in particular the United Nations Foundation Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves with its target to establish a sustainable global market for clean stoves and fuels (<http://www.cleancookstoves.org/>).

An important role for improved solid fuel stoves

SEFA and other strategies for moving the world towards the 2030 targets envisage a mix of interventions: In favorable settings, where biomass fuels are already purchased and/or households possess the necessary economic means, a relatively rapid shift to clean fuels is feasible; at the same time, households unable to afford and/or access modern fuels in the short- to medium-term must have access to solid fuel stoves that are as clean and safe as possible. The International Energy Agency has proposed distinct regional scenarios based on a combination of liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), biogas and low-emission solid fuel stoves, where globally 59 million (46%) people per year should gain access to IS out of a total of 129 million gaining access to all three types of modern energy (IEA 2011). Whatever the mix of fuels and technologies ultimately adopted by households over the next 20 years, improved solid fuel stoves will continue to play a very important part.

Over the last three decades, the term “improved stove” has been variably applied to describe stove models optimized for fuel efficiency or designed to minimize emissions. Consequently, their effectiveness in reducing health-damaging emissions has been highly variable (Bruce et al. 2006). Evidence is, however, emerging of the potential of IS to deliver at least some of the health benefits promised by the mainly observational epidemiological evidence on risks of exposure. The RESPIRE trial found that the *plancha* chimney stove used widely across Guatemala and other Latin American countries, reduced kitchen pollution concentrations by 90% and children’s and women’s exposures by 60% and 50% respectively. For children up to 18 months, this was associated with a 33% (95% CI: 2%, 55%) reduction in severe pneumonia incidence (Smith et al. 2011). Likewise, three cohort studies investigating the impacts of chimney stoves disseminated as part of the Chinese NISP reported 25-50% reductions in risk of chronic obstructive pulmonary

disease, lung cancer and adult pneumonia mortality, although these studies lacked exposure measurement (Chapman et al. 2005; Lan et al. 2002; Shen et al. 2009). Economic modelling suggests that IS can be a cost-effective means of reducing HAP-attributable disease burden (Mehta and Shahpar 2004), and show highly favorable cost-benefit ratios when examined from a societal perspective (Hutton et al. 2007; Malla et al 2010). There are, however, recent warnings that stoves which are not well suited to household needs may fail to deliver health benefits (Hanna et al. 2012).

Despite the widespread perception that achieving uptake of IS at scale presents significant policy and programmatic challenges, this issue has received relatively little attention. Understanding factors that make projects and programmes succeed or fail will be critically important to achieve the “quantum leap” (Rehfuess 2006) required for sustainable adoption of IS by hundreds of millions of households. The aim of this systematic review is to contribute to filling this evidence gap by identifying factors that enable or limit household uptake of improved solid fuel stoves in low and middle-income countries. Very few improved stoves initiatives to date have demonstrated health and broader benefits at scale and in a sustainable way. Consequently, a systematic review of past experience is likely to provide relevant cues to significant obstacles and facilitators, but is unlikely to generate a reliable and easily replicable “recipe” to guarantee the success of future initiatives.

METHODS

Scope of systematic review

This review forms part of a broader systematic review concerned with enablers of and barriers to large-scale uptake of a range of household energy technologies in the context of projects,

programmes or other relevant initiatives undertaken at any scale; findings related to clean fuels will be reported elsewhere. In principle, IS encompass a wide variety of designs and technologies, ranging from user-built stoves made of locally available materials to mass-produced advanced combustion stoves. These differ greatly in their suitability for different cooking practices and other household energy requirements, their emissions of PM, carbon monoxide and other health-damaging pollutants, their fuel efficiency and safety. Although the effectiveness of the interventions is of fundamental importance, this review was principally concerned with uptake and, accordingly, considered all IS types.

As a means of structuring the review, a comprehensive framework of factors impacting uptake of cleaner cooking technologies was developed, drawing on previous work (Bruce et al. 2006; World Bank 2011). This framework encompasses seven domains; it highlights first the central role of fuel and technology characteristics, and shows how two other domains – characteristics of households and settings, knowledge and perceptions – primarily operate at household and community level, whereas the remaining four domains – financial, tax and subsidy aspects; market development; regulation, legislation and standards, and; programmatic and policy mechanisms – primarily operate at programme and societal level (Figure 1). Enabling or limiting factors affecting short-term adoption may differ from those affecting longer-term sustained use. Also, uptake may occur equally or unequally across population groups differing by socio-economic status and urban-rural location, and is likely to be influenced by gender-related factors. For the purposes of this review, drawing on and further developing concepts advanced in the literature (Pine et al., 2011; Ruiz-Mercado et al., 2011) adoption is defined to include both acquisition (stoves are purchased or installed without any reference to their later use) and initial adoption (use is assessed less than one year from acquisition). Sustained use, on the other hand,

is defined to comprise both medium-term (assessed one or two years after acquisition) and long-term sustained use (reflecting longer time periods).

The systematic review was registered with the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) at the University of London, and a detailed, peer-reviewed protocol is available (Puzzolo et al., 2011).

Search strategy

This review adopted an exhaustive search strategy comprising (i) systematic searches in 27 peer-reviewed databases across multiple disciplines (including MEDLINE, EMBASE and Social Science databases); (ii) grey literature searches of fourteen portals of key stakeholder organizations, such as HEDON and the Partnership for Clean Indoor Air, complemented by searches through Google and Google scholar; (iii) handsearches of the references of included studies; and (iv) expert consultations. Full details are available in the protocol (Puzzolo et al. 2011).

For bibliographic databases, comprehensive search terms representing “interventions” (i.e. *stove OR (cook* AND technol*) OR (cook* AND fuel) OR LPG OR “LP gas” OR “liquid petroleum gas” OR “liquefied petroleum gas” OR “liquified petroleum gas” OR chulha OR chulla OR challah OR chula) were combined with search terms representing “uptake” (i.e. adopt* OR accept* OR deliver* OR dissemin* OR implement* OR scale OR “scal* up” OR “roll* out” OR “tak* up” OR uptake) using the Boolean operator AND. Piloting of the terms was carried out; small modifications to meet the needs of specific databases were made whenever necessary. Searches were conducted from 1980 to July 2011, using English terms; screening of papers was carried out in English, Spanish, Portuguese, French, German and Italian.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

Eligible studies had to relate to direct experience with IS, and to provide empirical information on factors influencing adoption or sustained use. Projects and programmes were only considered if they targeted households rather than public or commercial settings, with restriction to urban and rural areas of low- and middle-income countries, defined according to World Bank regions (<http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups>). Studies undertaken in refugee camps were excluded due to limited generalizability.

Recognizing that uptake of IS is influenced by factors operating at all levels in society (Figure 1), the review encompassed three types of studies: (i) qualitative studies, conducted as part of an intervention study or stand-alone; ii) quantitative epidemiological studies; and (iii) case studies drawing on multiple sources of information to provide a broad evaluation of a specific project, programme or policy. To qualify for inclusion, case studies had to (i) rely on at least one source of empirical information, (ii) report information on sampling, data collection and/or analysis and (iii) provide some analysis of factors influencing success/failure.

To identify eligible studies, titles and abstracts were screened by one author, with independent random checks of included (10%) and excluded (10%) abstracts. Full-text articles for initial consideration were independently screened by two or more authors. All decisions were documented using the software EPPI Reviewer 4 (<http://epi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?alias=epi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/er4>).

