

# Environmental Science Advances

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: T. A. Abebe, S. Sebastian and G. T. Tucho, *Environ. Sci.: Adv.*, 2026, DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Environmental significance statement

The environmental significance statement for the paper on spatial analysis of human fecal waste in rural Oromia, Ethiopia, emphasizing biomethane and nutrient recovery potential could be:

This study highlights the environmental benefits of utilizing human fecal waste in rural Oromia to produce biomethane and recover essential nutrients. By spatially analyzing waste distribution and recovery potential, it demonstrates a sustainable approach to waste management that reduces methane emissions—a potent greenhouse gas—while promoting renewable energy production and soil health restoration through nutrient recycling. This integrated biomethane and nutrient recovery strategy supports environmental sustainability, climate change mitigation, and improved agricultural productivity in resource-limited rural communities. Such interventions contribute to the circular bioeconomy, waste reduction, and enhanced local livelihood resilience.

This statement integrates key environmental advantages of biomethane production and nutrient recovery from waste, informed by recent understandings of their role in renewable energy, greenhouse gas mitigation, and soil fertility improvement.



# Spatial Analysis of Human Fecal Waste in Rural Oromia, Ethiopia: Biomethane and Nutrient Recovery Potential

View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C

Thomas Ayalew Abebe\*, Semella Sebastian, Gudina Terefe Tucho

Thomas Ayalew Abebe (first author and \*corresponding author) – Jimma University, Institute of Health, Department of Environmental Health Sciences and Technology, Jimma, Ethiopia. ORCID: 0000-0002-0399-4106, email: [ayalewthomas@gmail.com](mailto:ayalewthomas@gmail.com)

Semella Sebastian- DBFZ – Deutsches Biomasseforschungszentrum gemeinnützige GmbH, Leipzig, Germany

Gudina Terefe Tucho - Jimma University, Institute of Health, Department of Environmental Health Sciences and Technology, Jimma, Ethiopia. ORCID: 0000-0001-7848-5456

## Abstract

Sanitation remains a critical development and public-health challenge, particularly in rural Ethiopia, where only 7% of the population resides and access to safely managed sanitation. This study models the spatial distribution and resource-recovery potential of human feces in rural Oromia, integrating high-resolution population data with experimentally validated methane yields and nutrient contents. Model-based estimates suggest annual feces production of ~2 million tonnes, corresponding to ~27.9 PJ of biomethane energy and 7,309 t N, 2,206 t P, and 4,511 t K—equivalent to over 2.6 billion birr in synthetic fertilizer. Resource potential is spatially uneven, with northeastern and central highlands offering the greatest opportunities for biogas and nutrient recovery. Biogas digesters are best suited to livestock-rich highlands, urine-diverting dry toilets to peri-urban areas, and composting or container-based systems to low-income, nutrient-depleted communities. Adoption, however, is hindered by socio-cultural perceptions, financial constraints, and institutional gaps. Coordinated action across health, water-energy, agriculture, environmental protection, and infrastructure sectors—supported by strong regulation, targeted financing, community engagement, and public-private partnerships—is essential for scaling. With context-specific deployment and institutional support, Resource-Oriented Sanitation Technologies can convert human waste into a circular resource that enhances rural energy access, soil fertility, environmental sustainability, improves public health, and advances progress toward the Sustainable Development Goals.

**Keywords:** Resource-Oriented Sanitation, Biogas Potential, Nutrient Recovery, Rural Ethiopia



## Introduction

View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C

Sanitation remains one of the most critical global development and public-health challenges. Around 4.2 billion people worldwide rely on on-site sanitation systems, many of which lack effective containment, treatment, and resource recovery, resulting in significant health risks, environmental pollution, and missed opportunities for energy and nutrient recovery (1).

Ethiopia's reduction in open defecation — from 82% to 29% during the Millennium Development Goal period — represents one of the largest declines globally. However, only 7% of households currently have access to safely managed sanitation services, while 70-80% rely on unimproved latrines or basic pit systems (2-4). These systems often fail to safely isolate, treat, or dispose of fecal waste, leading to environmental contamination and high burdens of diarrheal and sanitation-related diseases (2, 5-8).

The sanitation crisis is especially pronounced in rural Ethiopia, where 77.5% of the population resides (9). Rural communities face intertwined challenges: inadequate sanitation infrastructure, energy poverty, and low agricultural productivity (10, 11). Residential cooking accounts for about 80% of total energy consumption, dominated by biomass fuels that produce hazardous indoor air pollution. Children in households using biomass fuels are 2.6–3.89 times more likely to suffer acute respiratory infections, while women experience anemia, respiratory symptoms, and reduced lung function (12-17).

Rural Oromia, Ethiopia's largest region, has large household sizes and high fertility rates (18-21), generating significant quantities of human waste — a resource that remains largely underutilized (22-24). Biogas systems could address both sanitation and energy deficits, yet only 0.3% of households have access to biogas, and 60% of these systems are non-functional due to technical limitations, lack of maintenance, and institutional gaps (25-28). Where adopted, biogas reduces firewood use by 45% and charcoal use by 50.9% (29, 30).

Recent experimental research has strengthened the evidence base for fecal-to-energy conversions. A laboratory study found that fresh human feces yields around 0.39 m<sup>3</sup> CH<sub>4</sub> per kg of fresh matter (14.16 MJ/kg), equivalent to approximately 28.71 m<sup>3</sup> of methane per person per year (22). Human feces show higher energy content than wood biomass and are comparable to wood biochar or bituminous coal (Gohil et al., 2018, Onabanjo et al., 2016, Ward, 2013). Complementary technical research on anaerobic membrane-based treatment and thickening of fecal sludge demonstrates practical pathways to improve feedstock quality and digestion performance, which can increase biogas yields and enable more compact treatment systems suitable for peri-rural deployment (31, 32). Additional studies demonstrate significant nutrient content (N, P, K) in digested feces, reinforcing the potential for bio-fertilizer production (33-37).



Ethiopian soils suffer from severe nutrient depletion — 122 kg N, 13 kg P, and 82 kg K per hectare annually — while over 37% of children are stunted due to malnutrition (Francis et al., 2021, FDRE, 2021). Resource-oriented toilet systems (ROTS) thus offer a dual solution for sanitation, energy and soil fertility (38-41). However, adoption remains low due to cost, lack of demand, cultural attitudes, leadership gaps, and limited space (38, 42). Despite 40% of households expressing interest in ROTS, only 7% show readiness and willingness to pay for adoption (Abebe et al., 2025).

Current sanitation practices also have climate implications. Methane and nitrous oxide emissions from non-sewered systems represent a significant share of sanitation-sector greenhouse gases (43, 44). Container-based sanitation in Nairobi produces 15.72 kg CO<sub>2</sub>-eq per capita annually (45), while emissions from sanitation chains in Kampala may constitute more than half of city-level emissions (46). Non-sewered sanitation systems globally contribute an estimated 4.7% of anthropogenic methane emissions (43). Off-site composting can reduce sanitation methane emissions by 13–44% (47). Comparative studies of fecal sludge management demonstrate the importance of integrating diagnostics, treatment selection, and disposal planning to limit environmental releases and public health threat while enabling resource recovery (32, 48-51).

Despite growing evidence, substantial knowledge gaps remain regarding the spatial distribution, quantity, and resource-recovery potential of fecal waste in rural Oromia. Previous studies have not integrated high-resolution population data, experimental methane yields, and nutrient content data that reflect local diets (52-54). GIS and remote sensing have proven effective for identifying optimal waste-management sites and improving sanitation planning in rural contexts (52-55).

This study addresses this critical gap by conducting a high-resolution spatial analysis of fecal waste generation and resource-recovery potential in rural Oromia. By integrating population data with experimentally validated biomethane yields and nutrient contents, the study identifies hotspots with the greatest potential for communal biogas systems and targeted bio-fertilizer application. The findings offer evidence for policymakers and development practitioners to transform waste from an environmental liability into an energy and agricultural resource, contributing to circular sanitation, climate mitigation, energy access, and sustainable agriculture goals simultaneously.

## Methods

### Study Area and Context

The Oromia region—Ethiopia's largest and most populous state—provides diverse environmental conditions that make spatially targeted resource-recovery planning essential. The quantity and quality of human feces, and thus its biomethane and nutrient-recovery potential, vary with socioeconomic, dietary, geographic, and climatic factors. Rural diets dominated by high-fiber, low-protein staples such



as teff, maize, and legumes generate high fecal volume but lower methane yield and nitrogen content (25, 26). Socioeconomic constraints—including poverty affecting over 24% of residents and limited access to improved sanitation and clean energy—underscore the need for integrated waste-to-energy strategies (56, 57). Oromia's climatic gradient, from cool highlands to arid lowlands, influences decomposition rates and biogas feasibility, with warmer zones offering more favorable anaerobic digestion conditions. Given that up to 80% of rural Ethiopian households rely on biomass fuels for cooking, expanding biogas systems is an urgent priority (12, 58).

