Correlates of better linear growth among children in sub-Saharan Africa: Cross sectional survey analysis of positive deviants in poor households

Dickson A. Amugsi[1*]

damugsi2002@yahoo.com; damugsi@aphrc.org

Zacharie T. Dimbuene[2, 3]

zacharie.tsala.dimbuene@gmail.com

Elizabeth W. Kimani-Murage[1]

ekimani@aphrc.org

1. African Population and Health Research Center, APHRC Campus, P.O Box 10787-00100, Nairobi, Kenya

2. Department of Population Sciences and Development, University of Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo

3. Statistics Canada, Microdata Access Division, 100 Tunney's Pasture Driveway, Ottawa, Canada, K1A 0T6

* Corresponding author: Dr. Dickson A. Amugsi

Email: damugsi2002@yahoo.com; damugsi@aphrc.org

Abstract

Objectives: To examine the socio-demographic correlates associated with better linear growth among children under 5 years living in poor households

Design: Cross-sectional

Setting: Ghana, Kenya, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Nigeria and Mozambique

Participants: Children aged 0–59 months (N=24,264) living in poor households, born to mothers aged 15–49 years. The DHS obtained information on children through face-to-face interviews with their mothers.

Primary outcome measure: Child height-for-age Z-scores (HAZ), categorised into HAZ≥-2 standard deviations (SD) (better growth/not stunted) and HAZ≤-2 SD (stunted/poor growth).

Results: A unit change in maternal years of education was associated with increased odds of better growth among children living in poor households in DRC [adjusted odds ratio (aOR)= 1.03, 95% CI=1.01,1.07)], Ghana (aOR=1.06, 95% CI=1.01,1.11), Kenya (aOR=1.03, 95% CI= 1.01, 1.05) and Nigeria (aOR=1.08, 95%=1.06,1.10). Maternal antenatal attendance of at least four visits was associated positively with better child growth in DRC (aOR=1.32, 95% CI=1.05, 1.67) and Ghana (aOR=1.67, 95% CI=1.19, 2.33). The association did not reach statistical significance in the remaining three countries. In Ghana, Mozambique and DRC, breastfeeding was associated significantly with the likelihood of better linear growth when only socio-demographic correlates were included in the models but disappeared after the inclusion of child-level covariates. In Nigeria, normal maternal weight was associated with increased odds (aOR=1.24, 95% CI=1.08, 1.43) of better growth among children living in poor households, so was overweight (aOR=1.51, 95% CI= 1.24, 1.83). In all the countries except Ghana, child biological factors such as sex and age were associated with reduced odds of better linear growth.

Conclusions: The socio-demographic factors included in this analysis have the potential to promote linear growth of children under 5 years living in poor households. Interventions aimed

at promoting linear growth among children living in poverty should target at enhancing these factors.

Keywords: child growth, sub-Saharan Africa, positive deviance, cross sectional survey

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Use of large nationally representative provides more robust estimates of associations between socio-demographic factors and better child growth
- The height data used to compute the HAZ were objectively measured, thereby reducing possible misclassification
- Use of multi-country data helped unmask differences and commonalities in the effects of the correlates on HAZ across countries
- Focus on factors that promote better child growth rather than risks factors for child growth deficiencies is a novelty
- The use of cross-sectional surveys may not allow to establish causation

Introduction

Childhood malnutrition is a significant public health problem confronting countries across the globe. However, there is evidence that global trends in child malnutrition have improved over the years. For example, it is estimated that childhood stunting (short stature for age), a critical undernutrition metric, decreased from 39·7% in 1990 to 26·7% in 2010 (1). The trend is predicted to reduce to 22% in 2020 (1). Despite global-level progress in the reduction of the problem during the past decades (2), Africa has not seen much improvement. Although there was a decline in stunting trends from 40.5% in 1980 to 35.2% in 2000 (3), the trends stagnated at 40% between 1990 and 2010 (1). The risk factors contributing to the stagnating trends in stunting in Africa are well documented (4-8).

The consequences of stunting on the later life of the child are well known. Indeed, there is strong evidence that stunting can have long-term effects on cognitive development, school achievement, economic productivity in adulthood and maternal reproductive outcomes (9-12). Stunting is also a condition that may be very difficult to reverse (9). Given the negative consequences of stunting on child health outcomes, the international community has paid considerable attention to the problem. For instance, the World Health Assembly Resolution (2012) set a 40% reduction in the number of stunted children under-5 as one of the six global nutrition targets for 2025 (10, 13). The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (14) also captured this undernutrition metric as a critical developmental target. It suggests the need for substantial investment in nutrition interventions to address childhood stunting, as averting stunting could produce life-long benefits. To achieve this goal, however, a better understanding of the factors that promote child growth is necessary to provide evidence for the design of effective nutrition intervention. The present study is set out to provide this evidence by focusing on factors that promote child growth rather than risk factors of child growth deficiencies.

124

125 The evidence further suggests a disproportionate burden of stunting among children in low and
126 middle-income countries, which is attributable to poverty, lack of food and high incidence of
127 infectious diseases among others (3, 10, 15, 16). In sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), several countries
128 are confronted with high prevalence of stunting among children under five years of age (3, 10,
129 16). The problem is notably more severe among children living in poor households (16-18)--they
130 tend to have the highest prevalence of childhood stunting (16). It is the case because poverty
131 creates conditions that favour poor child growth outcomes and prevents affected populations
132 from obtaining adequate access to prevention and care (16). Despite the health challengings
133 facing children living in poverty, some children are living in the same conditions *(positive*
134 *deviants)* or even worse yet have positive growth outcomes comparable to children living in
135 privilege households anywhere in the world (19-22). The questions this paper intends to
136 address is why some children in poor households are growing well, although they are faced
137 with similar adversity as those who are stunted are? What are the possible factors at the
138 individual, household and community levels that help them to have better growth outcomes?
139 Understanding this will help design programmes to promote the growth of children in
140 impoverished households or environments.

