Causes and consequences of child growth failure in low- and middle-income countries

Andrew Mertens,[1]* Jade Benjamin-Chung,[1] John M Colford Jr,[1] Jeremy Coyle[1], Mark J van der Laan,[1] Alan E Hubbard,[1] Sonali Dayal,[1] Ivana Malenica,[1] Nima Hejazi,[1] Oleg Sofrygin,[1] Wilson Cai,[1] Haodong Li,[1] Anna Nguyen,[1] Nolan N Pokpongkiat,[1] Stephanie Djajadi,[1] Anmol Seth,[1] Esther O Chung,[1] Wendy Jilek,[1] Vishak Subramoney,[2] Ryan Hafen,[3] Jonas Häggström,[4] Thea Norman,[5] Kenneth H Brown,[6] Parul Christian,[7] Benjamin F. Arnold,[1,8,9]* and members of the *ki* Child Growth Consortium[‡]

[1] Division of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of California, Berkeley, 2121 Berkeley Way Rm 5302 Berkeley, CA 94720-7360

[2] Certara Canada, 2000 Peel St, Montreal, Quebec H3A 2W5, Canada

[3] Hafen Consulting, LLC, West Richland WA, 99353

[4] MTEK Sciences 802-777 West Broadway, Vancouver, BC, V5Z 1J8, Canada

[5] Quantitative Sciences, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 500 5th Ave N, Seattle, WA 98109

[6] Department of Nutrition, University of California, Davis, 3135 Meyer Hall, Davis, CA 95616-5270

[7] Maternal, Newborn & Child Health Discovery & Tools, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 500 5th Ave N, Seattle, WA 98109

[8] Francis I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, 95 Kirkham St, San Francisco, CA 94143

[9] Department of Ophthalmology, University of California, San Francisco, 10 Koret Way, San Francisco, CA 94143

* Corresponding authors:

Andrew Mertens, amertens@berkeley.edu, Division of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of California, Berkeley, 2121 Berkeley Way Rm 5302 Berkeley, CA 94720-7360

Benjamin F. Arnold, ben.arnold@ucsf.edu, Francis I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, 95 Kirkham St, San Francisco, CA 94143

Abstract

Child growth failure is associated with a higher risk of illness and mortality,[1] which contributed to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 2.2 to end malnutrition by 2030. Current prenatal and postnatal interventions, such as nutritional supplementation, have been insufficient to eliminate growth failure in low resource settings —motivating a search for key age windows and population subgroups in which to focus future preventive efforts. Quantifying the effect of early growth failure on severe outcomes is important to assess burden and longer-term impacts on the child. Here we show through an analysis of 35 longitudinal cohorts (108,336 children) that maternal and child characteristics at birth accounted for the largest attributable differences in growth. Yet, postnatal growth failure was larger than differences at birth, and characteristics of the child's household environment were additional determinants of growth failure after age 6 months. Children who experienced early ponderal or linear growth failure were at much higher risk of persistent growth failure and were 2.0 to 4.8 times more likely to die by age 24 months. High attributable risk from prenatal causes, and severe consequences for children who experienced early growth failure, support a focus on pre-conception and pregnancy as key opportunities for new preventive interventions. Our results suggest that broad improvements in wellbeing will be necessary to eliminate growth failure in low resource settings, but that screening based on weight could help identify children at highest risk of death before age 24 months.