### Study Design and Data Sources

This study applies a spatial variability analysis to estimate the potential for nutrient recovery (nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium) and biomethane production from human feces in Ethiopia's Oromia region. Using a Geographic Information System (GIS), we integrate multiple datasets to map the distribution of human waste and its suitability for biofertilizer and biogas production.

The feces production estimate of 73 kg/person/year is grounded in global physiological ranges (0.15–0.4 kg/day) (59), Ethiopia's high-fiber, plant-based diets—dominated by cereals, legumes, and enset—which increase fecal bulk (60), and regional research recommending 70–75 kg/year for rural populations (24, 61, 62). Regional validation from sub-Saharan Africa (e.g., Kenya and Uganda) Comparable ranges from sub-Saharan Africa (65–80 kg/year) further validate this value (59, 63–67). The 73 kg/year figure offers a conservative and context-appropriate basis for resource-recovery planning and aligns with global guidance on safe fecal waste management (24, 68–70).

Biomethane and nutrient recovery estimates explicitly distinguish nutrient concentrations from total annual per-capita yields. The selected methane yield of 28.71 m<sup>3</sup> CH<sub>4</sub>/person/year is derived from experimental anaerobic digestion of feces from rural Ethiopian households (22), and falls within the 23–30 m<sup>3</sup>/person/year range reported in earlier studies (25, 71). A broader meta-analysis of methane yields from non-sewered sanitation systems (43). Similarly shows mean values clustering around 28 m<sup>3</sup>/person/year when conservative excreta production estimates (12 g TS/person/day) are applied. The methane yield and nutrient content values used here rely on experimentally validated measurements, ensuring realistic projections for fecal-based resource recovery. Selecting 28.71 m<sup>3</sup>/person/year avoids optimistic overestimation while remaining consistent with local fecal production rates and volatile solids content, providing a robust foundation for fecal sludge management and biogas planning. See in Table 1.



Table 1: Fourteen groups of literature data on anaerobic digestion with human feces as substrate [View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C

| SN                 | Studies | TS<br>(g/L) | VS<br>(g/L) | VS/TS<br>(%) | MP<br>(L/gVS) | W  | Constant<br>(K) | CH <sub>4</sub><br>density<br>at STP<br>(kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) | CH <sub>4</sub><br>yield<br>(kg/year) | CH <sub>4</sub> yield<br>(m <sup>3</sup> /year) |
|--------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|----|-----------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1                  | (72)    | 15.5        | 10.1        | 0.652        | 0.122         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 7                                     | 10  |
| 2                  | (73)    | NR          | 4.5         | -            | 0.124         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | -                                     | -   |
| 3                  | (74)    | 3.45        | 2.85        | 0.826        | 0.16          | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 12                                    | 16  |
| 4                  | (75)    | 219.5       | 179         | 0.815        | 0.177         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 13                                    | 18  |
| 5                  | (76)    | 4.5         | 2.83        | 0.629        | 0.22          | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 12                                    | 17  |
| 6                  | (77)    | 67          | 52.6        | 0.785        | 0.243         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 17                                    | 23  |
| 7                  | (78)    | 245         | 201         | 0.820        | 0.271         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 19                                    | 27  |
| 8                  | (79)    | 12          | 8.54        | 0.712        | 0.299         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 19                                    | 26  |
| 9                  | (80)    | 145.6       | 128         | 0.879        | 0.327         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 25                                    | 35  |
| 10                 | (81)    | 67.1        | 55.3        | 0.824        | 0.36          | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 26                                    | 36  |
| 11                 | (82)    | 47.94       | 35.48       | 0.740        | 0.402         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 26                                    | 36  |
| 12                 | (83)    | 3.2         | 2.6         | 0.813        | 0.449         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 32                                    | 45  |
| 13                 | (84)    | 150         | 130.5       | 0.870        | 0.471         | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 36                                    | 50  |
| 14                 | (85)    | 4.4         | 3.8         | 0.864        | 0.3           | 12 | 7300            | 0.716  | 23                                    | 32  |
| <b>Pooled mean</b> |         | -           | -           | -            | -             | -  | -               | -  | -                                     | <b>28</b>                                       |

**Notes:**

1. TS = Total Solids, VS = Volatile Solids, MP = Methane Potential, W = daily fecal solids production.
2. W (12 g TS/person/day) represents a low-end conservative estimate of fecal solids production, appropriate for rural or low-income settings with lower dietary protein/energy intake.
3. Constant (K = 7300) converts daily volatile solids and methane production to annual methane emissions (grams/year), encapsulating chemical conversion and unit scaling.
4. CH<sub>4</sub> density at STP = 0.716 kg/m<sup>3</sup>.
5. "NR" = Not reported; "-" indicates data unavailable or not applicable.

In contrast, (86), reported a combined theoretical energy potential of 8,568 GJ/year from food waste and human excreta at Jimma University, without isolating methane yields specifically from feces. Their estimates were based on aggregated institutional waste streams, making them less directly comparable to rural household conditions. For nutrient recovery, (22) measured per-kilogram concentrations of 3.71 g N, 1.12 g P, and 2.29 g K, whereas (86) reported annual per-capita totals of 4 kg N, 0.6 kg P, and 0.96 kg K. These differences reflect distinct methodological approaches: Donacho et al. quantify nutrient content per unit mass of feces, while Tucho and Okoth derive aggregated yearly outputs from a controlled institutional setting characterized by consistent diets and high excreta collection efficiency.

To provide realistic estimates for decentralized rural environments, this study adopts a methane potential of 28.71 m<sup>3</sup>/person/year and uses experimentally measured nutrient concentrations (g/kg) converted to annual totals (t/year). Monetary valuation of recoverable nutrients was performed by converting modeled N, P, and K quantities into equivalent amounts of urea, DAP, and muriate of potash





using standard nutrient content factors, and applying average import prices of approximately 536 USD/tonne (urea), 702 USD/tonne (DAP), and 443 USD/tonne (potash) (87, 88).

To estimate the rural population of Oromia's districts (woredas), highly disaggregated population data were integrated into a GIS. Total population grids were combined with a settlement typology to distinguish rural from urban areas. Two datasets were used:

**I) GHS-POP R2023A — Multitemporal Global Population Grid (89):**

**Scope & Resolution:** Global population estimates (1975–2030) at 100 m resolution.

**Method:** Census counts are dasymetrically redistributed using built-up extents from Sentinel-2, Landsat, and elevation data, yielding standardized 100 m raster estimates of population per cell, see (90).

**II) GHS-SMOD R2023A — Degree of Urbanisation Classification (91):**

**Scope & Resolution:** Global settlement typology (urban centres, clusters, rural areas) at 1 km resolution.

**Method:** Combines GHS-POP density with built-up surfaces from Sentinel-2 and Landsat to implement UN Stage I DoU criteria, see (90).

The Global Administrative Areas dataset (GADM, 2022) supported spatial aggregation and cartographic outputs. Data acquisition and raster processing were conducted in Google Earth Engine (GEE), with final analyses and mapping completed in QGIS 3.40.


## Geospatial Analysis for Rural Population Identification

GHS-POP and GHS-SMOD grids for Oromia (reference year 2020) were accessed in GEE. Rural populations were isolated by masking out urban areas: GHS-SMOD classes 30 (Urban Centre), 23 (Dense Urban Cluster), and 22 (Semi-Dense Urban Cluster) were reclassified to 0, while all other classes were set to 1. Multiplying this binary mask with GHS-POP removed urban populations and preserved rural cells.

Non-zero pixel values were then aggregated using Reducer.sum with the GADM 2022 boundaries as the reference geometry. The resulting woreda-level rural population estimates were exported as tables and further analyzed in Excel to compute feces production as well as methane and nutrient recovery potentials. Quality control was performed by comparing derived figures with available local census data; see in Figure 1.







*Figure 1 Flowchart illustrating the geospatial analysis of fecal production in rural communities of Oromia, Ethiopia, based on spatially explicit demographic raster data, urbanization classification, and zonal statistics at the district (Woreda) level, 2025.*

### Data Processing and Mapping

All calculations of total feces production, biomethane yield, and nutrient recovery were performed in Microsoft Excel using rural population estimates from GHS-POP 2023A and GHS-SMOD 2023A, combined with per-capita feces production (73 kg/person/year) and experimentally derived values for methane (28.71 m<sup>3</sup> CH<sub>4</sub>/person/year) and nutrients 3.71 g N/kg (0.27t/year), 1.12 g P/kg (0.082t/year), and 2.29 g K/kg (0.167t/year) per person (22).

Results were mapped in QGIS 3.40 using Oromia's georeferenced administrative boundaries. Raster analysis and binary classification isolated rural populations, while thematic maps employed Inverse Distance Weighting (IDW) interpolation to visualize spatial gradients in feces production, biomethane yield, and nutrient recovery.

Hotspot areas were overlaid with climate zones—Köppen–Geiger, 1991–2020; (92), poverty prevalence (Relative Wealth Index; (93)), and agriculture typology based FAO Agricultural Typology dataset (94), to assess practical applicability of ROTS technologies. Soil nutrient potential was integrated using the Africa SoilGrids Nutrient Clusters dataset at 30 m resolution (95). Data were reprojected to EPSG:4326 and clipped to the Oromia boundary for alignment across layers. Model reliability was verified using out-of-bag accuracy (~65%) and visual assessment of cluster separation.