141

142 The concept of *positive deviance* (as referenced above) is based on the observation that "
143 in *every community, there are certain individuals or groups whose uncommon behaviours and*
144 *strategies enable them to find better solutions to problems than their peers while having access*
145 *to the same resources and facing similar or worse challenges"(23, 24)*. Positive deviance (PD) is
146 founded on the idea that the most appropriate solutions to challenges already exist within a
147 given population(25, 26). PD aims to study the behaviours and characteristics of those who
148 achieve better results on a given health outcome than their peers who reside in the same
149 community (25). The PD approach was used previously to investigate newborn care, child
150 nutrition, safe sexual practices, malaria control, health service delivery and educational
151 outcomes in many settings (27-35). It is a well-established concept and can be explored using a

statistical approach, and often quantified as those who do not experience a negative outcome of interest compared to those around them with the same resources (25). Using the PD approach can be useful because it studies the 'positive' aspects of an outcome or community instead of the 'negative', and can identify potential points of intervention. The *positive deviants* in the present study are children who live in poor households and yet growing well relative to their counterparts who live in the same environment but are stunted. The main objective of this study is to examine the factors associated with better growth outcomes among children living in poor households. This resource-focused approach moves away from the dominant risk model approach, where the focus is usually on risk factors of child growth deficiencies. Using the PD approach is to help understand the drivers of better child growth and interventions to promote these drivers in poor households effectively.

Methodology

Data sources and sampling strategy

We analysed the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) (36) data from Ghana (2014), Kenya (2014), Nigeria (2013), Mozambique (2011) and Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) (2013-2014). The selection of the five countries was based on our previous analysis using the same countries and data (37, 38). The DHS data are nationally representative, repeated cross-sectional household surveys collected primarily in lower- and middle-income countries every 5 years using standardised questionnaires to enable cross-country comparisons (39, 40). The DHS utilises a two-stage sample design (41-45). The first stage involves the selection of sample points or clusters from an updated master sampling frame constructed from National Population and Housing Census of the respective countries. The clusters are selected using systematic sampling with probability proportional to size. Household listing is then conducted in all the selected clusters to provide a sampling frame for the second stage selection of households. The second stage selection involves the systematic sampling of the households listed in each cluster, and households to be included in the survey are randomly selected from the list. The rationale for the second stage selection is to ensure adequate numbers of

180 completed individual interviews to provide estimates for critical indicators with acceptable
181 precision. All men and women aged 15-59 and 15-49 respectively, in the selected households
182 (men in half of the households) are eligible to be interviewed if they were either usual residents
183 of the household or visitors present in the household on the night before the survey. The DHS
184 data collectors then interviewed all eligible study participants in their respective households
185 using standardised questionnaires.

186

187 *Study participants*

188 Our study population comprised singleton children aged 0–59 months, born to mothers aged
189 15–49 years. Information on children was obtained through face-to-face interviews with
190 mothers. Height was measured with an adjustable measuring board calibrated in millimetres.
191 Children younger than 24 months were measured lying down (recumbent length) on the board
192 while standing height was measured for older children. The height data were converted into Z-
193 scores based on the 2006 WHO growth standards (46). The total samples used in the current
194 analysis were: Ghana, n= 1,453; Nigeria, n= 10,378; Kenya, n= 4,967; Mozambique, n= 3,487;
195 and DRC, n= 3,979.

196

197 **Ethics statement**

198 The DHS obtained ethical clearance from Government recognised Ethical Review
199 Committees/Institutional Review Boards of the respective countries as well as the Institutional
200 Review Board of ICF International, USA before the surveys were conducted. The data collectors
201 obtained written informed consent from the mothers of the children before participation. The
202 authors of this paper sought and obtained permission from the DHS program for the use of the
203 data. The data were wholly anonymised, and therefore, the authors did not seek further ethical
204 clearance before their use.

205 **Patient and Public Involvement statement**

We used completely anonymised secondary data for the analysis. Therefore, no patients or public involvement can be reported.

Outcome and predictor variables

Outcome Variables

We used the child height-for-age Z-scores (HAZ) as the indicator of child linear growth in the analysis. For all datasets, HAZ scores were computed using 2006 WHO growth standards (46). We reclassified the HAZ into better linear growth/not stunted and stunted/poor growth. Children who have HAZ above -2 SD (HAZ>=-2SD) (46, 47) were considered having a better linear growth and described as *positive deviants*. Similarly, children who have HAZ below –2 SD (HAZ<–2) from the median HAZ of the WHO reference population (46) were considered stunted (chronically malnourished) or having a poor linear growth.

Stratification variable

We used the household wealth index (WI) as the stratification variable. The WI has been used in many DHS technical reports to measure inequalities in household characteristics, in the use of health and other services, and health outcomes (40, 41, 43, 48). It is an indicator of wealth that is consistent with expenditure and income measurement among households (39, 40, 43). The index in the DHS dataset was created based on assets ownership and housing characteristics of each household: type of roofing, and flooring material, source of drinking water, sanitation facilities, ownership of television, bicycle, motorcycle, automobile among others. A principal component analysis is then employed to assign weights to each asset in each household. The asset scores are summed up, and individuals ranked according to the household score. The WI is then divided into quintiles: poorest, poorer, middle, richer and richest (39, 40, 43). In this

231 paper, we recoded poor and poorest into poor/worse-off households. We restricted all the
232 analyses to children living in these households.

233 *Analytical framework*

234 The conceptual framework underpinning our empirical analysis is the widely used UNICEF
235 conceptual framework (49), which outlines the causes of undernutrition. It is a social-ecological
236 framework encompassing factors at the individual, household and societal levels. In the UNICEF
237 framework, child malnutrition can be analysed in terms of immediate, underlying and basic
238 causes. The immediate causes are inadequate dietary intakes and infectious disease, the
239 underlying causes are inadequate maternal, and childcare, inadequate health services and
240 healthy environment and the basic causes are institutional and socio-economic determinants
241 and potential resources (49). However, the present analysis was guided by the UNICEF
242 extended model of care (49, 50). The extended model suggests that child survival, growth and
243 development are influenced by a web of factors, with three underlying factors being food
244 security, healthcare and a healthy environment, and care for children and women (50). The
245 basic factors, in turn, influence the underlying factors. These basic factors may be described as
246 "exogenous" factors, which influence child nutrition through their effect on the intervening
247 proximate factors (underlying/endogenous factors). In effect, the underlying factors are,
248 therefore, endogenously determined by the exogenous factors (51).