Data extraction and quality appraisal

Data extraction for included studies was conducted by one author using standardized forms, and checked by two authors during synthesis. Key findings and characteristics of studies were

reported in summary tables. Qualitative studies were appraised for quality using established criteria related to reliability and validity of findings and the reflection of participant perspectives (Harden et al. 2009; Appendix 2.7 in Puzzolo et al. 2013). Quantitative studies were appraised for quality using Liverpool Quality Assessment Tools (Appendix 2.8 in Puzzolo et al. 2013) assessing design-specific sources of potential bias and confounding. The quality of case studies was examined by adapting published criteria for case studies (Atkins and Sampson 2002; Appendix 2.9 in Puzzolo et al. 2013), with a particular emphasis on distinguishing between empirical analysis and subjective author interpretation. Quality appraisal was independently conducted by two authors; any discrepancies were resolved through discussion between two or more authors. Results of quality appraisal were categorized as strong, moderate or weak with details provided under Results; it is, however, important to note that quality appraisal across study designs is not directly comparable.

Evidence synthesis

Synthesis of extracted studies was carried out in two stages. In the first stage, synthesis was conducted separately for the three types of studies, referencing detailed findings so these remain traceable to individual studies. For qualitative studies, the review used thematic synthesis, as developed and applied by Thomas and Harden (2008). Line-by-line coding of the full-text was followed by generation of descriptive themes for each study; these were compared across studies and synthesized under the seven framework domains and for equity in tabular and narrative form (Puzzolo et al. 2011). For quantitative and case studies, quantitative and/or descriptive findings in each study were extracted onto data extraction forms. Subsequently, findings were compiled in two tables, one for all quantitative studies and one for all case studies, and organized as specific enablers and barriers under the seven framework domains and equity. For each domain,

related enablers and barriers were grouped and relevant headings assigned; each of these headings was thereafter referred to as a factor. Specific findings for each factor were also described in narrative form.

In the second stage, synthesis of evidence relating to each factor was conducted drawing on the information from all three study types. Preserving a distinction between barriers and enablers was not considered meaningful, as it became apparent that most factors operate along a spectrum, where they enable uptake when present or satisfactory or limit uptake when absent or unsatisfactory. Findings were presented in tables, graphics and text. The strength of evidence supporting each factor was assessed by consistency across study types and countries and settings, as well as by number and quality of studies. We also conducted a graphical sensitivity analysis, based on moderate and strong studies.

Results

Description of included studies

Of 6690 unique records identified, 57 studies met the inclusion criteria (14 qualitative, 16 quantitative and 27 case studies) (see Supplemental Material, Figure S1). Notably, Bangladesh (n = 8), India (n = 17), Kenya (n = 5) and Mexico (n = 6) contributed a large number of studies; 31 studies were undertaken in rural and 11 in urban areas, while 15 covered both settings. Basic study characteristics are provided in Table 1, identifying 35 studies concerned with adoption and 13 studies concerned with sustained use; 9 studies assessed elements of both adoption and sustained use. Detailed study characteristics are available in Supplemental Material, Table S1, showing a range of stove types as determined by production materials, main fuel use, number of

potholes and ventilation. A majority of studies were concerned with stoves produced by local artisans, while 7 studies contributed findings for more standardized stove production.

Qualitative studies comprised interviews, focus groups and, ethnographic studies. A poor description of the theoretical approach to analysis and of strategies employed to increase the validity of findings, as well as limited distinction between findings emerging from the research and subjective author interpretations were common problems; five, eight and one study were categorized as strong, moderate and weak respectively. The 16 quantitative studies comprised controlled trials, cross-sectional surveys and economic analyses. Four, seven and five studies were classified as strong, moderate and weak quality respectively, with main areas of weakness being poor sampling methods and relatively simple descriptive analyses. The 27 case studies varied greatly in terms of the combination of direct empirical (e.g. cross-sectional surveys, focus groups, interviews), reference to publicly available statistics, and more subjective programme experience or opinion. Ten of these were considered to be of strong quality, twelve and five studies were assessed as moderate and weak respectively.

The results present the second stage of evidence synthesis; findings from individual studies and from the first stage of synthesis by study type are publicly accessible (Puzzolo et al. 2013). Table 2 lists factors under each domain (D1 to D7) supported by references (i.e. study IDs), recording study types and countries where the evidence was obtained. The following sections summarize findings under the relevant domains as well as for equity, and provide cross-links to factors in Table 2 (identified by use of italics). Figure 2 graphically displays all 31 factors and the number of quantitative, qualitative and case studies supporting them. Supplemental Material, Figure S2 shows the results of the graphical sensitivity analysis based on moderate and strong studies, with the findings regarding different factors being largely comparable to the main analysis.

D1. Fuel and technology characteristics

Many of the studies confirm the fundamental requirement that IS are designed to meet user needs in preparing local dishes with traditional cooking utensils and available fuels (*general design requirements*). Where relevant, stove designs must also meet other household energy needs, such as seasonal space heating. Failure to effectively address these issues almost guarantees that the improved stove will not be adopted and used long-term, or that it will be used for some but not the majority of purposes. Household requirements are rarely met in a “one size fits all” fashion, emphasizing the importance of incorporating user requirements in research and development and of offering a choice of high-quality designs.

Even if the stove is well-designed to meet local needs, its use will fall off where durability is poor and chimneys (where used) break or become blocked quickly (*durability and other specific design requirements*). Design and durability also impact on requirements for, and costs of, cleaning and maintenance which can be a disincentive if high. Many programmes report that a range of specific design problems (e.g. small size of stove entrance) lead to stove modifications by users limiting stove effectiveness or prompt reversion to traditional stoves. On the positive side, stoves with a modern, attractive appearance can be highly valued.

Fuel savings, perceived or measured, are widely reported as an important incentive. These comprise savings in fuel collection time (and associated injuries and threats), and/or household expenditure where fuel is bought. Some IS, however, are more restrictive in the type and size of fuel, which may be a barrier to adoption and use (*fuel requirements*). The other major area of savings related to stove performance is time, which (in addition to time saved by less fuel collection) may be achieved through more efficient cooking due to greater heat transfer

efficiency or parallel cooking on multiple potholes (*impacts on time*). However, the requirement for fuel processing (e.g. chopping wood into smaller pieces) or regular stove and chimney cleaning may add work. Time savings are reported to be used for other household work or income generation, but the attached value varies between settings; notably, several studies found that poor rural communities, where fuel and labour are both abundant, do not consider the opportunity costs of time spent on cooking or fuel collection important.

D2. Household and setting characteristics

This domain comprises the socio-economic, demographic, structural and geographical contexts of households, which interact to affect adoption and sustained use. Higher *socio-economic status*, related to income, household assets or expenditure, is widely found to enable adoption. Similarly, greater *education* (years of schooling or educational attainment) among women and men, increases uptake. Somewhat less consistent results emerge for demographic characteristics, notably with respect to sex and age of the head of household (*demographics*). Larger family size appears to act as a barrier to adoption, possibly due to the low value assigned to time and labor used to collect firewood and/or the need to cook for more people. On the other hand, house ownership is an enabler, which is likely to partially reflect socio-economic status, but also willingness to invest in home improvements (*house ownership and structure*). Indeed, the lack of a permanent home or kitchen as well as space limitations can be impediments to purchasing a built-in stove.

A generic issue at the household level, emerging from many countries and settings and having far reaching implications, is the phenomenon of habitual “fuel/stove stacking”. This describes *multiple fuel and stove use*, which may be a variety of solid fuels, an improved stove used

alongside a pre-existing (set of) traditional stove(s), or solid fuels used in combination with LPG or kerosene. Existing fuel/stove stacking enables uptake of an additional technology, but also acts as a barrier to exclusive use of IS. Households that purchase rather than collect solid fuels are more likely to adopt, reflecting the greater perceived value of monetary savings compared to time savings.