The final suitability map combined wealth, agriculture, climate, soil, and road-proximity layers in a GIS-based overlay model. Nested conditional statements and slope-based masking ensured geotechnical feasibility. Outputs were classified, symbolized, and polygonized to inform planning, stakeholder engagement, and decision-making for targeted biogas and bio-fertilizer interventions. These



spatial analyses provide a robust evidence base linking biophysical resource potential to practical implementation strategies, supporting SDG-aligned sanitation and energy planning in Oromia.

Results

Overview of Spatial Distribution

A GIS-based spatial analysis was conducted to evaluate human fecal resource generation and its potential for nutrient recovery and biogas production across Oromia. Administrative units were mapped for five key variables: human feces (kt/year), biomethane (Bio-CH<sub>4</sub>, million m<sup>3</sup>/year), nitrogen (t/year), phosphorus (t/year), and potassium (t/year). Consistent color scales facilitated direct spatial comparisons and highlighted regional heterogeneity.

Resource distribution is highly uneven. High-value clusters occur primarily in northeastern, central, and southwestern districts, corresponding to areas of higher rural population density, while southern, northern, eastern, and some southwestern districts show lower values for all variables. These spatial patterns, clearly visualized in classification maps, provide critical guidance for identifying hotspots and low-potential zones, enabling targeted interventions in resource recovery and decentralized biogas and bio-fertilizer planning.




Figure 2: Total population versus to rural population of Oromia region as derived from geospatial analysis based on population raster data (GHS POP 2023A) and raster data on degree of urbanization (GHS SMOD 2023A) via Google Earth Engine, 2025.



## Population Estimate

View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C

Oromia's rural population is estimated at 27 million, representing 61% of the region's total population. The highest rural population is found in East Hararghe zone (3.36 million), while Borena zone has the lowest (364,846). This demographic variation is a primary driver of the spatial patterns observed in resource generation; see in Figure 2.

## Human Feces Production

The analysis revealed that rural areas in the Oromia region of Ethiopia generate approximately 2 million tonnes of human feces annually. The spatial analysis highlights marked disparities across the region, with the lowest production class ( $\leq 2$  kt/year) was predominantly observed in the southern and southwestern parts of the study area, with several contiguous administrative units falling into this category. Intermediate production classes (2–4.8, 4.8–10.7, and 10.7–15.4 kt/year) were distributed throughout the central and western regions. The highest production class (15.4–24.9 kt/year) was concentrated in the northeastern administrative units, forming a distinct cluster. Notably, the maximum value class ( $\leq 24.9$  kt/year) was observed in several adjacent units in the northeast, indicating a regional hotspot for fecal resource generation; see in

, Map A.

## Biogas Methane (Bio-CH<sub>4</sub>) Potential

Annual human feces production translating to an estimated 775 million cubic meters of methane per year. With an energy conversion factor of 36 MJ per cubic meter, this equates to an energy potential of approximately 27.89 petajoules per year—enough to meet a substantial share of rural household cooking energy demands if properly harnessed. Human feces production exhibited marked spatial variability across the administrative units.

The spatial pattern of biogas methane potential closely mirrored that of human feces production, as expected due to the direct relationship between the two variables. The lowest class ( $\leq 0.8$  million m<sup>3</sup>/year) was found mainly in the southern and southwestern administrative units. The highest class ( $\leq 9.8$  million m<sup>3</sup>/year) was concentrated in the northeastern region, overlapping with the areas of highest fecal production. Intermediate classes were dispersed throughout the central and western portions of the study area; see in

, Map A.

## Nutrient Content Distribution (Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Potassium —NPK)

The total annual recoveries for the region are estimated at 7,309 tonnes of nitrogen, 2,206 tonnes of phosphorus, and 4,511 tonnes of potassium. These quantities are significant given Ethiopia's reliance



on imported synthetic fertilizers, highlighting the potential for locally sourced, circular nutrient solutions. View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C

From a nutrient recovery perspective, the analysis estimates annual recoveries of 7,309 tonnes of nitrogen (N), 2,206 tonnes of phosphorus (P), and 4,511 tonnes of potassium (K). These quantities are significant in the context of Ethiopia's reliance on imported synthetic fertilizers, suggesting that treated fecal waste could provide a locally available, circular alternative to improve soil fertility and support smallholder agriculture.

Nitrogen recovery from human fecal resources ranges from  $\leq 7.5$  t/year to  $\leq 93.1$  t/year across administrative units. The lowest values are prevalent in the southern and southwestern regions, while the highest class is observed in the northeast, forming a contiguous high-value zone. The highest nitrogen recovery ( $> 57$  t/year) is localized in unit 4300; see in

, Map A.

Phosphorus recovery ranges from  $\leq 2.3$  t/year to  $\leq 27.9$  t/year. The lowest class is mainly found in the southern and southwestern units, while the highest class is concentrated in the northeast. Phosphorus mirrors potassium distribution, peaking in central zones but dropping sharply in peripheral districts; see in

, Map A.

Potassium content varies from  $\leq 4.6$  t/year to  $\leq 57.5$  t/year, following the same general spatial pattern as nitrogen. The lowest values are in the southern and southwestern units, with peak values ( $> 35.2$  t/year) in central units (3900–4100); see in

, Map A.

### Regional Patterns, Clustering, and Spatial Gradients

A spatial gradient refers to a consistent geographic pattern in the distribution of a variable across space—in this case, the gradual increase in fecal waste, biomethane potential, and nutrient recovery from the northern to southern districts of Oromia. This gradient was identified through spatial interpolation and classification mapping in QGIS, based on district-level data derived from rural population density and experimentally validated yield estimates.

A consistent spatial clustering of high values for all variables is observed in the northeastern part of Oromia, corresponding to administrative units with higher population densities. The southwestern and central regions also emerge as high-potential zones, particularly for fecal production and methane generation. The analysis reveals a clear north-to-south escalation across all parameters: fecal production



risers from less than 4.8 kt/year in the northern units (3500–3700) to more than 15.4 kt/year in the southern districts (4100–4300). Similarly, Bio-CH<sub>4</sub> potential increases from under 1.87 million m<sup>3</sup>/year in the north to over 6.05 million m<sup>3</sup>/year in the southwest. Nutrient recovery (N, P, K) follows the same trend, increasing by factors of 5 to 12 between low-output and high-output zones.

The southwestern and central regions (units 3900–4300) account for over 75% of the highest value thresholds, primarily due to high rural population concentrations. In contrast, the northern and eastern districts (units 3500–3700) consistently fall below key resource thresholds.


View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C







Spatial analysis reveals six tiers of resource density per km<sup>2</sup>, with highest-yield zones concentrating  $\leq 46$  t feces,  $\leq 18,300$  m<sup>3</sup> biogas, and nutrient fluxes up to 0.17t N, 0.11t K, and 0.05t P annually; see in



, Map B.

View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C

## Discussion

### Biomethane potential and Energy implication

Our Model estimates rural Oromia generates over 2 million tonnes of human feces annually, potentially yielding approximately 27.89 PJ of methane energy—a substantial yet underutilized opportunity to reduce reliance on traditional biomass fuels, a major contributor to indoor air pollution and respiratory disease in Ethiopia (12, 17, 25). This aligns with findings from other regions, where fresh fecal sludge can produce 234–627 mL CH<sub>4</sub>/g VS when digested promptly (96, 97), though delayed emptying and weak sanitation services, as observed in Pakistan, reduce energy and nutrient recovery (98). Despite this potential, only ~0.3% of Ethiopian households currently use biogas systems, and over 60% of these are non-functional due to technical failures and poor maintenance (26, 39).

Household biogas in Oromia could be financially attractive if implemented properly. Similar studies also show that biogas digesters yield positive returns, especially when nutrient savings from bio-slurry are considered (99, 100). Programs such as the Africa Biogas Partnership Program (ABPP) have demonstrated reduced fuel consumption, improved crop yields, and health benefits (101). Nevertheless, widespread adoption is constrained by high upfront costs, limited credit access, and maintenance challenges (101, 102). Successful deployment requires building technical capacity, education, and local supply chains (102–104).

Given limitations such as low livestock ownership and land scarcity in parts of Oromia (25, 105), Resource-Oriented Toilet Systems (ROTS) provide a practical alternative for sustainable sanitation and energy production. Human feces have demonstrated significant biogas potential under these systems (22), reducing firewood and charcoal consumption (29). Integration of human and livestock waste in mixed farming systems can further enhance methane yields and nutrient recovery, potentially decreasing dependence on mineral fertilizers. Socioeconomic factors influence adoption and management practices, underscoring the need for context-specific implementation strategies (33).