249

250 **Data analysis**

251 In this analysis, we included only the basic factors (socio-demographic) in our empirical models.
252 We did this because there is evidence that in examining the association between child growth
253 outcomes and exogenous factors, the proximate factors (endogenous factors) are usually
254 excluded to avoid biased estimation of the regression parameters of the exogenous factors (51-
255 53). It is the case because the proximate factors are pathways through which the exogenous
256 factors influence child nutrition (53). Besides the basic factors, we also included antenatal care
257 (ANC) and breastfeeding practices, which relies mostly on exogenous public health provisions
258 rather than socio-demographic endowments of the household (51). The significance of

259 including the two variables is that changes in them are likely to be more responsive to policies,
260 programmes and interventions rather than changes in socio-demographic endowments of the
261 household (51). For example, there is evidence that policy, institutional and contextual settings
262 are critical determinants of the prevalence of breastfeeding practices (51, 54). In the
263 analysis, we built two regression models for each of the five countries. In the first model, we
264 included maternal body mass index (BMI), education, age, work status, parity, breastfeeding
265 status, marital status, antenatal attendance, sex of household head, household size, number of
266 children under five years and place of residence. We adjusted for child dietary diversity (DD)—
267 the details of how the DD is created can be found elsewhere (37), age and sex in the second
268 and final model. The UNICEF conceptual framework and the literature guided the selection of
269 the explanatory variables (50). We estimated adjusted ORs (aORs) of the effects of socio-
270 demographic factors on child growth.

271

272 **Results**

273 *Characteristics of study samples*

274 Tables 1 presents the results of the descriptive analysis. The results showed that Ghana (76%)
275 has the highest number of children with better growth followed by Kenya (68%), while in
276 Mozambique, DRC and Nigeria, the prevalence ranged from 50% to 52%. Regarding dietary
277 diversity intake, Mozambique had the highest prevalence of children who consumed at least
278 four food groups (24%), with DRC (6%) and Nigeria (6%) having the lowest prevalence. Similarly,
279 Mozambique had the highest number of women with normal weight (85%). The prevalence
280 ranged from 68% to 76% in DRC, Ghana, Kenya and Nigeria. For maternal education, Ghana has
281 the highest prevalence (23%) of women who had attained a secondary school education, while
282 Mozambique has the lowest prevalence (1.20%). Higher education was less than 1% among
283 women in poor households across all countries. Regarding antenatal attendance among
284 women, DRC registered the highest prevalence (77%) followed by Ghana (59%), while Nigeria
285 registered the lowest prevalence (19%).

286

Table 1: Characteristics of the study samples of the five countries

Variables	DRC		Ghana		Kenya		Mozambique		Nigeria	
Child-level covariates	%/mean	SD	%/mean	SD	%/mean	SD	%/mean	SD	%/mean	SD
Height-for-age (HAZ)	50.0		76.0		68.0		52.0		51.0	
DD < 4 food groups	94.0		90.6		88.5		76.4		93.9	
DD >= 4 food groups	6.0		9.4		11.5		23.6		6.1	
Sex of child										
Female	50.4		48.8		50.4		51.3		50.6	
Male	49.6		51.2		49.6		48.7		49.4	
Mother-level covariates										
Body Mass Index (BMI)										
BMI <18.50	15.8		7.4		17.0		7.99		12.4	
BMI = 18.50-24.99	76.3		73.3		68.0		84.6		74.4	
BMI = 25-29.99	6.7		15.7		12.2		6.91		10.5	
BMI >= 30	0.40		3.48		2.83		0.03		2.17	
Education										
No education	30.6		54.0		34.4		52.6		75.3	
Primary education	50.4		22.8		55.6		46.3		17.0	
Secondary education	19.0		23.2		9.43		1.17		7.6	
Higher education	0.05		0.1		0.1		na		0.1	
Working status										
Not working	20.0		16.5		45.9		61.5		35.3	
IS working	79.9		83.3		54.0		38.5		64.4	
Parity	4.44	2.46	4.21	2.3	4.36	2.46	4.37	2.43	4.83	2.75
Is Breastfeeding	73.5		65.0		64.4		68.7		63.9	
Marital status										
Not in union	11.4		11.1		13.7		14.3		3.2	
Married	65.2		69.4		81.2		68.8		95.9	
Cohabiting	23.3		19.5		5.1		16.9		0.1	
Number of antenatal visits >=4	77.2		59.2		31.1		28.3		18.8	

Household-level covariates										
Sex of household head										
Household head is Female	24.1		18.3		34.4		28.0		6.5	
Household head is Male	75.9		81.7		65.6		72		93.5	
Household size	6.4	2.55	6.67	3.14	6.22	2.35	5.97	2.5	7.63	3.42
Number of children under 5	2.24	0.98	1.98	0.99	2.02	0.87	2.03	0.91	2.5	1.22
Community-level covariates										
Urban residence	9.32		11.6		15.2		9.19		8.1	

DD= Dietary diversity; DRC= Democratic Republic of Congo; SD= Standard deviation

Multivariable results of the association between socio-demographic factors and better child growth

Tables 2-6 present the results of the association between sociodemographic factors at the child-level, maternal-level, household-level and community–level, and better linear growth among children in five SSA countries. The results showed that a unit change in maternal years of education was associated with increased odds of better linear growth among children in DRC (aOR=1.03, 95% CI=1.01,1.07), Ghana (aOR=1.06, 95% CI=1.01,1.11), Kenya (aOR=1.03, 95% CI= 1.01, 1.05) and Nigeria (aOR=1.08, 95%=1.06,1.10). Antenatal attendance of at least four visits was associated significantly with the likelihood of better child growth in DRC (aOR=1.32, 95% CI=1.05, 1.67) and Ghana (aOR=1.67, 95% CI=1.19, 2.33). The association did not reach statistical significance in the remaining three countries. In Kenya, children of mothers who were working and live in poor households had 23% reduced odds of better growth (aOR= 0.77, 95% CI=0.66, 0.91) relative to children of non-working mothers. In Nigeria, Mozambique and DRC, breastfeeding was positively associated with better child growth, but this association disappeared after the child level covariates were included in the model. Urban place of residence was associated with 28% reduced odds of better child growth (aOR=0.72, 95% CI=0.55, 0.95) in Mozambique, and increased odds in Nigeria (aOR=1.58, 95% CI= 1.33, 1.87). In Nigeria, normal maternal weight (BMI) was associated with increased odds (aOR=1.24, 95% CI=1.08, 1.43) of better child growth. Maternal overweight was also associated with increased odds (aOR=1.51, 95% CI= 1.24, 1.83) of better child growth in Nigeria. A unit change in household size was associated with increased odds (aOR=1.05, 95% CI= 1.01, 1.10) of better child growth. Maternal parity reduces the odds of better child growth (aOR=0.95, 95% CI=0.92, 0.98) in Nigeria. In all the countries except Ghana, child biological factors such as sex and age were associated with reduced odds of better child growth.