Geography and climate are also important influences on uptake. Urban households are generally more willing to adopt, while those in disaster-prone areas may be less willing or able. Those living at higher altitude and in other cold settings require interventions that also provide warmth. In some settings IS must also take seasonal demands into account. For example, stove portability is valued, where households switch between outdoor cooking during the dry season and indoor cooking during the rainy season.

D3. Knowledge and perceptions

This domain addresses the perceptions and expectations of users, mostly women, regarding the impact of IS on their daily lives. A prerequisite for adoption and sustained use is that users should be able to prepare their local dishes to the same taste, using established cooking utensils, especially in view of resistance to changing traditional practices (*tradition and culture*). The ability to cook for larger gatherings is also important in many settings.

Fewer adverse health effects, especially those directly perceived to be smoke-related, and a reduction in risk of burn injuries and house fires, emerge as enablers for adoption and sustained use (*smoke, health and safety*). By contrast, the perception that smoke protects against insects concerned households in two Indian studies. Likewise, cleaner homes and cooking vessels are appreciated by users of IS. Other reported benefits enabling adoption include emitted warmth,

the family eating together and children being able to study/play indoors (*cleanliness and home improvement*).

Where the advantages of IS outweigh those associated with traditional practices, households perceive the investment as good value for money. The improved stove not meeting expectations and competing household priorities, such as food security, limit willingness to pay. Beyond household considerations of *total perceived benefit*, social networks and opinion leaders influence adoption in positive and negative ways (*social influence*). Bad experience with the technology is especially destructive in this regard. IS can be an aspirational choice when seen to have aesthetic appeal and associated status gain.

D4. Financial, tax and subsidy aspects

Findings for this domain are derived from government-led, NGO-led and market-based dissemination approaches. Whatever the approach, the cost of high-quality IS is an important barrier to adoption and/or repurchase, which may be overcome through government- or market-led economies of scale or stove subsidies (*stove costs and subsidies*). Much of the evidence on stove subsidies is derived from India. Subsidies towards the stove or its component parts enable initial adoption, with several studies emphasizing that the poorest households would not have gained access to IS without them. Large subsidies can, however, devalue IS, limiting maintenance efforts and longer-term use and repurchase by households and, through subsidy expectations into the future, programme sustainability. Insights relating to flexible *versus* fixed pricing policies are mixed, although a multi-tier scheme (prices scaled for stove model) was reported to be effective in some Indian and Bangladeshi settings.

Liquidity constraints, especially among poorer populations, limit uptake. Whilst payments in instalments, price incentives or other promotional offers and consumer finance through microcredit/loans (offered through local companies or community lending schemes) are mechanisms to overcome this barrier, their relevance and success varied according to stove price and target population (*payment modalities*). For example, micro-credit was successfully employed to reach urban and rural poor households in Bangladesh, although in some settings short payback periods and high interest rates deterred those eligible from applying for microcredit.

Importantly, independent of the underlying ideology or programmatic approach, most programmes will benefit from some degree of government support (*programme subsidies*). Direct/indirect government financial support (e.g. grants, loans, tax incentives) towards improved stove programmes is a major enabler of uptake, especially, in relation to adequate upfront entrepreneurial capital for stove business development. Financial incentives for stove construction and maintenance and support towards R&D and awareness-raising are also important. Any dependence on national or international external support and supplies should be carefully evaluated for sustainability.

D5. Market development

Creating demand through appropriate and potentially setting-specific strategies is important for stove uptake (*demand creation*). Modes of demand creation comprise general awareness-raising activities about IS benefits (e.g. through media campaigns) and personal contact through women's organizations or company representatives. Product demonstrations and "word of mouth" appear the most important general driver of adoption. A demand-driven approach

facilitates long-term adoption and use; coercive approaches based on deliberate misinformation or false promises are likely to favor rejection of the technology despite initial uptake. Demand can only be met, if those raw materials, stove parts or complete stoves not available locally are accessible to users through well- managed *supply chains*. Supply chains may be newly established or make use of existing production and dissemination networks. Road infrastructure has an impact on distribution and availability, including prices, and may be a pre-condition for supply of stoves that are not locally produced.

Both government-led and market-based programmatic approaches ultimately rely on functional, self-sustaining businesses to produce, disseminate and maintain IS in order to be successful (*business and sales approach*). Findings with respect to success of mass production *versus* artisanal production are inconclusive, partially as each choice is often intrinsically linked to overall programmatic approach. The challenge to sustain income is an important issue for IS businesses. Despite potentially large unmet demand, the experience of many Indian stove companies suggests that a relatively poor market segment and the seasonality of stove production result in modest returns. Approaches adopted to ensure sustained income among small- and larger-scale producers include: (i) combining sales through a government programme with sales on the open market, (ii) cross-subsidizing sales to households through sales to institutional customers, (iii) specializing in the production of stove parts, (iv) pursuing indirect sales via outlets or direct sales via manufacturers, (v) exploring opportunities for the joint sale of two or more products or (vi) ensuring an independent second source of income. Overall, an entrepreneurial mode and appropriate business skills emerge as keys to success and financial viability. The lack of commercial interest in providing after-sales services may be a barrier to sustained use.

D6. Regulation, legislation and standards

Relatively few studies report on the role of this domain but the clear message is that standards and their enforcement are critical for large-scale promotion of high-quality IS. While limited findings did not suggest a strong enabling or limiting role for state control on fuel and raw material pricing, subsidies on kerosene or LPG can create market distortions, acting against IS uptake. Certification of stove or stove component manufacturers by a standards agency or a network of producers is a means of ensuring adherence to design specifications for fuel efficiency and emissions (*regulation, certification and standardization*). Certification must be enforced through mechanisms, such as the procurement of materials from designated suppliers, the exclusive use of accredited manufacturers and penalties to revoke accreditation in case of non-compliance with standards (*enforcement mechanisms*).

D7. Programmatic and policy mechanisms

This domain addresses interactions between different stakeholders, specific aspects of programme planning and implementation, monitoring and quality control.

Coordination and regular interaction between stakeholders, be they government agencies, NGOs, private sector entities or targeted households and communities, and careful programme management with good feedback systems are enablers of uptake (*institutional arrangements*).

Where appropriate, synergies may be achieved through integration of IS with broader rural development programmes. The Indian experience suggests that state- *versus* market-based programs show distinct strengths and weaknesses. The former tend to create dependence on public support and control technology innovation but minimize opportunities for corruption, whereas the latter enable technology innovation by local partners but may be liable to favouritism. Independent of programmatic approach, government has a key role in ensuring links

to relevant mainstream policy, R&D for stove technologies, health campaigns and financial oversight. Short-term, target-bound programmes, frequently related to strict funding schemes often fail to achieve sustainable change. *Community involvement*, from identification of suitable stove designs to stove distribution, creates a greater sense of ownership. Fostering women's engagement is particularly important.

Several programmes have successfully employed competition and reward schemes – between women or households (Bangladesh, India), producers or implementers (Cambodia, India), villages/counties (China, India) – to encourage uptake and sustained use (*creation of competition*). Targeting of market segments has also been successfully employed: in selected Indian states, programme preference for villages or districts expressing high demand for improved stoves led to high coverage rates in these selected locations; in the Chinese NISP's competitive focus on wealthier counties local co-funding was critical for rapid programme uptake at scale.