### Agricultural Value and Nutrient Recovery

According to our model the reuse of treated human feces in Oromia could supply approximately 7,309 t N, 2,206 t P, and 4,511 t K annually, equivalent to over 2.6 billion birr in synthetic fertilizer imports. Globally, studies demonstrate the agronomic benefits of treated fecal sludge and composted human waste, including improved crop yields for leafy vegetables, maize, soybean, and other crops (106–111). Economic assessments indicate that including nutrient recovery substantially enhances returns, with IRRs exceeding 50% in some contexts (63, 100, 112, 113).





Safe recovery is essential due to public health risks from pathogens such as *Escherichia coli* and *Ascaris* spp. Effective treatment methods include thermophilic composting, solar drying, urea stabilization, urine diversion, fecal separation, co-digestion with agricultural residues, and extended storage, all of which reduce pathogen loads and preserve nutrient content (114-122). Context-specific, decentralized solutions are critical where centralized treatment is unavailable.

### Psychosocial, Socioeconomic and Institutional Constraints

Despite technological feasibility, adoption of ecological sanitation and biogas systems in rural Ethiopia faces significant cultural, behavioral, and institutional barriers. Over 70% of households in rural Oromia view human waste reuse as culturally unacceptable (39). Adoption is shaped by attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and technology compatibility, as explained by the Theory of Planned Behavior (123). and Diffusion of Innovation model (124, 125). Other barriers include construction costs, limited awareness, low household income, land scarcity, livestock ownership, and infrastructure constraints (26, 38, 39, 42, 100, 124, 126-130).

Institutional and technical challenges further limit adoption. Inadequate training, supply chain gaps, and insufficient maintenance services reduce functionality, with programs like Ethiopia's National Biogas Programme achieving only ~50% of targets (27, 28, 131). Addressing these constraints requires integrated, multi-level interventions, including financial incentives, microfinance, hands-on training, culturally tailored education, and private-sector engagement to support safe, efficient, and economically viable resource recovery (39, 42, 132-139).

Collectively, these insights highlight the potential of treated human waste to enhance soil fertility, support sustainable agriculture, and provide energy, while emphasizing that socio-cultural and institutional factors must be addressed to realize the full benefits of ecological sanitation in Oromia.

### Resource Oriented Sanitation Technology Suitability in Oromia

The spatial integration or overlay of on Figure 5 is based on wealth index, climate zones, agricultural typologies, and soil nutrient clusters on Figure 4 across Oromia reveals distinct regional entry points for deploying resource-oriented sanitation technologies (ROST) that align with ecological capacity and agricultural demand while remaining socio-economically viable.

This approach quantifies potential biomethane and nutrient recovery while accounting for settlement morphology, population density, and ecological capacity.

High-wealth zones, predominantly in central and western mixed-farming highlands, exhibit strong feasibility for household- and community-scale biogas systems. These areas coincide with livestock-dense agricultural typologies, stable climates favorable for anaerobic digestion (tropical monsoon to



warm-temperate), and nutrient-rich soil clusters (C1, C11, C16, C20). Resilient soils, including Nitisols and Andisols, can safely receive digestate, enabling integrated waste treatment and soil fertility enhancement (37, 140-142).




Figure 4: (A) Agricultural typology map of Oromia (low to high land use), demonstrating spatial variation in crop–livestock intensity and demand for recovered fertilizer inputs based on FAO Agricultural Typology Dataset (94), (B) Climate classification zones of Oromia, representing the biophysical constraints from tropical monsoon to arid steppe belts that inform water-independent versus anaerobic digestion suitability based Köppen–Geiger data set (92), (C) Soil nutrient-cluster typology of Oromia (band 1, class 1–20), mapping soil organic matter and plant-available NPK receptivity clusters that govern digestate absorption thresholds and urine-fertilizer targeting potential based on Africa-wide SoilGrids Nutrient Clusters dataset (95), and (D) Relative Wealth Index spatial distribution across Oromia, showing household investment feasibility gradients derived from the rasterized wealth index surface based on chi et al dataset,(93), 2025.

Peri-urban and upper-middle wealth belts, intersecting moderate-to-high agricultural opportunity zones with partial aridity and moderately receptive soils (C3, C4, C5, C14, C17, C19), are suited for decentralized urine-diverting dry toilets (UDDTs). These systems produce concentrated nitrogen–phosphorus streams that can be applied to cropland in controlled doses without overloading water-limited soils (143-145).

The poorest, remote, and nutrient-depleted zones (C8, C12, C13) with steep slopes and low agricultural priority are suitable only for light-infrastructure sanitation, such as simplified UDDTs or subsidized CBS networks, with nutrient reuse limited to household gardens, tree pits, or micro-plots. Across all zones, ROST deployment must align sanitation technology with household affordability and ecological nutrient thresholds to maximize recovery while ensuring environmental safety (1).






Figure 5: Final resource-oriented sanitation technology (ROST) targeting map resulting from the 4-layer GIS overlay (wealth + agriculture + climate + soil nutrient clusters), classifying Oromia into discrete reuse-aligned infrastructure zones: Biogas-enabled digesters (green gradient), Nitrogen-deficit UDDT urine routes (yellow gradient), Road-aligned container-based sanitation corridors (red gradient), and biomass-supported composting belts (brown gradient), 2025.

### Spatial Targeting and Policy Recommendations

Recent GIS-based analyses underscore the resource recovery potential of human waste for biomethane production and nutrient recycling. Globally, human excreta could supply up to 22% of phosphorus demand (146), while experimental studies in Ethiopia report biomethane yields of 0.393 m<sup>3</sup>/kg and substantial nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium content in feces (22), highlighting its dual role as bioenergy feedstock and organic fertilizer. Complementary global studies demonstrate hotspots of nutrient depletion and accumulation (147) and identify spatial constraints on biomethane and heat production from biomass, emphasizing the feasibility of localized energy recovery near population centers (148).

Applying these insights to Oromia, high-potential districts emerge where population density, fecal biomass availability, and nutrient output converge, offering strategic targets for pilot circular sanitation projects. Faecal sludge reuse in agriculture presents opportunities for waste management and soil fertility enhancement but requires addressing financial viability, health risks, and cultural perceptions (149-152).



Effective deployment of circular sanitation and resource-recovery systems in Ethiopia requires coordinated, sector-wide action anchored in clear institutional mandates, strong regulatory frameworks, and integrated planning across ministries. The Ministry of Health should enforce multi-barrier treatment standards for all fecal waste while leading national behavior change campaigns through the Health Extension Program to address cultural resistance to reuse. The Ministry of Water and Energy must integrate waste-to-energy solutions into the national energy strategy, issue technical guidelines for digesters, and expand rural renewable energy programs to include biogas for household and productive uses. The Ministry of Agriculture should formally recognize treated human waste as an approved organic fertilizer, develop nutrient-application guidelines tailored to soil clusters and crop systems, and build the capacity of Development Agents to promote safe reuse within climate-smart agriculture programs. The Ethiopian Environmental Protection Authority must establish and enforce environmental and public-health regulations governing treatment plants, effluent quality, and nutrient runoff while linking methane-emission reductions to Ethiopia's climate commitments. The Ministry of Urban and Infrastructure needs to strategically plan and allocate land for treatment facilities, integrate container-based sanitation into dense settlements, and standardize designs for decentralized systems in small towns. The Ministry of Finance should create financing mechanisms—including subsidies, tax incentives, and microfinance instruments—to support households, cooperatives, and private actors investing in biogas and resource-recovery technologies. The Ministry of Education and the TVET system must incorporate ecological sanitation, composting, and biogas technical training into curricula to build a skilled workforce, while universities expand research on pathogen removal, digester performance, and nutrient recovery. The Ministry of Industry and SME development agencies should strengthen domestic manufacturing of biogas components, UDDT parts, and CBS equipment and establish quality standards to ensure durable products. Climate and disaster management institutions must prioritize waterless sanitation and biogas systems in drought-prone regions to strengthen resilience and reduce dependence on firewood and imported fertilizers. Regional governments, woredas, and kebeles should use GIS-based targeting to identify suitable zones for specific technologies, mobilize communities, enforce construction standards, and ensure the safe transport and end-use of treated products. Private-sector operators and PPP models are essential for scaling fecal sludge collection, transport, treatment, and nutrient-recovery businesses, while civil society organizations play a critical role in community engagement, training, and inclusion of marginalized groups. Collectively, these coordinated actions—supported by cross-sectoral collaboration, regulatory alignment, financing mechanisms, and strong supply chains—are essential for transforming human waste from an environmental liability into a driver of energy security, soil fertility, and sustainable rural development in Ethiopia. These measures can simultaneously improve rural sanitation, energy security, soil fertility, and climate resilience. By adapting best practices to local conditions, Oromia can transform human waste into a vital resource for sustainable development.





## Limitations

Reported biomethane and nutrient recovery values are model-derived estimates based on spatially explicit population data and laboratory yields, not direct field measurements. They should be interpreted as indicative potential for planning and prioritization rather than actual recovered resources. A formal sensitivity analysis was not conducted, although laboratory measurements provide a reliable baseline.