Table 2: Multivariable analysis of the effects of socio-demographic factors on better linear growth among children living in poor households in DRC

Variables	Model 1	Model 2
Mother-level covariates		
BMI (kg/m^2) = 18.50 - 24.99	0.972	0.979
	(0.758 - 1.247)	(0.753 - 1.274)
BMI (kg/m^2) = 25 - 29.99	0.913	0.861
	(0.604 - 1.379)	(0.551 - 1.348)
BMI (kg/m^2) >= 30	0.310*	0.301
	(0.0795 - 1.207)	(0.0558 - 1.620)
Maternal education (in single years)	1.030**	1.034**
	(1.001 - 1.060)	(1.003 - 1.065)
Age of the mother (in years)	0.994	1.012
	(0.972 - 1.016)	(0.988 - 1.037)
Working status = Is working	0.840	0.873
	(0.671 - 1.052)	(0.684 - 1.113)
Parity	0.995	0.989
	(0.934 - 1.060)	(0.923 - 1.061)
Is Breastfeeding = YES	1.379***	0.813*
	(1.110 - 1.712)	(0.637 - 1.036)
Marital Status = Married	0.880	0.937
	(0.648 - 1.196)	(0.677 - 1.297)
Marital Status = Cohabiting	0.986	1.036
	(0.704 - 1.379)	(0.731 - 1.469)
Number of antenatal visits = 4+ visits	2.125***	1.321**
	(1.710 - 2.641)	(1.046 - 1.668)
Household-level covariates		
Head of HH is Male	0.957	0.936
	(0.759 - 1.206)	(0.741 - 1.183)
Household size	1.014	1.005
	(0.965 - 1.065)	(0.954 - 1.058)
Number of children under 5 years	1.018	1.068
	(0.904 - 1.147)	(0.943 - 1.210)
Community-level covariates		
Urban residence = Urban	0.989	0.972
	(0.740 - 1.322)	(0.720 - 1.312)
Child-level covariates		
Dietary Diversity (DD) >= 4		1.049
		(0.686 - 1.602)
Age of the child (in months)		0.959***
		(0.953 - 0.965)
Sex of child = Male		0.773***
		(0.639 - 0.935)
Observations	**3,979**	**3,979**

95% Confidence Intervals (CIs) in parentheses; DD-Dietary diversity; HH-Household; BMI-Body mass index
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 3: Multivariable analysis of the effects of socio-demographic factors on better linear growth among children living in poor households in Ghana

Variables	Model 1	Model 2
Mother-level covariates		
BMI (kg/m^2) = 18.50 - 24.99	0.944	0.946
	(0.554 - 1.608)	(0.554 - 1.617)
BMI (kg/m^2) = 25 - 29.99	1.702	1.727*
	(0.888 - 3.262)	(0.902 - 3.305)
BMI (kg/m^2) >= 30	2.048	2.183
	(0.739 - 5.677)	(0.783 - 6.089)
Maternal education (in single years)	1.059**	1.057**
	(1.012 - 1.107)	(1.010 - 1.106)
Age of the mother (in years)	1.004	1.009
	(0.966 - 1.044)	(0.969 - 1.050)
Working status = Is working	0.772	0.798
	(0.509 - 1.170)	(0.524 - 1.214)
Parity	1.009	1.007
	(0.902 - 1.129)	(0.899 - 1.129)
Is Breastfeeding = YES	1.705***	1.412*
	(1.206 - 2.410)	(0.975 - 2.045)
Marital Status = Married	1.316	1.300
	(0.761 - 2.278)	(0.755 - 2.239)
Marital Status = Cohabiting	0.994	0.950
	(0.539 - 1.831)	(0.516 - 1.747)
Number of antenatal visits = 4+ visits	2.004***	1.667***
	(1.464 - 2.743)	(1.193 - 2.329)
Household-level covariates		
Head of HH is Male	0.889	0.911
	(0.549 - 1.440)	(0.566 - 1.468)
Household size	0.987	0.983
	(0.928 - 1.050)	(0.923 - 1.047)
Number of children under 5	0.946	0.942
	(0.774 - 1.156)	(0.771 - 1.150)
Community-level covariate		
Urban residence = Urban	1.239	1.224
	(0.735 - 2.087)	(0.733 - 2.046)
Child-level covariates		
Dietary Diversity (DD) >= 4		1.281
		(0.765 - 2.146)
Age of the child (in months)		0.989*
		(0.979 - 1.000)
Sex of child = Male		0.850
		(0.624 - 1.159)
Observations	**1,453**	**1,453**

95% Confidence Intervals (CIs) in parentheses; DD-Dietary diversity; HH-Household; BMI-Body mass index
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4: Multivariable analysis of the effects of socio-demographic factors on better linear growth among children living in poor households in Kenya

Variables	Model 1	Model 2
Mother-level covariates		
BMI (kg/m^2) = 18.50 - 24.99	0.894	0.896
	(0.716 - 1.116)	(0.716 - 1.122)
BMI (kg/m^2) = 25 - 29.99	1.234	1.255
	(0.910 - 1.674)	(0.923 - 1.706)
BMI (kg/m^2) >= 30	0.982	0.971
	(0.580 - 1.663)	(0.579 - 1.630)
Maternal education (in single years)	1.028**	1.029**
	(1.006 - 1.051)	(1.006 - 1.052)
Age of the mother (in years)	1.026***	1.029***
	(1.006 - 1.046)	(1.009 - 1.050)
Working status = Is working	0.760***	0.774***
	(0.646 - 0.896)	(0.656 - 0.914)
Parity	0.965	0.962
	(0.911 - 1.023)	(0.907 - 1.020)
Is Breastfeeding = YES	1.324***	1.182*
	(1.116 - 1.571)	(0.978 - 1.429)
Marital Status = Married	0.994	1.019
	(0.777 - 1.270)	(0.796 - 1.303)
Marital Status = Cohabiting	0.951	0.967
	(0.639 - 1.417)	(0.647 - 1.443)
Number of antenatal visits = 4+ visits	1.288***	1.173*
	(1.084 - 1.531)	(0.978 - 1.407)
Household-level covariates		
Head of HH is Male	1.041	1.037
	(0.873 - 1.242)	(0.868 - 1.239)
Household size	0.965*	0.959*
	(0.924 - 1.007)	(0.919 - 1.002)
Number of children under 5	0.976	0.984
	(0.878 - 1.084)	(0.884 - 1.095)
Community-level covariate		
Urban residence = Urban	1.111	1.111
	(0.900 - 1.373)	(0.898 - 1.375)
Child-level covariates		
Dietary Diversity (DD) >= 4		0.914
		(0.720 - 1.161)
Age of the child (in months)		0.991***
		(0.987 - 0.996)
Sex of child = Male		0.717***
		(0.615 - 0.836)
Observations	**4,967**	**4,967**