Programme planning and implementation need to consider all stages from choice of raw materials for stove construction to post-acquisition support. Adherence to design specifications and high-quality *construction and installation* are important. Faulty construction and/or installation of IS and, where applicable, chimneys lead to reduced functionality and durability. Appropriately training stove builders in construction and entrepreneurship and establishing the stove business as a profession, rather than a casual job, are thus critical enablers of uptake. Insufficient user training on stove (and chimney) use, cleaning and maintenance negatively affect functionality and sustained use, potentially leading to frustration (*user training*). Hands-on-training tends to be more effective than the provision of an instruction manual. Lack of or poor-quality *post-acquisition support* is an important barrier to sustained use, as identified across

many studies and settings. Consequently, there is a stated need for a formal policy, for example combining free after-sales services during a warranty period with subsequent services for payment.

Equally, lack of appropriate *monitoring and quality control* mechanisms is widely reported as a barrier. Sufficient technical personnel and adequate financial resources for monitoring at pre-construction, construction and installation phases as well as post-construction should be ensured. Responsiveness to concerns expressed by users, producers and implementers is critical.

Equity in adoption and sustained use

Equity considerations are critical in scaling-up improved stove dissemination with those of lowest socio-economic status, living in rural or remote areas and women experiencing the greatest health risks associated with traditional household energy practices; yet, these groups are also the least able to access or afford IS.

Programmes with an explicit goal to reach socio-economically disadvantaged households or areas have achieved greater adoption through various mechanisms, including (i) a tiered approach offering different stove models and prices for higher- *versus* lower-income households, (ii) subsidies, (iii) payments in instalments and (iv) access to credit. However, exclusively market-based approaches fail to penetrate beyond a certain level of *poverty*, as disadvantaged groups with limited education tend to perceive other household priorities as more pressing and generate little or no demand for IS. Consequently, companies usually do not market to “bottom of the pyramid” households, unless incentives are provided at the programme level.

Women’s decision-making power is often limited, as men typically exercise greater budget control (*gender*). This may be further complicated by women’s distinct positions within the

household (e.g. first wife, mother-in-law). There appear to be gender preferences with respect to stove attributes, with women valuing health benefits and men favoring fuel efficiency and monetary savings. These should be taken into account in marketing campaigns, where men have been insufficiently targeted to date. Women and women's networks often play a key role in stove construction and installation, marketing and sales, although in one Bangladeshi study men were found to be reluctant to support this form of women's empowerment.

Findings with respect to a programmatic focus on urban *versus* rural areas are mixed (*urban/rural location*). Commercial businesses, however, tend to target urban areas, where the business is more feasible and profitable, as users often pay for fuelwood and are willing to pay for an improved stove.

Discussion

All domains matter

Drawing on more than 50 studies with qualitative, quantitative and case study designs this systematic review identified 31 distinct factors capable of acting as enablers or barriers to uptake of IS. All seven of the *a priori* defined domains were populated with multiple factors, although some were supported by more evidence than others (Figure 2). This indicates that all domains matter and jointly influence adoption and sustained use of IS. Integration between factors primarily acting at household/community level and factors acting primarily at programme/societal level is critical, if programmes are to reach their intended populations and be successful at scale and over extended periods of time.

Given the many factors identified, an important question is whether some are more important than others, and if so, which. Broadly speaking, the evidence suggests that policies and programmes must consider *all* factors as well as the inter-relationships between them. Furthermore, prioritisation requires both a suitable method and an evidence base that supports such assessment, and it is not clear that either of these is currently available. Specifically, the heterogeneity inherent in the studies included in this review makes comparative assessment difficult, with only the quantitative studies using multivariable regression providing any formal analysis of independently associated factors (yet, even then, outcomes vary across studies). Consistency of findings offers some guide to importance, but many factors fulfil this criterion, and lack of evidence does not mean a factor is unimportant. An example of this last point is that few studies report on standards and regulation, but this is mostly a reflection of the historical lack of policy attention in this field. Indeed, much effort is currently being put into developing stove standards with ISO along with regional testing centres (ISO 2012); national regulation governing certification is expected to follow. Consequently, attempts to identify the most important factors are bound to rely mainly on judgement at this stage.

Notwithstanding the constraints on prioritisation, it appears that several of the factors across the two household and community-level domains (notably, socio-economic aspects, total perceived benefit and tradition and culture) as well as the Fuel and technology characteristics domain (in particular general design requirements) are likely to act as absolute barriers in all settings, i.e. overlooking them during the design of a policy or programme is likely to lead to programme failure. For example, an IS that does not meet traditional cooking requirements will not be continuously used, even if a household is initially persuaded to acquire it. Likewise, in accordance with the principles of diffusion of innovation theory (Rogers 1995), perceived overall

stove benefits must exceed those of traditional cooking practices for stoves to be adopted and used, even if major contributors can variably be health, fuel and time savings or social influence. This also illustrates that the importance of many other factors across these three domains tends to vary, for example, the valuation by households of fuel savings and impacts on time differs greatly between settings and social strata.

Insights gathered from a community perspective may provide guidance on where emphasis within the four domains at programme/societal level is to be placed. For example, the identification of a major discrepancy between those technologies that households aspire to have and those they can afford to have will help prioritize stove costs and payment modalities for in-depth consideration and evaluation. As for the technology and household/community level, some factors identified under Financial, tax and subsidy aspects (in particular stove costs and subsidies and programme subsidies), Market development (notably, demand creation and supply chains) and Programmatic and policy mechanisms (importantly, user training and post-acquisition support) must be considered in all settings. Some other factors, on the other hand, depend on the technology chosen (e.g. installation considerations are of no concern for portable stoves).

General and specific insights

Insights gained from this review have been derived from a mix of smaller-scale projects and programmes and a few truly large-scale efforts, including the Chinese and Indian National Improved Stove Programmes (Sinton et al. 2004; Barnes et al. 2012). Even though some countries are over-represented among included studies, the evidence for 25 out of 31 factors is derived from three continents, suggesting that insights apply globally. It is notable that more or less identical factors emerge independent of scale of delivery, programmatic approach,

technology and household and setting characteristics, although, as described in the section on Equity in adoption and sustained use, some findings are more relevant to specific population groups, such as women, socio-economically disadvantaged households, or households in urban or rural areas. This reinforces the validity and generalizability of findings, but, as emphasized above, *how* these factors affect adoption and sustained use of IS is frequently context-specific, and detailed mechanisms of action are not necessarily transferable. For example, creating demand among the target population and developing appropriate and reliable supply chains is critical, independent of the policy or programmatic approach. Yet, how incentives for future users are created and whether supply chains are set up exclusively in the private sector or supported by government (e.g. through linkage with ongoing state-supported rural development programmes), is highly variable. This context-dependence also precludes clear conclusions being drawn in relation to market-based *vs.* state-based approaches. Notably, several factors clearly apply to both philosophies, and future programmes can be expected to employ a mix of both market development and government involvement (IEA 2011).

Intervention effectiveness

Assessing intervention effectiveness was not among the objectives of this systematic review. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that the goal of any effort to promote IS should be that households adopt and use the most effective technologies possible. From a health perspective the impacts on emissions, exposure and safety are of primary concern. Very few included studies provided data on effectiveness or referenced relevant investigations of the technology concerned. There is, however, a growing literature showing that the HAP reductions in everyday use and associated health benefits which can be achieved with most currently promoted stove models are limited, at least in terms of reaching levels close to WHO air quality guidelines (Albalak et al.