## Conclusion

Human waste in rural Oromia represents a significant, underutilized resource for sustainable energy and agriculture. Our model estimates over 2 million tonnes of feces could yield ~27.9 PJ of biomethane and supply substantial nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium—equivalent to over 2.6 billion birr in synthetic fertilizer. Spatial analysis identifies region-specific opportunities: biogas digesters in livestock-rich highlands, UDDTs in peri-urban zones, and simplified composting or container-based sanitation in low-income, nutrient-depleted areas.

Realizing this potential requires addressing cultural, financial, and institutional barriers through capacity building, tailored education, financial incentives, and cross-sectoral coordination. Safe, context-specific deployment of Resource-Oriented Sanitation Technologies can enhance rural energy security, soil fertility, and environmental sustainability, transforming human waste into a vital component of circular sanitation and sustainable development.

Estimates are model-based and intended for planning and prioritization rather than direct field measurement.

## Data Availability

- The dataset used to generate maps, calculations, and shape files, are available from the corresponding author upon request.

## Declaration of AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

- During manuscript preparation, the non-native English authors used ChatGPT and Grammarly to improve readability and proofreading. All text was carefully reviewed and edited by the authors, who take full responsibility for the final content.

## Author contributions

- T.A.A., S.S., and G.T.T. contributed equally to the conception, the detailed spatial analysis output, replication of the study's conclusions depends on access to the final aggregated Woreda-level output table (containing Population, Feces, Methane, N, P, K totals). All authors read, reviewed, and approved the final version.



**Funding Declaration**View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D5VA00356C

- No funding.

**Ethics and Consent to Participate declarations:**

- Not applicable.

**Competing interests**

- The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**Consent to Publish declaration**

- Not applicable

**Acknowledgements**

- We sincerely thank Jimma University's Department of Environmental Health Sciences and Technology and the German Biomass Research Center (DBFZ) for their support.

**References**

1. Patwa A, Kumar A, Vijay R. Critical review on on-site sanitation technologies: Typologies, treatment and transition towards circular economy. *Bioresource Technology*. 2025/02/01;418:131954.
2. Kassa N, Tagesse D. Accelerating Safely Managed Sanitation (SMS) in Ethiopia: UNICEF Ethiopia; 2023. Available from: <https://www.unicef.org/ethiopia/stories/accelerating-safely-managed-sanitation-sms-ethiopia>.
3. Alemu F, Eba K, Bongor ZT, Youya A, Gerbaba MJ, Teklu AM, et al. The effect of a health extension program on improving water, sanitation, and hygiene practices in rural Ethiopia. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2023 2023/08/07;23(1):836.
4. Desye B, Geto AK, Daba C, Bezie AE, Reda S, Sisay T, et al. Spatial and multilevel analysis of determinant factors for safely managed sanitation services in Ethiopia. *Scientific Reports*. 2025 2025/08/23;15(1):31027.
5. Baye D. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Target 6.2 in Ethiopia: Challenges and Opportunities. *OALib*. 2021 01/01;08:1-28.
6. Ethiopian Ministry of Health. National WASH and Environmental Health Strategy (2021-2025). 2022.
7. Girma M, Hussein A, Norris T, Genye T, Tessema M, Bossuyt A, et al. Progress in Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) coverage and potential contribution to the decline in diarrhea and stunting in Ethiopia. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*. 2024 2024/07/01;20(S5):e13280.
8. EPHI and ICF. Ethiopia Mini Demographic and Health Survey 2019: Final Report. Rockville, Maryland, USA: 2019.
9. UNDESA. Worldmeters. World Population Prospects: The 2024 Revision 2024. Available from: <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/ethiopia-population/>.
10. Bayu HG, editor Towards a healthier food system for rural ethiopia : integrating food production, diets and nutrition2024.
11. Simon B. Briefing on early results: Project to promote efficient cooking with electricity in Ethiopia. 2021.



12. Sanbata H, Asfaw A, Kumie A. Association of biomass fuel use with acute respiratory infections among under- five children in a slum urban of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health*. 2014/10/31;14(1):1122.
13. LaFave D, Beyene A, Bluffstone R, Dissanayake S, Gebreegziabher Z, Mekonnen A, et al. Impacts of improved biomass cookstoves on child and adult health: Experimental evidence from rural Ethiopia. *World Development*. 2021 04/01;140:105332.
14. Enyew HD, Mereta ST, Hailu A. Biomass fuel use and acute respiratory infection among children younger than 5 years in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Public health*. 2021;193:29-40.
15. Alemayehu M, Alemu K, Sharma HR, Gizaw Z, Shibru A. Household Fuel Use and Acute Respiratory Infections in Children Under Five Years of Age in Gondar city of Ethiopia. *Journal of environment and earth science*. 2014;4:77-85.
16. Tamire M, Addissie A, Kumie A, Husmark E, Skovbjerg S, Andersson R, et al. Respiratory Symptoms and Lung Function among Ethiopian Women in Relation to Household Fuel Use. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2019;17.
17. Habtamu D, Abebe B, Seid T. Health risk perceptions of household air pollution and perceived benefits of improved stoves among pregnant women in rural Ethiopia: a mixed method study. *BMJ Open*. 2023 Aug 30;13(8):e072328. PubMed PMID: 37648392. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC10471873. Epub 2023/08/31. eng.
18. Lee H, Kindane EG, Doh YA, Nam EW. Determinants of modern family planning methods in Ethiopia: A community-based, cross-section mixed methods study. *Dialogues in Health*. 2022 2022/12/01;1:100025.
19. Negash WD, Belachew TB, Asmamaw DB, Bitew DA. Predictors of desire to limit childbearing among reproductive age women in high fertility regions in Ethiopia. A multilevel mixed effect analysis. *BMC Public Health*. 2023 2023/05/30;23(1):1011.
20. Dibaba Y. Factors Influencing Women's Intention to Limit Child Bearing in Oromia, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Development*. 2009;23:28-33.
21. Rafiq M, Hailemariam A. Household size in Ethiopia: variations and some recent correlates. *Ethiopian journal of development research*. 1986;8 2:71-100.
22. Donacho DO, Tucho GT, Olani DD, Kabtiyimer HE, Hailu AB, Wolde AD. Experimental evaluation of fresh human feces biogas and compost potential: Evidence for circular economy from waste streams in Ethiopia. *Heliyon*. 2023 Dec;9(12):e22494. PubMed PMID: 38046133. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC10686851. Epub 2023/12/04. eng.
23. Jagisso Y, Aune JB, Angassa A. Unlocking the Agricultural Potential of Manure in Agropastoral Systems: Traditional Beliefs Hindering Its Use in Southern Ethiopia. *Agriculture*. 2019.
24. Obsa O, Tadesse M, Kim D-G, Asaye Z, Yimer F, Gebrehiwot M, et al. Organic Waste Generation and Its Valorization Potential through Composting in Shashemene, Southern Ethiopia. *Sustainability*. 2022;14(6):3660. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/su14063660.
25. Tucho G, Nonhebel S. Bio-Wastes as an Alternative Household Cooking Energy Source in Ethiopia. *Energies*. 2015;8(9):9565-83.
26. Berhe TG, Tesfahuney RG, Desta GA, Mekonnen LS. Biogas plant distribution for rural household sustainable energy supply in Africa. *Energy and Policy Research*. 2017;4(1):10-20.
27. Sime G, Jin Z. Technical and socioeconomic constraints to the domestication and functionality of biogas technology in rural areas of southern Ethiopia. *Cogent Engineering*. 2020;7(1).
28. Tesfay AH, Hailu MH, Gebrerufael FA, Adaramola MS. Implementation and Status of Biogas Technology in Ethiopia- Case of Tigray Region. *Momona Ethiopian Journal of Science*. 2021;12:257-73.