‡Members of the *ki* Child Growth Consortium

1. Souheila Abbeddou, Food Safety and Nutrition Unit, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Ghent University, Belgium
2. Linda S. Adair, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA
3. Tahmeed Ahmed, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
4. Asad Ali, Aga Khan University, Pakistan
5. Hasmot Ali, JiVitA Project, Bangladesh, Johns Hopkins, USA
6. Per Ashorn, Center for Child Health Research, Tampere University and Tampere University Hospital, Finland
7. Rajiv Bahl, World Health Organization, Switzerland
8. Elodie Becquey, International Food Policy Research Institute, USA
9. France Begín, UNICEF, USA
10. Pascal Obong Bessong, HIV/AIDS & Global Health Research Programme, University of Venda, South Africa
11. Maharaj Kishan Bhan, Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi, India
12. Nita Bhandari, Centre for Health Research and Development, Society for Applied Studies, New Delhi, India
13. Santosh K. Bhargava, Senior Consultant Pediatrics, Sunder Lal Jain Hospital, Ashok Vihar, India
14. Robert E. Black, Johns Hopkins University, USA
15. Ladaporn Bodhidatta, Armed Forces Research Institute of Medical Sciences, Bangkok, Thailand
16. Delia Carba, USC Office of Population Studies Foundation, Inc., University of San Carlos, Cebu, Philippines
17. William Checkley, Johns Hopkins University, USA
18. Jean E. Crabtree, Leeds Institute for Medical Research, St. James's University Hospital, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
19. Kathryn G. Dewey, Institute for Global Nutrition, Department of Nutrition, University of California, Davis, USA
20. Christopher P. Duggan, Center for Nutrition, Boston Children's Hospital, USA
21. Caroline H.D. Fall, Professor of International Paediatric Epidemiology, MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, United Kingdom
22. Abu Syed Golam Faruque, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
23. Wafaie W. Fawzi, Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, USA
24. José Quirino da Silva Filho, Federal University of Ceará, Brazil
25. Robert H. Gilman, Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health, USA
26. Richard Guerrant, University of Virginia, USA
27. Rashidul Haque, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
28. S. M. Tafsir Hasan, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
29. Sonja Y. Hess, Dept of Nutrition and Institute for Global Nutrition, University of California Davis, USA
30. Eric R. Houpt, University of Virginia, USA
31. Jean H. Humphrey, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, USA
32. Najeeha Talat Iqbal, Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Aga Khan University, Pakistan
33. Elizabeth Yakes Jimenez, Departments of Pediatrics and Internal Medicine, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, USA
34. Jacob John, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India
35. Sushil Matthew John, Professor, Low Cost Effective Care Unit, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

36. Gagandeep Kang, Translational Health Science and Technology Institute, Faridabad, Haryana, India
37. Margaret Kosek, University of Virginia, USA
38. Michael S. Kramer, McGill University and McGill University Health Centre, Canada
39. Alain Labrique, Center of Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, USA
40. Nanette R. Lee, USC-Office of Population Studies Foundation Inc., University of San Carlos, Cebu, Philippines
41. Aldo Ângelo Moreira Lima, Federal University of Ceará, Brazil
42. Tjale Cloupas Mahopo, Department of Nutrition, School of Health Sciences, University of Venda, South Africa
43. Kenneth Maleta, Department of Public Health, School of Public Health and Family Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Malawi, Malawi
44. Dharma S. Manandhar, Mother and Infant Research Activities, Nepal
45. Karim P. Manji, Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Muhimbili University School of Health and Allied Sciences, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
46. Reynaldo Martorell, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, USA
47. Sarmila Mazumder, Centre for Health Research and Development, Society for Applied Studies, New Delhi, India
48. Estomih Mduma, Haydom Lutheran Hospital, Haydom, Tanzania
49. Venkata Raghava Mohan, Professor, Community Medicine, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu,In dia
50. Sophie E. Moore, Department of Women and Children's Health, Kings College London, London, UK & MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom
51. Robert Ntozini, Zvitambo Institute for Maternal and Child Health Research, Zimbabwe
53. Mzwakhe Emanuel Nyathi, Department of Animal Sciences, School of Agriculture, University of Venda, South Africa
54. Maribel Paredes Olortegui, AB PRISMA, Peru
55. Césaire T. Ouédraogo, Institute for Global Nutrition, Department of Nutrition, University of California, Davis, CA, USA
56. William A. Petri, University of Virginia, USA
57. Prasanna Samuel Premkumar, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India
58. Andrew M. Prentice, MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Banjul, The Gambia
59. Najeeb Rahman, Aga Khan University, Pakistan
60. Manuel Ramirez-Zea, INCAP Research Center for the Prevention of Chronic Diseases, Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama, Guatemala City, Guatemala
61. Harshpal Singh Sachdev, Senior Consultant Pediatrics and Clinical Epidemiology, Sitaram Bhartia Institute of Science and Research, B-16 Qutab Institutional Area, New Delhi, India
62. Kamran Sadiq, Aga Khan University, Pakistan
63. Rajiv Sarkar, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India
64. Monira Sarmin, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
65. Naomi M. Saville, Institute for Global Health, University College London, United Kingdom
66. Saijuddin Shaikh, JiVitA Project, Bangladesh, Johns Hopkins, USA
67. Bhim P. Shrestha, Health Research and Development Forum, Kathmandu, Nepal
68. Sanjaya Kumar Shrestha, MD, Walter Reed/AFRIMS Research Unit, Kathmandu, Nepal Centre for International Health, University of Bergen, Norway
69. Alberto Melo Soares, Federal University of Ceará, Brazil