2001; Hanna et al. 2012; Riojas-Rodriguez et al. 2001), although some chimney stoves have resulted in statistically significant and meaningful health improvements (Smith et al 2011, Lan et al 2001; Chapman et al 2005; Shen et al. 2009). More than half of the studies included in this review promoted at least one stove type with chimneys or smoke hoods but, given model variability and the specific problems reported in relation to chimney installation and maintenance, it cannot be assumed that these stoves resulted in exposure reductions and health benefits similar to those observed in the Guatemalan (Smith et al 2011) or Chinese studies (Lan et al. 2002; Chapman et al. 2005; Shen et al. 2009). No studies were found on adoption of recently developed advanced combustion stoves (e.g. forced draft or semi-gasifier stoves). Their low emission rates in the laboratory (relative to more widely used rocket-type stoves) hold future promise (Jetter et al. 2012), although reliable performance in the field remains to be confirmed.

Therefore, a key question is whether findings from this review on factors influencing uptake of interventions of uncertain effectiveness will be relevant to adoption of much more effective future interventions. It is likely they are, although some caution is needed. The quality and modernity of stoves and resultant benefits, in particular fuel savings, time savings, cleanliness and health, are highly valued by users. As these features are strengthened with future technologies, this can be expected to reinforce demand and willingness to pay, as well as longer-term use and maintenance. Another critical and complex issue is the higher price of more advanced stove models. This could exclude low-income households from programmes; conversely large-scale production should reduce price, and innovations in financing for both suppliers and potential consumers can effectively extend access.

Adoption vs. sustained use vs. exclusive use

We did not specifically explore factors affecting exclusive or near-exclusive use of IS, as this is both a rare phenomenon and rarely studied. Indeed, as previously reported (Ruiz-Mercado et al. 2011) and demonstrated in this review, adoption does not imply that households abandon their traditional stoves. It is recognized that factors influencing adoption are likely to differ from those influencing sustained use. Generally speaking, while many stove projects and programmes have achieved a reasonable degree of adoption, sustained use, maintenance and replacement have been observed less frequently (Table 1). Several factors specifically influence the chances of a programme achieving longer-term and sustainable success. For example, insufficient user training, lack of post-acquisition support and non-availability of stove components limit maintenance and repair of IS. Creating incentives for high-quality maintenance and repair services may be one area where programme subsidies can be successfully employed to promote long-term use.

Methodological strengths and limitations

This systematic review was broad-based in terms of the range of enablers and barriers considered, short-term versus longer-term uptake assessed and settings covered, although it focused on household rather than public or commercial settings and excluded refugee camps.

While carbon-finance studies are likely to provide a rich source of information, none were identified. The review employed a comprehensive search strategy, combining searches of the peer-reviewed and grey literature with handsearches and expert consultations. This broad approach was critical – all four strategies led to inclusion of studies that would not otherwise have been identified. Screening was undertaken in several languages; we were, however, unable

to search Chinese-language databases or screen Chinese-language studies, although we identified a well-known independent evaluation of the NISP. Other aspects of the methodology sought to minimize subjectivity and retain information and referencing to detail (Puzzolo et al. 2013). Consistent findings across settings, research approaches and study designs represent an important strength. The evidence supporting these factors is, however, drawn from a set of studies that vary greatly in terms of approach, quality and context. While the sensitivity analysis suggests that findings are relatively robust with respect to the quality of individual studies, an inherent weakness of our methodological approach is that individual findings become de-contextualized. Moreover, studies do not contribute equally towards the insights gained, with “rich” studies reporting findings towards multiple factors across domains, and “poorer” studies – due to the specificity of the research question asked and the nature of the research undertaken – reporting findings towards one or more factors within a single domain.

The validity of the insights gained is fundamentally determined by the quality of included studies. Established methods were used to appraise individual study quality, although it was sometimes difficult to reliably distinguish between genuinely poor-quality data collection and analysis *vs.* inadequate reporting of methods. A significant proportion of all three study types showed methodological flaws. Despite these, qualitative studies covered context-specific social scenarios offering explanations for why certain factors influence uptake from the perspectives of users. While many quantitative studies did not go beyond simple univariable descriptions of conditions, others used sophisticated modelling approaches to understand the relative impact of various factors. Case studies provided valuable insights through combination of data and programme experience. While some studies, notable quantitative designs carried out at one time of year, may not do justice to the importance of seasonality, insights related to seasonal

conditions (e.g. differing household energy needs, value of portability for wet vs. dry seasons) were identified under the relevant factors.

Given the included study designs and their apparent limitations, the majority of individual study findings should be seen as associations rather than as causal effects. It is principally through the combination of studies that conclusions can be drawn about possible causal relationships. Factors which are identified consistently across countries and regions, in distinct types of study, and in an enabling or limiting role are more likely to be causal. For example, post-acquisition support is considered essential by users in a large number of qualitative, quantitative and case studies in Bangladesh, India and Mexico (Table 2). Where present and of high quality, post-acquisition support facilitates regular maintenance and repair; where absent, it reduces stove functionality, with IS falling into disuse and not being maintained, repaired or replaced as appropriate.

Importantly, by drawing on multiple types of evidence we were able to address the full scope of the systematic review, covering all seven domains as well as equity – each type of evidence offers explanations that the others are unable to capture. This approach contrasts markedly with a recent systematic review of who adopts IS and clean fuels, which considered only multivariable regression analyses (Lewis and Pattanayak 2012). Based on eleven regression analyses in eight studies and the basic meta-analytical technique of vote-counting, the review found 18 variable groups across the three categories; price, socio-economic status and demographics associated with adoption. As the authors do not offer any explanation of the likely mechanisms that underlie these associations, it is difficult to draw conclusions with respect to the development of programmes and policies. We believe that our approach has led to a more rounded understanding of the factors influencing IS uptake from different perspectives, and provides a reasonably strong

and pragmatic basis for the design and delivery of efforts that are successful at scale and over time.

Conclusion

This comprehensive mixed-method systematic review has identified 31 factors within seven domains which impact on uptake of IS, including equity. Some factors appear critical for success, but none can guarantee either adoption or sustained use. Prioritisation is problematic given the nature of the available evidence (and potentially the nature of the problem). Therefore all factors need to be considered, albeit some will be less relevant in certain settings. How then can the learning from this review be implemented in a manner which will help those planning and evaluating programmes make the best decisions? We propose two key actions, one relating to the development of a policy tool and one concerning further analysis and future research.

The findings from this review provide the basis for the development of a policy tool to assess all domains and constituent factors; this would be applicable during planning, implementation and evaluation stages of policies and programmes to promote specific IS in specific settings. The tool could comprise instruments for assessing each relevant factor, and employ a software interface to ensure that unnecessary data collection is avoided.

In terms of future research, two steps are proposed. First, the report to the Department for International Development, UK (Puzzolo et al. 2013) includes much more detailed and setting-specific findings, and we would encourage other groups to review this material to identify how implementation could be further enhanced in specific circumstances. Second, research studies are needed to strengthen our understanding of which factors are most important for securing

adoption and sustained use, including maintenance and replacement, and will need to draw on a combination of quantitative and qualitative scientific approaches. Qualitative methods can make an important contribution to ensure understanding of the uptake process, in particular by capturing stakeholder perspectives including those of beneficiaries, communities, government and industry. Prospective evaluations of programmes that incorporate the learning from this review (including a focus on complex and controversial topics such as stove subsidies) will be especially useful.