29. Kelebe HE, and Olorunnisola A. Biogas as an alternative energy source and a waste management strategy in Northern Ethiopia. *Biofuels*. 2016 2016/09/02;7(5):479-87. View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1059/B5VA00356C
30. Alemayehu YA. Status and Benefits of Renewable Energy Technologies in the Rural Areas of Ethiopia: A Case Study on Improved Cooking Stoves and Biogas Technologies. *International Journal of Renewable Energy Development*. 2015;4:103-11.
31. Shahid MA, Maqbool N, Khan SJ. An integrated investigation on anaerobic membrane-based thickening of fecal sludge and the role of extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) in solid-liquid separation. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 2022 2022/03/01;305:114350.
32. Maqbool N, Khan SJ, Hashmi I. An integrated assessment of fecal sludge management (FSM) in Islamabad, Pakistan: challenges and treatment solutions. *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*. 2025 2025/02/01;22(4):2577-90.
33. Hellman J, editor Re-sourcing soil fertility 2020.
34. Jones DL, Cross PC, Withers PJA, DeLuca TH, Robinson DA, Quilliam RS, et al. REVIEW: Nutrient stripping: the global disparity between food security and soil nutrient stocks. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. 2013;50:851-62.
35. Weldegebriel R, Araya T, Egziabher YG. Effect of NPK and Blended Fertilizer Application on Nutrient Uptake and Use Efficiency of Selected Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench) Varieties Under Rain-fed Condition in Sheraro District, Northern Ethiopia. *Momona Ethiopian Journal of Science*. 2018;10:140-56.
36. Francis A, Mitiku H, Wassie H, Befekadu G. Soil fertility status, fertilizer application and nutrient balance in SNNPR, southern Ethiopia in contrasting agro-ecological zones of Ethiopia. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*. 2021.
37. Devault M, Woolf D, Lehmann J. Nutrient recycling potential of excreta for global crop and grassland production. *Nature Sustainability*. 2025 2025/01/01;8(1):99-111.
38. Alemu F, Kumie A, Medhin G, Gebre T, Godfrey P. A socio-ecological analysis of barriers to the adoption, sustainability and consistent use of sanitation facilities in rural Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health*. 2017 2017/09/13;17(1):706.
39. Abebe TA, Novotný J, Hasman J, Mamo BG, Tucho GT. Barriers to transition to resource-oriented sanitation in rural Ethiopia. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. 2025 2025/01/01;32(5):2668-81.
40. Drewko A, editor "Resource-Oriented Public Toilets in Developing Countries: Ideas, Design, Operation and Maintenance for Arba Minch, Ethiopia" 2007.
41. Werkneh AA, Gebru SB. Development of ecological sanitation approaches for integrated recovery of biogas, nutrients and clean water from domestic wastewater. *Resources, Environment and Sustainability*. 2023 2023/03/01;11:100095.
42. Tamene A, Afework A. Exploring barriers to the adoption and utilization of improved latrine facilities in rural Ethiopia: An Integrated Behavioral Model for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (IBM-WASH) approach. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(1):e0245289. PubMed PMID: 33428677. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC7799797. Epub 2021/01/12. eng.
43. Cheng S, Long J, Evans B, Zhan Z, Li T, Chen C, et al. Non-negligible greenhouse gas emissions from non-sewered sanitation systems: A meta-analysis. *Environmental research*. 2022 Sep;212(Pt D):113468. PubMed PMID: 35597295. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC9227720. Epub 2022/05/22. eng.
44. McKenna P, Zakaria F, Guest J, Evans B, Banwart S. Will the circle be unbroken? The climate mitigation and sustainable development given by a circular economy of carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus and water. *RSC Sustainability*. 2023;1(4):960-74.
45. Okeny D, Niwagaba CB, Kalibbala HM, McConville JR. Greenhouse gas emissions from container-based sanitation systems in East African cities: a case study in Nairobi, Kenya. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*. 2024;14(12):1231-43.



46. Johnson J, Zakaria F, Nkurunziza AG, Way C, Camargo-Valero MA, Evans B. Whole-system analysis reveals high greenhouse-gas emissions from citywide sanitation in Kampala, Uganda. *Communications Earth & Environment*. 2022 2022/04/05;3(1):80.
47. McNicol G, Jeliarovski J, François JJ, Kramer S, Ryals RA. Climate change mitigation potential in sanitation via off-site composting of human waste. *Nature Climate Change*. 2020;10:545-9.
48. Koulouri ME, Templeton MR, Fowler GD. Source separation of human excreta: Effect on resource recovery via pyrolysis. *J Environ Manage*. 2023 Jul 15;338:117782. PubMed PMID: 37015142. Epub 2023/04/05. eng.
49. Harder R, Wielemaker R, Molander S, Öberg G. Reframing human excreta management as part of food and farming systems. *Water research*. 2020 May 15;175:115601. PubMed PMID: 32203816. Epub 2020/03/24. eng.
50. Macura B, Metson GS, McConville JR, Harder R. Recovery of plant nutrients from human excreta and domestic wastewater for reuse in agriculture: a systematic map and evidence platform. *Environmental Evidence*. 2024 2024/08/20;13(1):21.
51. Woldeyohans AM, Alemayehu E, Rousseau DPL, Mereta ST, Dong P, Linnemann V, et al. Characteristics and management of fecal sludge in Ethiopia with a focus on resource recovery. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2025 2025/02/15;965:178633.
52. Ajisegiri B, Andres LA, Bhatt S, Dasgupta B, Echenique JA, Gething PW, et al. Geospatial modeling of access to water and sanitation in Nigeria. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*. 2019;9(2):258-80.
53. The Water Page. Leveraging GIS Technology for Sanitation Planning n.d. [cited 2025 17 June]. Available from: <https://thewaterpage.com/leveraging-gis-technology-for-sanitation-planning/>.
54. IRES. Why You Should Utilize GIS for WASH Programmes: Indepth Research Institute; 2023 [cited 2025 17 June]. Available from: <https://indepthresearch.org/blog/gis-for-wash-programs/#:~:text=GIS%20technology%20provides%20an%20effective%20way%20to%20map%2C,information%20to%20improve%20planning%2C%20decision-making%2C%20and%20resource%20allocation.>
55. Jones SA. Challenges of Developing a Sanitation Infrastructure Gis for the Tohono O'Odham Nation. *Public Works Management & Policy*. 2003;8:121 - 31.
56. CSA. Ethiopia Socioeconomic Panel Survey, Wave 5 (ESPS-5) 2021-2022. Public Use Dataset. Ref: ETH\_2021\_ESPS-W5\_v02\_M. In: Bank TW, editor. 02 ed2023.
57. UNDP. Multidimensional Poverty Index 2023. Unstacking global poverty: data for high impact action. 2023.
58. Wassie YT, Rannestad MM, Adaramola MS. Determinants of household energy choices in rural sub-Saharan Africa: An example from southern Ethiopia. *Energy*. 2021 2021/04/15;221:119785.
59. Berendes DM, Yang PJ, Lai A, Hu D, Brown J. Estimation of global recoverable human and animal faecal biomass. *Nature Sustainability*. 2018 2018/11/01;1(11):679-85.
60. World Health O, Food, Agriculture Organization of the United N. Diet, nutrition and the prevention of chronic diseases. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2003.
61. Tilley E, Strande L, Luthi C, Mosler HJ, Udert KM, Gebauer H, et al. Looking beyond technology: an integrated approach to water, sanitation and hygiene in low income countries. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2014 Sep 2;48(17):9965-70. PubMed PMID: 25025776.
62. Donacho DO, Tucho GT, Hailu AB. Households' access to safely managed sanitation facility and its determinant factors in Jimma town, Ethiopia. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*. 2022;12(2):217-26.



63. Koné D, Cofie OO, Nelson K. Low-cost options for pathogen reduction and nutrient recovery from faecal sludge. *Wastewater Irrigation and Health*. 2009;171-88. [View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/B5VA00356C
64. Franceys R, Pickford J, Reed R. A guide to the development of on-site sanitation 1992.
65. Gudda FO, Moturi WN, Oduor OS, Muchiri EW, Ensink J. Pit latrine fill-up rates: variation determinants and public health implications in informal settlements, Nakuru-Kenya. *BMC Public Health*. 2019 2019/01/15;19(1):68.
66. Yvonne L, Zziwa A, Banadda N, Wanyama J, Kabenge I, Robert K, et al. Modeling sludge accumulation rates in lined pit latrines in slum areas of Kampala City, Uganda. *African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*. 2016 08/31;10:253-62.
67. Rose C, Parker A, Jefferson B, Cartmell E. The characterization of feces and urine: a review of the literature to inform advanced treatment technology. *Critical reviews in environmental science and technology*. 2015;45(17):1827-79.
68. Jayathilake N, Drechsel P, Keraita B, Fernando S, Hanjra M. RRR Series -Issue 14 - Guidelines and Regulations for Fecal Sludge Management from On-site Sanitation Facilities 2019.
69. Prüss-Ustün A, Wolf J, Bartram J, Clasen T, Cumming O, Freeman M, et al. Burden of disease from inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene for selected adverse health outcomes: An updated analysis with a focus on low- and middle-income countries. *International journal of hygiene and environmental health*. 2019 05/01;222.
70. JMP. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2022: special focus on gender: World Health Organization; 2024.
71. Asfaw A, Benti NE. Challenges and Solutions in Biogas Technology Adoption in Ethiopia: A Review. *Ethiopian Journal of Science and Sustainable Development*. 2022 07/31;9:18.
72. Sun Z-Y, Liu K, Tan L, Tang Y-Q, Kida K. Development of an efficient anaerobic co-digestion process for garbage, excreta, and septic tank sludge to create a resource recycling-oriented society. *Waste Management*. 2017 2017/03/01;61:188-94.
73. Wendland C, Deegener S, Behrendt J, Toshev P, Otterpohl R. Anaerobic digestion of blackwater from vacuum toilets and kitchen refuse in a continuous stirred tank reactor (CSTR). *Water Science and Technology*. 2007;55(7):187-94.
74. Lavagnolo MC, Girotto F, Hirata O, Cossu R. Lab-scale co-digestion of kitchen waste and brown water for a preliminary performance evaluation of a decentralized waste and wastewater management. *Waste Management*. 2017 2017/08/01;66:155-60.
75. van Eekert MHA, Gibson WT, Torondel B, Abilahi F, Liseki B, Schuman E, et al. Anaerobic digestion is the dominant pathway for pit latrine decomposition and is limited by intrinsic factors. *Water Science and Technology*. 2019;79(12):2242-50.
76. Giwa AS, Zhang X, Memon AG, Ali N. Co-Digestion of Household Black Water with Kitchen Waste for a Sustainable Decentralized Waste Management: Biochemical Methane Potential and Mixing Ratios Effects. *Environmental Engineering Science*. 2021 2021/09/01;38(9):877-85.
77. Wang HH, Lau E, Horton R. The Wakley–Wu Lien Teh Prize Essay 2020: Chinese health workers' experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet*. 2020 2020/07/04;396(10243):13.
78. Riungu J, Ronteltap M, van Lier JB. Anaerobic stabilisation of urine diverting dehydrating toilet faeces (UDDT-F) in urban poor settlements: biochemical energy recovery. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*. 2019;9(2):289-99.
79. Chatterjee P, Ghangrekar MM, Rao S. Biogas Production from Partially Digested Septic Tank Sludge and its Kinetics. *Waste and Biomass Valorization*. 2019 2019/02/01;10(2):387-98.