95% Confidence Intervals (CIs) in parentheses; DD-Dietary diversity; HH-Household; BMI-Body mass index
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 5: Multivariable analysis of the effects of socio-demographic factors on better linear growth among children living in poor households in Mozambique

Variables	Model 1	Model 2
Mother-level covariates		
BMI (kg/m^2) = 18.50 - 24.99	1.305*	1.328*
	(0.968 - 1.760)	(0.985 - 1.789)
BMI (kg/m^2) = 25.00 - 29.99	1.201	1.225
	(0.792 - 1.821)	(0.806 - 1.863)
BMI (kg/m^2) >= 30	1.503	1.528
	(0.389 - 5.810)	(0.417 - 5.603)
Maternal education (in single years)	1.030	1.031
	(0.990 - 1.072)	(0.990 - 1.073)
Age of the mother (in years)	1.012	1.017*
	(0.994 - 1.029)	(0.999 - 1.036)
Working status = Is working	0.938	0.936
	(0.798 - 1.102)	(0.795 - 1.102)
Parity	0.988	0.993
	(0.935 - 1.045)	(0.939 - 1.050)
Is Breastfeeding = YES	1.182*	0.968
	(0.991 - 1.411)	(0.798 - 1.173)
Marital Status = Married	0.941	0.923
	(0.715 - 1.237)	(0.701 - 1.216)
Marital Status = Cohabiting	0.972	0.967
	(0.710 - 1.330)	(0.706 - 1.326)
Number of antenatal visits = 4+ visits	1.182*	1.001
	(0.990 - 1.411)	(0.831 - 1.207)
Household-level covariates		
Head of HH is Male	1.126	1.124
	(0.912 - 1.390)	(0.910 - 1.388)
Household size	1.067***	1.053**
	(1.018 - 1.118)	(1.005 - 1.104)
Number of children under 5	1.006	1.040
	(0.894 - 1.132)	(0.923 - 1.171)
Community-level covariate		
Urban residence = Urban	0.709**	0.721**
	(0.540 - 0.931)	(0.550 - 0.947)
Child-level covariates		
Dietary Diversity (DD) >= 4		1.169
		(0.968 - 1.413)
Age of the child (in months)		0.985***
		(0.980 - 0.990)
Sex of child = Male		0.743***
		(0.635 - 0.870)
Observations	**3,487**	**3,487**

95% Confidence Intervals (CIs) in parentheses; DD-Dietary diversity; HH-Household; BMI-Body mass index
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 6: Multivariable analysis of the effects of socio-demographic factors on better linear growth among children living in poor households in Nigeria

Variables	Model 1	Model 2
Mother-level covariates		
BMI (kg/m^2) = 18.50 - 24.99	1.231***	1.241***
	(1.073 - 1.413)	(1.080 - 1.428)
BMI (kg/m^2) = 25.00 - 29.99	1.484***	1.508***
	(1.228 - 1.794)	(1.243 - 1.828)
BMI (kg/m^2) >= 30	1.216	1.221
	(0.874 - 1.693)	(0.868 - 1.720)
Maternal education (in single years)	1.072***	1.076***
	(1.052 - 1.092)	(1.056 - 1.096)
Age of the mother (in years)	1.012**	1.018***
	(1.001 - 1.023)	(1.007 - 1.030)
Working status = Is working	1.056	1.081
	(0.960 - 1.162)	(0.981 - 1.191)
Parity	0.952***	0.950***
	(0.925 - 0.979)	(0.923 - 0.978)
Is Breastfeeding = Yes	1.320***	1.035
	(1.199 - 1.453)	(0.933 - 1.149)
Marital Status = Married	0.900	0.923
	(0.685 - 1.183)	(0.702 - 1.213)
Marital Status = Cohabiting	1.133	1.107
	(0.646 - 1.987)	(0.622 - 1.970)
Number of antenatal visits = 4+ visits	1.354***	1.081
	(1.201 - 1.525)	(0.955 - 1.224)
Household-level covariates		
Head of HH is Male	0.955	0.953
	(0.782 - 1.168)	(0.778 - 1.168)
Household size	0.991	0.986
	(0.971 - 1.011)	(0.966 - 1.007)
Number of children under 5	1.017	1.040
	(0.964 - 1.072)	(0.986 - 1.097)
Community-level covariate		
Urban residence = Urban	1.518***	1.575***
	(1.283 - 1.796)	(1.325 - 1.872)
Child-level covariates		
Dietary Diversity (DD) >= 4		1.148
		(0.941 - 1.401)
Age of the child (in months)		0.981***
		(0.978 - 0.984)
Sex of child = Male		0.843***
		(0.771 - 0.923)
Observations	**10,378**	**10,378**

95% Confidence Intervals (CIs) in parentheses; DD-Dietary diversity; HH-Household; BMI-Body mass index
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Discussion

The study examined the socio-demographic factors associated with better child growth in poor households in five sub-Saharan African countries. We utilised *a positive deviance* approach as our analytical lens, whereby children who were growing well though living in poor households were considered *positive deviants*. The results showed that the effects of socio-demographic factors on child growth vary across countries. Maternal higher years of education had a significant positive effect on better linear growth among children living in poverty in DRC, Ghana, Kenya and Nigeria. This finding suggests that maternal education can mitigate the adverse effects of poverty on children's nutritional status. Thus, education is an essential resource for improving child growth outcomes in the face of adversity. It may be the case because there is substantial evidence on the effect of education on child-caring practices and the utilisation of health services (55-57), both of which are critical for positive child health outcomes (55, 58). The findings in the present study are in line with the literature (57, 59). A study using data from three SSA countries showed that a higher level of maternal education was associated with reduced the odds of child stunting (59). The literature, together with the present study, though using slightly different analytical approaches, demonstrated the importance of education in improving child growth outcomes.