References

- Albalak A, Bruce NG, McCracken JP, Smith KR. 2001. Indoor respirable particulate matter concentrations from an open fire, improved cookstove, and LPG/open fire combination in a rural Guatemalan community. *Environ Sci Technol* 35(13):2650-55.
- Atkins C, Sampson J. 2002. Critical appraisal guidelines for single case study research. Proceedings of the Tenth European Conference on Information Systems, Poland. Available: <http://is2.lse.ac.uk/asp/aspecis/20020011.pdf> [accessed 13 November 2012].
- Barnes DF, Kumar P, Openshaw K. 2012. Cleaner hearths, better homes: new stoves for India and the developing world. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bonjour S, Adair-Rohani H, Wolf J, Bruce NG, Mehta S, Prüss-Üstün A, et al. 2013. Solid fuel use for household cooking: country and regional estimates for 1980-2010. *Environ Health Perspect* 121(7):784-90.
- Bruce N, Rehfuess EA, Mehta S, Hutton G, Smith KR. 2006. Indoor air pollution. In: Disease control priorities in developing countries. 2nd edition (Jamison DT, Breman JG, Measham AR, Alleyne G, eds). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chapman RS, He X, Blair AE, Lan Q. 2005. Improvement in household stoves and risk of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in Xuanwei, China: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ* 331(7524):1050.
- Dherani M, Pope D, Mascarenhas M, Smith KR, Weber M, Bruce N. 2008. Indoor air pollution from unprocessed solid fuel use and pneumonia risk in children aged under five years: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bull World Health Organ* 86(5):390-398.
- Hanna R, Duflo E, Greenstone M. 2012. Up in smoke: the influence of household behaviour on the long-run impact of improved cooking stoves. NBER Working Paper No. 18033. Cambridge MA: MIT Department of Economics. Available: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w18033> [accessed 20 November 2013].
- Harden A, Brunton G, Fletcher A, Oakley A. 2009. Teenage pregnancy and social disadvantage: systematic review integrating controlled trials and qualitative studies. *BMJ* 339:b4254.
- Hosgood HD, Wei H, Sapkota A, Choudhury I, Bruce N, Smith KR, et al. 2011. Household coal use and lung cancer: systematic review and meta-analysis of case-control studies, with an emphasis on geographic variation. *Int J Epidemiol* 40(3):719-28.

- Hutton G, Rehfuess EA, Tediosi F. 2007. Evaluation of the costs and benefits of interventions to reduce indoor air pollution. *Energy Sustain Dev* 11(4):34-43.
- IEA. 2011. *World Energy Outlook 2011*. Paris: International Energy Agency and OECD. Available: <http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/publications/weo-2011/> [accessed 20 November 2013].
- Jetter J, Zhao Y, Smith KR, Khan B, Yelverton T, Decarlo P, et al. 2012. Pollutant emissions and energy efficiency under controlled conditions for household biomass cookstoves and implications for metrics useful in setting international test standards. *Environ Sci Technol* 46(19):10827-34.
- ISO. 2012. *International Workshop Agreement IWA 11:2012 - Guidelines for evaluating cookstove performance*. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization, 2012. Available: http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail?csnumber=61975 [accessed 20 November 2013].
- Kurmi OP, Semple S, Simkhada P, Smith WC, Ayres JC. 2010. COPD and chronic bronchitis risk of indoor air pollution from solid fuel: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Thorax* 65(3):221-8.
- Lan Q, Chapman RS, Schreinemachers DM, Tian L, He X. 2002. Household stove improvement and risk of lung cancer in Xuanwei, China. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 94(11):826-35.
- Lewis JJ, Pattanayak SK. 2012. Who adopts improved fuels and cookstoves? A systematic review. *Environ Health Perspect* 120(5):637-645.
- Lim SS, Vos T, Flaxman AD, Danaei G, Shibuya K, Adair-Rohani H, et al. 2012. A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet* 380:2224–60.
- Malla MB, Bruce N, Bates L, Rehfuess EA. 2011. Applying global cost-benefit analysis methods to indoor air pollution mitigation interventions in Nepal, Kenya and Sudan: insights and challenges. *Energy Policy* 39:7518-7529.
- Mehta S, Shahpar C. 2004. The health benefits of interventions to reduce indoor air pollution from solid fuel use: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Energy Sustain Dev* 8:53-59.
- Naeher LP, Brauer M, Lipsett M, Zelikoff JT, Simpson DS, Koenig JQ et al. 2007. Woodsmoke health effects: a review. *Inhalation Toxicology* 19:67-106.

- Pine K, Edwards R, Masera OR, Schilman A, Marrón-Mares A, Riojas-Rodríguez H. 2011. Adoption and use of improved biomass stoves in rural Mexico. *Energy Sustain Dev* 15(2):176-83.
- Pokhrel AK, Smith KR, Khalakdina A, Deuja A, Bates MN. 2005. Case-control study of indoor cooking smoke exposure and cataract in Nepal and India. *Int J Epidemiol* 34(3):702-708.
- Pope DP, Mishra V, Thompson L, Siddiqui AR, Rehfuess EA, Weber MW et al. 2010. Systematic review and meta-analyses of risk of low birth weight and stillbirth associated with indoor air pollution in developing countries. *Epidemiol Reviews* 32(1):70-81.
- Pope CA III, Burnett RT, Turner MC, Cohen A, Krewski D, Jerrett M, et al. 2011. Lung cancer and cardiovascular disease mortality associated with ambient air pollution and cigarette smoke: shape of the exposure-response relationships. *Environ Health Perspect* 119(11):1616-21.
- Puzzolo E, Stanistreet D, Pope D, Bruce N, Rehfuess EA. 2011. What are the enabling or limiting factors influencing the large-scale uptake by households of cleaner and more efficient household energy technologies, covering clean fuel and improved solid fuel cookstoves? A systematic review. Protocol. London: EPPI-Centre, University of London. Available: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/Output/188384/Default.aspx> [accessed 13 November 2012].
- Puzzolo E, Stanistreet S, Pope D, Bruce NG, Rehfuess EA. Factors influencing the large scale uptake by households of cleaner and more efficient household energy technologies. A systematic review. London: EPPI-Centre, University of London, 2013. Available: <http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=3426> [accessed 20 November 2013].
- Rehfuess EA, Mehta S, Prüss-Üstün A. 2006. Assessing household solid fuel use – multiple implications for the millennium development goals. *Environ Health Perspect* 114(3):373–378.
- Rehfuess EA. 2008. Fuel for life: household energy and health. Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: <http://www.who.int/indoorair/publications/fuelforlife/en/> [accessed 20 November 2013].
- Rogers E. 1995. Diffusion of innovations. 4th edition. New York: The Free Press.

- Riojas-Rodriguez H, Romano-Riquer P, Santos-Burgoa C, Smith KR. 2001. Household firewood use and the health of children and women of Indian communities in Chiapas, Mexico. *Int J Occup Environ Health* 7(1):44–53
- Ruiz-Mercado I, Masera O, Zamora H, Smith KR. 2011. Adoption and sustained use of improved cookstoves. *Energy Policy* 39:7557-7566.
- Saksena S, Thompson L, Smith KR. 2003. The indoor air pollution and exposure database: household pollution levels in developing countries. Version 1.1 Geneva: World Health Organization. Available: http://www.who.int/indoorair/health_impacts/databases_iap/en/index.html [accessed 13 November 2012].
- SEFA. Sustainable Energy for All Initiative. Available: <http://www.sustainableenergyforall.org> [accessed 13 November 2012].
- Shen M, Chapman RS, Vermeulen R, Tian L, Zheng T, Chen BE, et al. 2009. Coal use, stove improvement, and adult pneumonia mortality in Xuanwei, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Environ Health Perspect* 117(2):261-6.
- Sinton JE, Smith KR, Peabody JW, Yaping L, Xiliang Z, Edwards R, et al. 2004. An assessment of programs to promote improved household stoves in China. *Energy Sustain Dev* 8(3):33-52.
- Smith KR, McCracken JP, Weber MW, Hubbard A, Jenny A, Thompson LM et al. 2011. Effect of reduction in household air pollution on childhood pneumonia in Guatemala (RESPIRE): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 378(9804):1717-26.
- Smith KR, Peel J. 2010. Mind the Gap. *Environ Health Perspect* 118(12):1643–1645.
- Sumpter C, Chandramohan D. 2013. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the associations between indoor air pollution and tuberculosis. *Trop Med Int Health* 18(1):101-8.
- Thomas J, Harden A. 2008. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 8:45.
- United Nations Foundation Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves. Available: <http://www.cleancookstoves.org/> [accessed 13 November 2012].