80. Duan N, Zhang D, Khoshnevisan B, Kougias PG, Treu L, Liu Z, et al. Human waste anaerobic digestion as a promising low-carbon strategy: Operating performance, microbial dynamics and environmental footprint. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2020 2020/05/20;256:120414. View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120414
81. Kim J, Kim J, Lee C. Anaerobic co-digestion of food waste, human feces, and toilet paper: Methane potential and synergistic effect. *Fuel*. 2019 2019/07/15;248:189-95.
82. Zuo S, Zhou X, Li Z, Wang X, Yu L. Investigation on Recycling Dry Toilet Generated Blackwater by Anaerobic Digestion: From Energy Recovery to Sanitation. *Sustainability*. 2021;13(8):4090. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/su13084090.
83. Zhang L, Zhang G, Tian M, Zhang J, Zhang Y. Modeling of laminar filmwise condensation of methane with nitrogen on an isothermal vertical plate. *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer*. 2019 2019/06/01;105:10-8.
84. Zhang Y, Liu Y, Ye Y, Shen D, Zhang H, Huang H, et al. Quantitative proteome analysis of colorectal cancer-related differential proteins. *Journal of Cancer Research and Clinical Oncology*. 2017 2017/02/01;143(2):233-41.
85. Rajagopal R, Lim JW, Mao Y, Chen C-L, Wang J-Y. Anaerobic co-digestion of source segregated brown water (feces-without-urine) and food waste: For Singapore context. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2013 2013/01/15;443:877-86.
86. Tucho GT, Okoth T. Evaluation of neglected bio-wastes potential with food-energy-sanitation nexus. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2020 2020/01/01;242:118547.
87. Addis Fortune. Fed Seals Costly Fertiliser Deal, Demand Remains Unmet 2025 [cited 2025 15 March 2025]. Available from: <https://addisfortune.news/fed-seals-costly-fertiliser-deal-demand-remains-unmet/>.
88. Food, Agriculture Organization of the United N. Fertilizer and Plant Nutrition Guide. Rome: FAO; 2013.
89. Schiavina MF, Sergio; MacManus, Kytt; Carioli, Alessandra. GHS-POP R2023A – GHS population grid multitemporal (1975–2030) In: European Commission JRCJ, editor. 2023.
90. Pesaresi M, Marcello S, Panagiotis P, Sergio F, Katarzyna K, H. UJ, et al. Advances on the Global Human Settlement Layer by joint assessment of Earth Observation and population survey data. *International Journal of Digital Earth*. 2024 2024/12/31;17(1):2390454.
91. Schiavina MM, Michele; Pesaresi, Martino. GHS-SMOD R2023A - GHS settlement layers, application of the Degree of Urbanisation methodology (stage I) to GHS-POP R2023A and GHS-BUILT-S R2023A, multitemporal (1975-2030). In: European Commission JRCJ, editor. 2023.
92. Beck HE, McVicar TR, Vergopolan N, Berg A, Lutsko NJ, Dufour A, et al. High-resolution (1 km) Köppen-Geiger maps for 1901-2099 based on constrained CMIP6 projections. *Scientific data*. 2023 Oct 23;10(1):724. PubMed PMID: 37872197. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC10593765. Epub 2023/10/24. eng.
93. Chi G, Fang H, Chatterjee S, Blumenstock JE. Microestimates of wealth for all low-and middle-income countries. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2022 Jan 18;119(3). PubMed PMID: 35017299. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC8784134. Epub 2022/01/13. eng.
94. FAO. Hand in Hand Initiative - Stochastic Frontier Analysis Task Force. 2025.
95. Hengl T, Miller MAE, Križan J, Shepherd KD, Sila A, Kilibarda M, et al. African soil properties and nutrients mapped at 30 m spatial resolution using two-scale ensemble machine learning. *Scientific Reports*. 2021 2021/03/17;11(1):6130.
96. Maqbool N, Sam S, Jamal Khan S, Strande L. Relation of organic fractions in fresh and stored fecal sludge and foodwaste to biogas production. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*. 2024;14(3):277-90.





97. Kilucha M, Cheng S, Minza S, Nasiruddin SM, Velempini K, Li X, et al. **Insights into the anaerobic digestion of fecal sludge and food waste in Tanzania.** *Frontiers in Environmental Science*. 2022;10:911348. View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D3VA00356C
98. Maqbool N, Shahid MA, Khan SJ. Situational assessment for fecal sludge management in major cities of Pakistan. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. 2023 2023/09/01;30(44):98869-80.
99. Gwavuya SG, Abele S, Barfuss I, Zeller M, Müller J. Household energy economics in rural Ethiopia: A cost-benefit analysis of biogas energy. *Renewable Energy*. 2012;48:202-9.
100. Gautam R, Baral S, Herat S. Biogas as a sustainable energy source in Nepal: Present status and future challenges. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 2009 2009/01/01;13(1):248-52.
101. Clemens H, Bailis R, Nyambane A, Ndung'u V. Africa Biogas Partnership Program: A review of clean cooking implementation through market development in East Africa. *Energy for Sustainable Development*. 2018 2018/10/01;46:23-31.
102. Tolessa A. Current Status and Future Prospects of Small-Scale Household Biodigesters in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Energy*. 2024 2024/01/01;2024(1):5596028.
103. Henriques JJ, Schnorr WG. Sustainability Assessment and Implementation of a Biogas Digester System in Western Kenya. 2010 IEEE Green Technologies Conference. 2010:1-5.
104. Warnars L, Oppenoorth H. Bioslurry: A Supreme Fertilizer 2014.
105. Getaneh A, Eba K, Tucho GT. Assessment of Biomass Energy Potential for Biogas Technology Adoption and Its Determinant Factors in Rural District of Limmu Kossa, Jimma, Ethiopia. *Energies*. 2024;17(9):2176. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/en17092176.
106. Laure N, Mbappe T, Tchifo Lontsi R, Joel S. Vermicomposting of Sludge from the Camp SIC Cité-Verte Wastewater Treatment Plant (Yaounde-Cameroon). *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*. 2024 02/29;20:200.
107. Kenne RE, Noubep WF, Tamfuh PA, Mbaveng DL, Tchunte SAK, Enang RK, et al. Agronomic Value of Composts Made from Fecal Sludge and Household Waste and Effect on Maize Production in Dschang (West Cameroon). *World Journal of Agricultural Research*. 2023;11(3):72-82. PubMed PMID: doi:10.12691/wjar-11-3-2.
108. Rodrigues Prates A, Renée Coscione A, Carvalho Minhoto Teixeira Filho M, Gasparoti Miranda B, Arf O, Hamilton Abreu-Junior C, et al. Composted Sewage Sludge Enhances Soybean Production and Agronomic Performance in Naturally Infertile Soils (Cerrado Region, Brazil). *Agronomy*. 2020;10(11):1677. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/agronomy10111677.
109. Trimmer JT, Margenot AJ, Cusick RD, Guest JS. Aligning Product Chemistry and Soil Context for Agronomic Reuse of Human-Derived Resources. *Environmental science & technology*. 2019 Jun 4;53(11):6501-10. PubMed PMID: 31017776. Epub 2019/04/25. eng.
110. Ramakrishna G, Shettigar N, Parama V, Gagana S. EVALUATION OF CO-COMPOSTED FAECAL SLUDGE APPLICATION IN AGRICULTURE 2019. 701-11 p.
111. Pradhan SK, Cofie O, Nikiema J, Heinonen-Tanski H. Fecal Sludge Derived Products as Fertilizer for Lettuce Cultivation in Urban Agriculture. *Sustainability*. 2019;11(24):7101. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/su11247101.
112. Nartey EG, Cofie O, Gebrezgabher S, Nikiema J. Crops and farmers' response to application of fecal sludge derived - Fortifer™ in different agro-ecological zones in Ghana. *J Environ Manage*. 2021 Sep 1;293:112970. PubMed PMID: 34091139. Epub 2021/06/07. eng.
113. Koné D. Making urban excreta and wastewater management contribute to cities' economic development: a paradigm shift. *Water Policy*. 2010;12(4):602-10.
114. Carter LJ, Dennis S, Allen K, McKenna P, Chen X, Daniell TJ, et al. Mitigating Contaminant-Driven Risks for the Safe Expansion of the Agricultural—Sanitation Circular Economy in an Urbanizing World. *ACS ES&T Water*. 2024 2024/04/12;4(4):1166-76.