Further, the results showed that in DRC and Ghana, mothers who attended at least four antenatal visits (ANC) have children with better linear growth outcomes. The plausible explanation for the positive effect is that mothers who attend ANC are likely to receive health and nutrition education, which may have a positive impact on their caring practices, with its consequential effect on better child health outcomes. These findings are similar to others by previous researchers. For example, Kuhnt and Vollmer (60) found that having at least four ANC visits was associated with reduced odds of stunting in pre-school children. This finding means that promoting ANC attendance among women can have a beneficial effect not only on the mothers but also their offspring. Therefore, interventions to promote child growth in poor environments should incorporate ANC as a critical intervention package.

Our analysis also illuminated the widely recognised benefits of breastfeeding for improved child health and developmental outcomes (61-63), but only when child-level covariates were not included in the empirical regression models. For instance, in Ghana, Mozambique and DRC, breastfeeding showed a significant positive effect on better child linear growth in the models containing only the socio-demographic factors. However, this significant association disappeared after child-level covariate such as dietary diversity, age and sex were included. This finding may mean that whether breastfeeding will have a positive effect on child growth or not is conditional on the inclusion or otherwise of child-level covariates. Therefore, in examining the effects of socio-demographic factors on child linear growth, it is significant to include child-level covariates to avoid presenting misleading estimates (64). The non-significant positive effect of breastfeeding on child growth has previously been documented (58, 64, 65). Indeed, Marquis and colleagues (64) observed an inverse relationship between breastfeeding and child linear growth. They attributed this inverse relationship to what they termed *reverse causality*—that is, the breastfeeding did not lead to poor growth, but poor growth and health led to increased breastfeeding.

Surprisingly, in Mozambique, the widely recognised urban advantage in terms of favourable health outcomes was not observed in the present study. The analysis showed that urban place of residence associated negatively with child linear growth in poor households. The reason for this inverse relationship could be attributed to the precarious conditions under which some of the urban poor live in (e.g. slums) (66). In the literature, both negative and positive effects have been found with the urban place of residence and child growth outcomes (66, 67). Some previous studies have observed that urban children are usually taller and heavier (67, 68). However, this may not include those children in poor urban settings, as there is evidence that children in these settings tend to have shorter heights than expected (66). This finding may mean that the so-called urban advantage does not benefit the urban poor in Mozambique.

The strength of our study is the use of large nationally representative samples, thereby providing more robust estimates of observed associations as well as enhancing the generalizability of the findings. The use of multi-country data unmasks differences and highlights commonalities in the effects of the correlates on child growth across countries, which would not have been possible with single country data. Further, the height data used for computing the HAZ indicator were objectively measured, reducing possible misclassification. The novelty of this study is its focus on factors that promote better child growth rather than risks factors for child growth deficiencies. A limitation worth mentioning is the cross-sectional nature of the data, which does not lend itself to the establishments of a causal relationship between the predictor and outcome variables. The conclusions in the paper are, therefore interpreted as mere associations between the predictor variables and the outcome variable. Another limitation is that the use of PD is somewhat limited as we were not able to explore all the potential PD behaviours that may contribute to positive child growth outcomes using quantitative data of this nature. Notwithstanding, PD is a well-established concept and hence makes it possible to explore the approach (PD) using quantitative data.

Conclusions

The study examined the effects of child, maternal, household and community-level socio-demographic factors on better linear growth among children in five SSA countries. The results showed that the effects of socio-demographic factors on child linear growth vary across countries. Maternal education has a positive effect on better growth among children in all countries except Mozambique. Improving maternal education in poor households may have a beneficial effect on child growth outcomes. A higher number of ANC visits has a significant positive effect on better child growth. Interventions to promote linear growth among children living in poverty should incorporate ANC as one of the critical intervention packages.

Acknowledgements

We wish to express our profound gratitude to The DHS Program, USA for providing us access to the data. We also wish to acknowledge institutions of respective countries that played critical roles in the data collection process.

Competing Interest

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

Funding

This study did not receive funding from any source.

Data Sharing Statement

This study was a re-analysis of existing data that are publicly available from The DHS Program at http://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-fr221-dhs-final-reports.cfm. Data are accessible free of charge upon registration with the Demographic and Health Survey program (The DHS Program). The registration is done on the DHS website indicated above.

Authors' Contribution

DAA conceived and designed the study, interpreted the results, wrote the first draft of the manuscript, and contributed to revision of the manuscript. DAA and ZTD analysed the data. ZTD and EWK contributed to study design, data interpretation, and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors take responsibility for any issues that might arise from the publication of this manuscript.