WHO. 2006. Air quality guidelines. Global update 2005. Copenhagen: World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. Available: <http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/Housing-and-health/publications/pre-2009/air-quality-guidelines.-global-update-2005.-particulate-matter,-ozone,-nitrogen-dioxide-and-sulfur-dioxide> [accessed 20 November 2013].

World Bank. 2011. Household cookstoves, environment, health and climate change: a new look at an old problem. Washington DC: World Bank. Available: <http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/documents/Household%20Cookstoves-web.pdf> [accessed 20 November 2013].

Table 1. Basic characteristics of included studies.

Study ID	Source ^a	Country	Setting	Adoption	Sustained use
(A) Qualitative studies					
A1	Anderson 2007	India	Rural		✓
A2	Chowdhury et al. 2011	Bangladesh	Rural	✓	✓
A3	Christoff 2010	Mexico	Rural	✓	
A4	Gordon et al. 2007	Mongolia	Urban	✓	
A5	Jago et al. 2006a	India	Rural	✓	
A6	Jago et al. 2007a	India	Rural	✓	
A7	Pandey 1989	Nepal	Rural	✓	✓
A8	Person et al. 2012	Kenya	Rural	✓	
A9	Sesan 2012	Kenya	Urban ^b	✓	
A10	Simon 2007	India	Rural	✓	✓
A11	Sovacool and Drupady 2011	Bangladesh	Rural/urban	✓	✓
A12	Troncoso et al. 2007	Mexico	Rural	✓	
A13	Troncoso et al. 2011	Mexico	Rural	✓	
A14	Velasco 2008	Mexico	Rural	✓	
(B) Quantitative studies					
B1	Agurto-Adrianzen 2009	Peru	Rural	✓	
B2	Bensch and Peters 2011	Senegal	Urban	✓	
B3	Damte and Koch 2011	Ethiopia	Urban		✓
B4	El Tayeb Muneer and Mohammed 2003	Sudan	Rural/urban	✓	
B5	George and Yadla 1995	India	Rural	✓	
B6	Inayatullah 2011	Pakistan	Rural	✓	
B7	Jago et al. 2006b	India	Rural	✓	
B8	Jago et al. 2007b	India	Rural	✓	
B9	Levine and Cotterman 2012	Uganda	Urban	✓	
B10	Miller and Mobarak 2011	Bangladesh	Rural	✓	
B11	Mwangi 1992	Kenya	Rural	✓	
B12	Pandey and Yadama 1992	Nepal	Rural	✓	
B13	Pine et al. 2011	Mexico	Rural	✓	
B14	Pushpa 2011	India	Rural	✓	
B15	Silk et al. 2012	Kenya	Rural	✓	
B16	Wallmo and Jacobson 1997	Uganda	Rural	✓	
(C) Case studies					
C1	Amarasekara 1989	Sri Lanka	Rural/urban	✓	
C2	Barnes et al. 2012a	India, Western Maharashtra	Rural/urban		✓
C3	Barnes et al. 2012b	India, Haryana	Rural/urban		✓

Study ID	Source ^a	Country	Setting	Adoption	Sustained use
C4	Barnes et al. 2012c	India, Karnataka	Rural/urban		✓
C5	Barnes et al. 2012d	India, Gujarat	Rural/urban		✓
C6	Barnes et al. 2012e	India, Andhra Pradesh	Rural/urban		✓
C7	Barnes et al. 2012f	India, West Bengal	Rural/urban		✓
C8	GERES 2009	Cambodia	Urban	✓	✓
C9	Kürschner et al. 2009	Bangladesh	Rural/urban	✓	✓
C10	Masera et al. 2005	Mexico	Rural	✓	
C11	Mounkaila 1989	Niger	Urban	✓	
C12	Namuye 1989	Kenya	Urban	✓	
C13	Osei 2010	Ghana	Rural/urban	✓	
C14	Sawadogo 1989	Burkina Faso	Urban	✓	
C15	Shastri et al. 2002	India	Rural		✓
C16	Shrimali et al. 2011	India	Rural/urban		✓
C17	Simon 2010	India	Rural	✓	✓
C18	Sinton et al. 2004	China	Rural/urban		✓
C19	Sudjarwo et al. 1989	Indonesia	Rural	✓	✓
C20	USAID/Winrock 2008	Peru	Rural		✓
C21	USAID/Winrock 2009	Bangladesh	Urban	✓	
C22	World Bank 2004a	Guatemala	Rural	✓	
C23	World Bank 2004b	Guatemala	Rural	✓	
C24	World Bank 2004c	Guatemala	Rural	✓	
C25	World Bank 2010a	Bangladesh	Rural/urban		✓
C26	World Bank 2010b	Bangladesh	Rural/urban		✓
C27	World Bank 2010c	Bangladesh	Urban	✓	

✓ Denotes whether study assesses adoption, sustained use or both.

^aFull references are given in Supplemental Material, Table S1. ^bThis study was conducted in a peri-urban setting.