115. Sisay SF, Gari SR, Ambelu A. Fecal Sludge Management and Sanitation Safety: An Assessment in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Environmental Health Insights*. 2024;18:11786302241267187. PubMed PMID: 38476843. View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/D3VA00356C
116. Preneta N, Kramer S, Magloire B, Noel JM. Thermophilic co-composting of human wastes in Haiti. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*. 2013;3(4):649-54.
117. Berendes D, Levy K, Knee J, Handzel T, Hill VR. Ascaris and Escherichia coli Inactivation in an Ecological Sanitation System in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10(5):e0125336.
118. Mrimi EC, Matwewe FJ, Kellner C, Thomas J, editors. Safe resource recovery from faecal sludge: evidence from an innovative treatment system in rural Tanzania 2020.
119. Vinnerås B, editor Possibilities for sustainable nutrient recycling by faecal separation combined with urine 2002.
120. Bayisa YM, Aga T, Mengistu YS. Optimization of Pretreated Teff Straw Blended with Coffee Husk for Biogas Production by Using Response Surface Methodology. Available at SSRN 3965534. 2021.
121. Manga M, Evans BE, Ngasala TM, Camargo-Valero MA. Recycling of Faecal Sludge: Nitrogen, Carbon and Organic Matter Transformation during Co-Composting of Faecal Sludge with Different Bulking Agents. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2022 Aug 25;19(17). PubMed PMID: 36078309. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC9518209. Epub 2022/09/10. eng.
122. Schönning C, Westrell T, Axel Stenström T, Arnbjerg-Nielsen K, Bernt Hasling A, Høibye L, et al. Microbial risk assessment of local handling and use of human faeces. *Journal of Water and Health*. 2006;5(1):117-28.
123. Ajzen I. The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 1991 12/01;50:179-211.
124. Ejigu AK, Yeshitela K. Envisioning sustainable sanitation planning: a unified approach of diffusion of innovation and theory of planned behavior in predicting ecosan toilet adoption in Arba Minch City, Ethiopia. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*. 2024 2024-March-28;Volume 12 - 2024. English.
125. Ejigu AK, Yeshitela K. Integrating resource oriented sanitation technologies with urban agriculture in developing countries: measuring the governance capacity of Arba Minch City, Ethiopia. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*. 2023;5:1153502.
126. Gwara S, Wale E, Odindo A. Behavioral intentions of rural farmers to recycle human excreta in agriculture. *Scientific Reports*. 2022 2022/04/07;12(1):5890.
127. Kabir H, Yegbemey RN, Bauer S. Factors determinant of biogas adoption in Bangladesh. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 2013 2013/12/01;28:881-9.
128. Thanh Truc N, Tran N, Nguyen Vo Chau N, Bentzen J. Factors Influencing the Adoption of Small-scale Biogas Digesters in Developing Countries – Empirical Evidence from Vietnam. *International Business Research*. 2016 12/22;10:1-.
129. Vaidya A. Stakeholders' Perception About the Effectiveness of Renewable Energy Subsidy in Nepal: A Review of Biogas Subsidy. *Journal of the Institute of Engineering*. 2020 10/16;15:375-84.
130. Katuwal H. Biogas adoption in Nepal: empirical evidence from a nationwide survey. *Heliyon*. 2022 2022/08/01;8(8):e10106.
131. Mengistu MG, Simane B, Eshete G, Workneh T. Institutional Factors Influencing the Dissemination of Biogas Technology in Ethiopia. *Journal of Human Ecology*. 2016;55:117 - 34.
132. Chandani Y, Andersson S, Heaton A, Noel M, Shieshia M, Mwiroti A, et al. Making products available among community health workers: Evidence for improving community health supply chains from Ethiopia, Malawi, and Rwanda. *Journal of global health*. 2014



Dec;4(2):020405. PubMed PMID: 25520795. Pubmed Central PMCID: PMC4267090. Epub 2014/12/19. eng. New Article Online  
DOI: 10.1059/ESVA00356C

133. Banamwana C, Musoke D, Ntakirutimana T, Buregyeya E, Ssempebwa J, Maina GW, et al. Complexity of adoption and diffusion of ecological sanitation technology: a review of literature. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*. 2022;12(11):755-69.
134. Mamo BG, Josef N, and Ficek F. Barriers for upgrading of latrines in rural Ethiopia: disentangling a sanitation socio-technical lock-in. *Local Environment*. 2023 2023/08/03;28(8):1026-44.
135. Khalid A. Human excreta: a resource or a taboo? Assessing the socio-cultural barriers, acceptability, and reuse of human excreta as a resource in Kakul Village District Abbottabad, Northwestern Pakistan. *Journal of Water Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*. 2018;8:71-80.
136. Mariwah S, Drangert J-O. Community perceptions of human excreta as fertilizer in peri-urban agriculture in Ghana. *Waste Management & Research*. 2011 2011/08/01;29(8):815-22.
137. Otoo M, Gebrezgabher SA, Danso GK, Amewu S, Amirova I, editors. Market adoption and diffusion of fecal sludge-based fertilizer in developing countries: crosscountry analyses 2018.
138. Ejigu AK, Yeshitela K. Exploring the factors influencing urban farmers' perception and attitude toward the use of excreta-based organic fertilizers in Arba Minch City, Ethiopia. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*. 2024.
139. Murray A, Mekala GD, Chen X. Evolving policies and the roles of public and private stakeholders in wastewater and faecal-sludge management in India, China and Ghana. *Water International*. 2011;36:491 - 504.
140. Sogn TA, Dragicevic I, Linjordet R, Krogstad T, Eijssink VGH, Eich-Greatorex S. Recycling of biogas digestates in plant production: NPK fertilizer value and risk of leaching. *International Journal of Recycling of Organic Waste in Agriculture*. 2018 2018/03/01;7(1):49-58.
141. Liu W, Yao B, Xu Y, Dai S, Wang M, Ma J, et al. Biogas digestate as a potential nitrogen source enhances soil fertility, rice nitrogen metabolism and yield. *Field Crops Research*. 2024 2024/11/01;318:109568.
142. Slepetiene A, Ceseviciene J, Amaleviciute-Volunge K, Mankeviciene A, Parasotas I, Skersiene A, et al. Solid and Liquid Phases of Anaerobic Digestate for Sustainable Use of Agricultural Soil. *Sustainability*. 2023;15(2):1345. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/su15021345.
143. van der Kooij S, van Vliet BJM, Stomph TJ, Sutton NB, Anten NPR, Hoffland E. Phosphorus recovered from human excreta: A socio-ecological-technical approach to phosphorus recycling. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*. 2020 2020/06/01;157:104744.
144. Rumeau M, Pistocchi C, Ait-Mouheb N, Marsden C, Brunel B. Unveiling the impact of human urine fertilization on soil bacterial communities: A path toward sustainable fertilization. *Applied Soil Ecology*. 2024 2024/09/01;201:105471.
145. Yu G, Wang Q, Zheng X, Yang B, Zhang C, Zhang G, et al. Effects of human urine application on soil physicochemical properties, microbial communities, and enzymatic activities. *Frontiers in Agronomy*. 2025 2025-July-01;Volume 7 - 2025. English.
146. Mihelcic JR, Fry LM, Shaw RM. Global potential of phosphorus recovery from human urine and feces. *Chemosphere*. 2011;84 6:832-9.
147. Potter PA, Ramankutty N, Bennett EM, Donner SD. Characterizing the Spatial Patterns of Global Fertilizer Application and Manure Production. *Earth Interactions*. 2010;14:1-22.
148. Siegrist A, Bowman G, Burg V. Energy generation potentials from agricultural residues: The influence of techno-spatial restrictions on biomethane, electricity, and heat production. *Applied Energy*. 2022.





149. Mallory A, Holm R, Parker A. A Review of the Financial Value of Faecal Sludge Reuse in Low-Income Countries. *Sustainability*. 2020;12(20):8334. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/su12208334. [View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/D3VA00356C
150. Nimoh F, Ohene-Yankyera K, Poku K, Konradsen F, Abaidoo RC. Health Risk Perception on Excreta Reuse for Peri-urban Agriculture in Southern Ghana. *Journal of economics and sustainable development*. 2014;5:174-81.
151. Jensen PKM, Phuc PD, Dalsgaard A, Konradsen F. Successful sanitation promotion must recognize the use of latrine wastes in agriculture--the example of Viet Nam. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2005;83 11:873-4.
152. Abeysuriya K, Khawaja N, Mills F, Carrard N, Kome A, Willetts J. Faecal sludge reuse in Birendranagar, Nepal: a case study of the world health organisation's multiple barrier approach. *Water Practice & Technology*. 2018;13:1-20.



## Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study, including spatial datasets on human fecal waste distribution, biomethane production potential, and nutrient recovery estimations, are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