References

1. de Onis M, Blössner M, Borghi E. Prevalence and trends of stunting among pre-school children, 1990–2020. Public health nutrition. 2011;15(1):142-8.
2. de Onis M, Blossner M, Borghi E, Morris R, Frongillo EA. Methodology for estimating regional and global trends of child malnutrition. International journal of epidemiology. 2004;33(6):1260-70.
3. de Onis M, Frongillo EA, Blossner M. Is malnutrition declining? An analysis of changes in levels of child malnutrition since 1980. Bull World Health Organ. 2000;78(10):1222-33.
4. Danaei G, Andrews KG, Sudfeld CR, Fink G, McCoy DC, Peet E, et al. Risk Factors for Childhood Stunting in 137 Developing Countries: A Comparative Risk Assessment Analysis at Global, Regional, and Country Levels. PLoS medicine. 2016;13(11):e1002164.
5. Mosites E, Dawson-Hahn E, Walson J, Rowhani-Rahbar A, Neuhouser ML. Piecing together the stunting puzzle: a framework for attributable factors of child stunting. Paediatr Int Child Health. 2017;37(3):158-65.
6. Prado EL, Yakes Jimenez E, Vosti S, Stewart R, Stewart CP, Somé J, et al. Path analyses of risk factors for linear growth faltering in four prospective cohorts of young children in Ghana, Malawi and Burkina Faso. BMJ Global Health. 2019;4(1):e001155.
7. Budge S, Parker AH, Hutchings PT, Garbutt C. Environmental enteric dysfunction and child stunting. Nutrition Reviews. 2019;77(4):240-53.
8. Black RE, Allen LH, Bhutta ZA, Caulfield LE, de Onis M, Ezzati M, et al. Maternal and child undernutrition: global and regional exposures and health consequences. Lancet. 2008;371(9608):243-60.
9. Muller O, Krawinkel M. Malnutrition and Health in Developing Countries Canadian Medical Association Journal. 2005;171:279–93.
10. de Onis M, Blossner M, Borghi E. Prevalence and trends of stunting among pre-school children, 1990-2020. Public health nutrition. 2012;15(1):142-8.
11. Delisle H. Early nutritional influences on obesity, diabetes and cardiovascular disease risk. International Workshop, 6-9 June 2004, Montreal University, Quebec, Canada. Maternal and Child Nutrition. 2005;1(3):128-9.
12. Kar BR, Rao SL, Chandramouli BA. Cognitive development in children with chronic protein energy malnutrition. Behav Brain Funct. 2008;4:31-.
13. WHO. Global nutrition targets 2025: stunting policy brief (WHO/NMH/NHD/14.3). Geneva: World Health Organization; 2014.
14. UN. Sustainable Development Goals 2015 [cited 2019 23.08]. Available from: http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/.
15. WHO. World Health Organization global data base on child growth and malnutrition Geneva2011 [cited 2019 23.08]. Available from: http://www.who.int/nutgrowthdb/database/countries/gha/en/.
16. de Poel V, Hosseinpoor RA, Jehu-Appiah C, Vega J, Speybroeck N. Malnutrition and the disproportionate burden on the poor: the case of Ghana. Int J Equity Health. 2007;6(21).
17. Hong R. Effects of economic inequality on chronic childhood undernutrition in Ghana Public Health Nutr. 2005;4(10):372-8.
18. Kismul H, Acharya P, Mapatano MA, Hatloy A. Determinants of childhood stunting in the Democratic Republic of Congo: further analysis of Demographic and Health Survey 2013-14. BMC Public Health. 2017;18(1):74.
19. Keino S, Plasqui G, Ettyang G, van den Borne B. Determinants of stunting and overweight among young children and adolescents in sub-Saharan Africa Food Nutr Bull. 2014;35(2):167-78.

20. Lamontagne JF, Engle PL, Zeitlin MF. Maternal employment, child care, and nutritional status of 12-18-month-old children in Managua, Nicaragua Social science & medicine (1982). 1998;46(3):403-14.
21. Amugsi DA, Mittelmark MB, Lartey A. An analysis of socio-demographic patterns in child malnutrition trends using Ghana demographic and health survey data in the period 1993–2008. BMC Public Health. 2013;13(1):960.
22. Beeghly M, Tronick E. Early resilience in the context of parent-infant relationships: a social developmental perspective Current problems in pediatric and adolescent health care. 2011;41(7):197-201.
23. Zeitlin MF, Ghassemi H, Mansour M, Levine RA, Dillanneva M, Carballo M, et al. Positive deviance in child nutrition: with emphasis on psychosocial and behavioural aspects and implications for development: United Nations University Tokyo. 1990.
24. Sternin M, Sternin J, Marsh D. Rapid, sustained childhood malnutrition alleviation through a "positive deviance" approach in rural Vietnam: preliminary findings. In: Keeley E, Burkhalter BR, Wollinka O, Bashir N, eds. The hearth nutrition model: applications in Haiti, Vietnam, and Bangladesh, Report of a Technical Meeting at World Relief Corporation, Wheaton, IL, June 19-21, 1996. Arlington: BASICS, 1997.1997.
25. Long KNG, Gren LH, Rees CA, West JH, Hall PC, Gray B, et al. Determinants of better health: a cross-sectional assessment of positive deviants among women in West Bengal. BMC Public Health. 2013;13(1):372.
26. Marsh DR, Schroeder DG. The positive deviance approach to improve health outcomes: experience and evidence from the field: preface. Food Nutr Bull 2002;23(suppl 4):5-8.
27. Bolles K, Speraw C, Berggren G, Lafontant JG. Ti Foyer (hearth) community-based nutrition activities informed by the positive deviance approach in Leogane, Haiti: A programmatic description. Food Nutr Bull. 2002;23(suppl 4):11-7.
28. EcoYoff. Positive deviance—take 2. Living and learning newsletter. 2003 [Available from: http://ifnc.tufts.edu/pdf/ecoyoff21.pdf.
29. Sethi V, Kashyap S, Seth V, Agarwal S. Encouraging appropriate infant feeding practices in slums: a positive deviance approach. . Pakistan J Nutr 2003;2:164-6.
30. Shafique M, Edwards HM, De Beyl CZ, Thavrin BK, Min M, Roca-Feltrer A. Positive deviance as a novel tool in malaria control and elimination: methodology, qualitative assessment and future potential. Malaria journal. 2016;15:91.
31. Marsh DR, Schroeder DG, Dearden KA, Sternin J, Sternin M. The power of positive deviance BMJ 2004;329:1177-9.
32. Marsh DR, Pachón H, Schroeder DG, Ha TT, Dearden K, Lang TT, et al. Design of a prospective, randomized evaluation of an integrated nutrition program in rural Viet Nam Food Nutr Bull 2002;23(suppl 4):36-47.
33. Dearden K, Quan N, Do M, Marsh DR, Schroeder G, Pachón H, et al. What influences health behavior? Learning from caregivers of young children in Vietnam Food Nutr Bull. 2002;23(suppl 4):119-29.
34. Baxter R, Taylor N, Kellar I, Lawton R. What methods are used to apply positive deviance within healthcare organisations? A systematic review. BMJ Quality & Safety. 2016;25(3):190-201.
35. Ahrari M, Kuttab A, Khamis S, Farahat AA, Darmstadt GL, Marsh DR, et al. Socioeconomic and behavioral factors associated with successful pregnancy outcomes in upper Egypt: a positive deviance inquiry Food Nutr Bull. 2002;23:83-8.
36. The DHS Program. Demographic and Health Surveys [Available from: http://dhsprogram.com/data/available-datasets.cfm.