Table 2. Enabling and limiting factors for uptake of improved stoves

Factor	Type of evidence ^a	Country, type of evidence ^a and setting ^{b, c}
D1. Fuel and technology characteristics		
Fuel savings	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A2,B10, C9,C27} , Burkina Faso ^{C14} , Cambodia ^{C8} , Guatemala ^{C22} , India ^{A1,A5,A10,B7,C2-C7,C16} , Kenya ^{A8,C12} , Mongolia ^{A4} , Mexico ^{A12} , Nepal ^{B12} , Niger ^{C11} , Sri Lanka ^{C1} , Uganda ^{B16}
Impacts on time	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A11,C9} , Burkina Faso ^{C14} , Cambodia ^{C8} , Guatemala ^{C22,C24} , India ^{A1,A6,C2-C7,C16} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{C12} , Mexico ^{A3, A12,A14} , Nepal ^{A7,B12} , Sri Lanka ^{C1} , Uganda ^{B16}
General design requirements	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{C21} , Cambodia ^{C8} , China ^{C18} , Guatemala ^{C22-C24} , India ^{A1,A5,A6,B8,C2-C7,C17} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Mexico ^{A3,A12,A13,B13} , Nepal ^{B12} , Uganda ^{B16}
Durability and other specific design requirements	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{C9} , Burkina Faso ^{C14} , Guatemala ^{C22} , India ^{A1,A6,B8,C7,C17} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{C12} , Mexico ^{A3,A12,C10} , Nepal ^{B12} , Niger ^{C11} , Sri Lanka ^{C1} , Uganda ^{B9,B16}
Fuel requirements	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A2,A11} , Guatemala ^{C24} , India ^{A1,C7,C17} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Mexico ^{A3,A12,A13} , Nepal ^{A7,B12} , Uganda ^{B16}
D2. Household and setting characteristics		
Socio-economic status	A, B, C	Burkina Faso ^{C14} , Ethiopia ^{B3} , India ^{B14,C16} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{A8,A9,B11,B15} , Pakistan ^{B6} , Peru ^{B1} , Senegal ^{B2} , Sudan ^{B4}
Education	B, C	Bangladesh ^{B10} , Ethiopia ^{B3} , India ^{B5,B14} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{B15} , Mexico ^{B13} , Pakistan ^{B6} , Peru ^{B1} , Sri Lanka ^{C1} , Senegal ^{B2} , Sudan ^{B4}
Demographics	B	Ethiopia ^{B3} , India ^{B14} , Kenya ^{B11,B15} , Mexico ^{B13} , Pakistan ^{B6} , Peru ^{B1} , Sudan ^{B4} , Uganda ^{B9}
House ownership and structure	A, B, C	Ethiopia ^{B3} , Kenya ^{A9} , India ^{C3-C5} , Mexico ^{B13, C10} , Peru ^{C20} , Uganda ^{B16}
Multiple fuel and stove use	A, B, C	Cambodia ^{C8} , India ^{A10,B7,C4,C5,C16} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Mexico ^{A12-A14,B13,C10} , Pakistan ^{B6} , Sri Lanka ^{C1}
Geography and climate	A, C	Bangladesh ^{A11,C9} , Cambodia ^{C8} , Guatemala ^{C23} , India ^{A1,C3,C16} , Kenya ^{A8} , Mexico ^{A12} , Mongolia ^{A4} , Niger ^{C11}
D3. Knowledge and perceptions		
Smoke, health and safety	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A11,B10} , Cambodia ^{C8} , Guatemala ^{C23} , India ^{A1,B8,C2-C7,C16} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{A9,C12} , Mexico ^{A3,A14,B13,C10} , Mongolia ^{A4} , Nepal ^{B12} , Niger ^{C11} , Uganda ^{B16}
Cleanliness and home improvement	A, B, C	Guatemala ^{C23,C24} , India ^{A5,B8,C2-C7} , Kenya ^{A8,A9,C12} , Mexico ^{A3,A12,A14,C10} , Mongolia ^{A4} , Nepal ^{A7} , Niger ^{C11} , Uganda ^{B16}
Total perceived benefit	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{C21} , India ^{A1,A6,B8,B14,C4,C6} , Kenya ^{A8,A9} , Mexico ^{A12} , Nepal ^{A7,B12} , Niger ^{C11} , Sudan ^{B4} , Uganda ^{B16}
Social influence	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{B10} , India ^{C2-C4} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{A8,C12} , Mexico ^{A3,A12,A14,B13,C10} , Nepal ^{A7,B12} , Niger ^{C11} , Peru ^{B1,C20} , Uganda ^{B16}
Tradition and culture	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A11} , India ^{A1,A5,A6,C5} , Kenya ^{A8} , Mexico ^{A3,A12,A13} , Nepal ^{A7,B12} , Uganda ^{B16}

Factor	Type of evidence ^a	Country, type of evidence ^a and setting ^{b, c}
D4. Financial, tax and subsidy aspects		
Stove costs and subsidies	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{B10,C26,C27} , Guatemala ^{C22-C24} , India ^{A1,A10,C2,C7,C17} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{A8,A9,C12} , Mongolia ^{A4} , Niger ^{C11} , Uganda ^{B9,B16}
Payment modalities	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{B10,C21,C26} , Ghana ^{C13} , Guatemala ^{C22} , India ^{A5,A6,B8,C16} , Kenya ^{A9} , Mexico ^{C10} , Peru ^{C20} , Uganda ^{B9}
Programme subsidies	A, C	Bangladesh ^{C9,C21,C25} , China ^{C18} , Ghana ^{C13} , Guatemala ^{C22-C24} , India ^{C5,C6,C16} , Kenya ^{A9} , Mexico ^{A13}
D5. Market development		
Demand creation	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{B10, C9,C21,C25,C27} , Burkina Faso ^{C14} , Ethiopia ^{B3} , Guatemala ^{C22-C24} , India ^{A10,C3,C16-C17} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{A8,B11,B15,C12} , Mexico ^{C10} , Niger ^{C11} , Peru ^{C20} , Sudan ^{B4} , Uganda ^{B9,B16}
Supply chains	A, C	Bangladesh ^{A11,C21,C25} , Ghana ^{C13} , Guatemala ^{C22,C23} , India ^{A1,A10,C6,C16} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{A8} , Niger ^{C11} , Sri Lanka ^{C1}
Business and sales approach	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A11,C9,C21} , Cambodia ^{C8} , Ghana ^{C13} , Guatemala ^{C22,C23} , India ^{A10,C3-C6,C16,C17} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Kenya ^{A8,B15} , Mexico ^{C10} , Uganda ^{B9}
D6. Regulation, legislation and standards		
Regulation, certification and standardization	A, C	Cambodia ^{C8} , China ^{C18} , Guatemala ^{C22} , Kenya ^{A8,C12} , India ^{C4,C6,C7,C16} , Niger ^{C11}
Enforcement mechanisms	C	Cambodia ^{C8} , China ^{C18} , India ^{C2,C3,C5,C7,C16,C17}
D7. Programmatic and policy mechanisms		
Construction and installation	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A2,C26,C9} , Cambodia ^{C8} , China ^{C18} , Guatemala ^{C22-C24} , India ^{A6,B5,C2-C7} , Mexico ^{A3,A12} , Nepal ^{A7} , Peru ^{C20} , Sri Lanka ^{C1}
Institutional arrangements	A, C	Bangladesh ^{A11,C25} , China ^{C18} , Guatemala ^{C23,C24} , India ^{C2-C7,C16,C17} , Kenya ^{A9} , Sri Lanka ^{C1}
Community involvement	A, C	Bangladesh ^{C21,C26} , Guatemala ^{C22} , India ^{A10,C2-C6} , Kenya ^{A9} , Mexico ^{A13,C10}
Creation of competition	C	Cambodia ^{C8} , China ^{C18} , India ^{C2-C5,C7} , Peru ^{C20}
User training	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A11,C9,C25,C26} , Guatemala ^{C22,C23} , India ^{B5,C2-C5,C7,C16} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Mexico ^{A3,A12,C10}
Post-acquisition support	A, B, C	Bangladesh ^{A11,C9,C25,C26} , India ^{A10,B5,C2-C4,C6,C7,C16} , Mexico ^{A3,A13}
Monitoring and quality control	C	Bangladesh ^{C9,C21,C25,C27} , Cambodia ^{C8} , Guatemala ^{C22-C24} , India ^{C2-C7,C16} , Indonesia ^{C19} , Mexico ^{C10} , Niger ^{C11}


^aA = qualitative studies, B=quantitative studies, C = case studies. ^bAll factors are supported by findings in rural as well as urban settings. ^cDesignations such as A1, B2 and C3 refer to study IDs (see Table 1).

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Framework of factors enabling or limiting uptake of cleaner cooking technologies.

This framework illustrates how seven domains – one relating to the characteristics of the intervention, two operating at household/community and four operating at programme/societal level – affect uptake of IS. Uptake at scale comprises short-term adoption as well as longer-term sustained use and may take place in equitable or less equitable ways. Factors within the seven domains may enable or limit one or several of adoption, sustained use and equity.

Figure 2. Factors influencing uptake of improved solid fuel stoves across seven domains






Figure 2.