37. Amugsi DA, Dimbuene ZT, Kimani-Murage EW, Mberu B, Ezeh AC. Differential effects of dietary diversity and maternal characteristics on linear growth of children aged 6-59 months in sub-Saharan Africa: a multi-country analysis. Public health nutrition. 2017;20(6):1029-45.
38. Amugsi DA, Dimbuene ZT, Kyobutungi C. Correlates of the double burden of malnutrition among women: an analysis of cross sectional survey data from sub-Saharan Africa. BMJ Open. 2019;9(7):e029545.
39. The DHS Program. Demographic and Health Surveys [cited 2018 06.09]. Available from: https://dhsprogram.com/data/dataset_admin/download-datasets.cfm [
40. The DHS Program. DHS Methodology [Available from: http://dhsprogram.com/What-We-Do/Survey-Types/DHS-Methodology.cfm.
41. Ghana Statistical Service (GSS), Ghana Health Service (GHS), ICF Macro. GhanaDemographic and Health Survey 2008 Accra, Ghana: GSS, GHS, and ICF Macro; 2009.
42. Ministry of Health and Social Services (MoHSS), Macro International Inc. Namibia Demographic and Health Survey 2006-07 Windhoek, Namibia and Calverton, Maryland, USA: MoHSS and Macro International Inc. ; 2008.
43. Ghana Statistical Service (GSS), Ghana Health Service (GHS), ICF International. Ghana Demographic and Health Survey 2014. Rockville, Maryland, USA: GSS, GHS, and ICF International.; 2015.
44. National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria], ICF International. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2013. Abuja, Nigeria, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: NPC and ICF International. . 2014.
45. National Bureau of Statistics-Kenya, ICF International. 2014 KDHS Key Findings. Rockville, Maryland, USA: KNBS and ICF International. 2015.
46. WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group. WHO Child Growth Standards based on length/height, weight and age Acta paediatrica (Oslo, Norway : 1992) Supplement. 2006;450:76-85.
47. Faye CM, Fonn S, Levin J, Kimani-Murage E. Analysing child linear growth trajectories among under-5 children in two Nairobi informal settlements. Public health nutrition. 2019;22(11):2001-11.
48. The Nambia Ministry of Health and Social Services (MoHSS) and ICF International, International. The Namibia Demographic and Health Survey 2013 Windhoek, Namibia, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: MoHSS and ICF. 2014.
49. UNICEF. The State of World's Children: Causes of Child Malnutrition 1998 [Available from: https://www.unicef.org/sowc98/fig5.htm.
50. Engle PL, Menon P, Haddadb L. Care and nutrition: concepts and measurements. Washington, DC: UNICEF/International Food Policy Institute. 1997.
51. Zanello G, Srinivasan CS, Shankar B. What Explains Cambodia's Success in Reducing Child Stunting-2000-2014? PloS one. 2016;11(9):e0162668.
52. Smith LC, Ruel MT, Ndiaye A. Why is child malnutrition lower in urban than in rural areas? Evidence from 36 developing countries World Devel. 2005;33(8):1285-305.
53. Sastry N. What explains rural-urban differentials in child mortality in Brazil? Social science & medicine (1982). 1997;44(7):989-1002.
54. Rollins NC, Bhandari N, Hajeebhoy N, Horton S, Lutter CK, Martines JC, et al. Why invest, and what it will take to improve breastfeeding practices? Lancet. 2016;387(10017):491-504.
55. Mirmiran P, Mohammadi F, Allahverdian S, Azizi F. Association of educational level and marital status with dietary intake and cardiovascular risk factors in Tehranian adults: Tehran lipid and glucose study (TLGS). Nutr Res. 2002;22.
56. Armar-Klemesu M, Ruel MT, Maxwell DG, Levin CE, Morris SS. Poor maternal schooling is the main constraint to good child care practices in Accra. J Nutr. 2000;130(6):1597-607.
57. Urke HB, Mittelmark MB, Amugsi DA, Matanda DJ. Resources for nurturing childcare practices in urban and rural settings: Findings from the Colombia 2010 Demographic and Health Survey. Child Care Health Dev 2018;44(4):572-82.

58. Amugsi DA, Mittelmark MB, Lartey A, Matanda DJ, Urke HB. Influence of childcare practices on nutritional status of Ghanaian children: a regression analysis of the Ghana Demographic and Health Surveys. BMJ Open. 2014;4.
59. Makoka D, Masibo PK. Is there a threshold level of maternal education sufficient to reduce child undernutrition? Evidence from Malawi, Tanzania and Zimbabwe. BMC Pediatrics. 2015;15(1):96.
60. Kuhnt J, Vollmer S. Antenatal care services and its implications for vital and health outcomes of children: evidence from 193 surveys in 69 low-income and middle-income countries. BMJ open. 2017;7(11):e017122-e.
61. WHO. Continued breastfeeding for healthy growth and development of children 2019 [cited 2019 03.09]. Available from: https://www.who.int/elena/titles/continued_breastfeeding/en/.
62. Yan J, Liu L, Zhu Y, Huang G, Wang PP. The association between breastfeeding and childhood obesity: a meta-analysis. BMC public health. 2014;14:1267-.
63. Kramer MS, Aboud F, Mironova E, Vanilovich I, Platt RW, Matush L, et al. Breastfeeding and child cognitive development: new evidence from a large randomized trial. Archives of general psychiatry. 2008;65(5):578-84.
64. Marquis GS, Habicht JP, Lanata CF, Black RE, Rasmussen KM. Association of breastfeeding and stunting in Peruvian toddlers: an example of reverse causality. International journal of epidemiology. 1997;26(2):349-56.
65. Mulder-Sibanda M, Sibanda-Mulder FS. Prolonged breastfeeding in Bangladesh: indicators of inadequate feeding practices or mothers' response to children's poor health? Public Health. 1999;113(2):65-8.
66. Fotso JC, Madise N, Baschieri A, Cleland J, Zulu E, Mutua MK, et al. Child growth in urban deprived settings: does household poverty status matter? At which stage of child development? Health & place. 2012;18(2):375-84.
67. Paciorek CJ, Stevens GA, Finucane MM, Ezzati M, Nutrition Impact Model Study G. Children's height and weight in rural and urban populations in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic analysis of population-representative data. Lancet Glob Health. 2013;1(5):e300-e9.
68. Amugsi DA, Mittelmark MB, Lartey A. Dietary Diversity is a Predictor of Acute Malnutrition in Rural but Not in Urban Settings: Evidence from Ghana British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research. 2014;4(25):4310–24.