70. Bakary Sonko, MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Banjul, The Gambia
71. Aryeh D. Stein, Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, USA
72. Erling Svensen, Haukeland University Hospital, Norway
73. Sana Syed, Department of Pediatrics, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology & Nutrition University of Virginia School of Medicine, and Aga Khan University, Pakistan
74. Fayaz Umrani, Aga Khan University, Pakistan
75. Honorine D. Ward, Tufts Medical Center, Tufts University School of Medicine, USA
76. Keith P. West Jr., Center for Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, USA
77. Lee Shu Fune Wu, Center for Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, USA
78. Seungmi Yang, McGill University, Canada
79. Pablo Penataro Yori, University of Virginia, USA

Introduction

Growth failure in the form of stunting, a marker of chronic malnutrition, and wasting, a marker of acute malnutrition, is common among young children in low-resource settings, and may contribute to child mortality and adult morbidity.[1,2] Worldwide, 22% of children under age 5 years are stunted and 7% are wasted, with most of the burden occurring in low- and middle- income counties (LMIC).[3] Current estimates attribute > 250,000 deaths annually to stunting and > 1 million deaths annually to wasting.[2] Stunted or wasted children also experience worse cognitive development[4–9] and adult economic outcomes.[10]

Despite widespread recognition of the importance of growth failure to global public health, preventive interventions in LMICs have had limited success.[11–13] A range of nutritional interventions, targeting all stages of fetal and child development, including nutrition education, food and micronutrient supplementation during pregnancy, promotion of exclusive breastfeeding for 6 months and continued breastfeeding for 2 years, and food and micronutrient supplementation during weaning, have been found to have a beneficial effect on child growth.[14–16] However, postnatal breastfeeding interventions and nutritional interventions delivered to children who have begun complementary feeding have only had small effects on population-level stunting and wasting burdens.[14,16–18] Additionally, water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) interventions, which aim to reduce childhood infections that may heighten the risk of wasting and stunting in non-emergency settings[19,20], have had no effect on child growth in several recent large randomized control trials.[21–24] The small effect sizes of preventative interventions may reflect an incomplete understanding of the optimal way and time to intervene.[25]

Modest effects of interventions to prevent stunting and wasting in recent decades have spurred renewed interest in efforts to combine rich data sources[26] with advances in statistical methodology[27] to more deeply understand the key causes of child growth failure.[11,22,23,28] Understanding the relationship between the causes and timing of growth failure is also crucial because children who falter early could be at higher risk for more severe growth failure later. In companion articles, we report that the highest rates of incident stunting and wasting occur by age 3 months.[29,30] Behaviours associated with higher risk of stunting or wasting could be targeted by future interventions, and interventions could be optimized to encourage behaviour change before the age at which growth failure occurs. Characteristics associated with higher risk could also be used to identify children at risk of growth failure who might benefit most from preventative interventions.

Pooled longitudinal analyses

Here, we report a pooled analysis of 35 longitudinal cohorts in 15 low- and middle-income countries in South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and Eastern Europe, initiated between 1969 and 2014. Our objective was to estimate relationships between child, parental, and household characteristics and measures of child chronic and acute growth failure, including length-for-age and weight-for-length Z-scores, stunting, wasting, and length and weight velocities from birth to age 24 months. Details on the estimation of growth failure outcomes are included in companion articles.[29,30] We also estimated associations between early growth failure and more severe growth failure or mortality by age 24

months.

Cohorts were assembled as part of the Knowledge Integration (*ki*) initiative of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation which includes a database of millions of participants from studies on childbirth, growth and development.[26] We selected longitudinal cohorts from the database that met five inclusion criteria: 1) conducted in low- or middle-income countries; 2) enrolled children between birth and age 24 months and measured their length and weight repeatedly over time; 3) did not restrict enrollment to acutely ill children; 4) enrolled at least 200 children; and 5) collected anthropometric status measurements at least every 3 months (Extended Data Fig 1). Inclusion criteria ensured we could rigorously evaluate the timing and onset of growth failure among children who were broadly representative of populations in low- and middle-income countries. Thirty-one cohorts from 15 countries met inclusion criteria, and 94,019 children and 645,869 total measurements were included in this analysis (Fig 1). Child mortality was rare and not reported in many of the *ki* datasets, so we relaxed inclusion criteria for studies used in the mortality analysis to include studies that measured children at least twice a year. Four additional cohorts met this inclusion criterion, and 14,317 children and 70,659 additional measurements were included in mortality analyses (108,336 total children, 716,573 total observations, Extended data table 1). Cohorts were distributed throughout South Asia, Africa, and Latin America, with a single European cohort from Belarus.

We calculated length-for-age Z-scores (LAZ), weight-for-age Z-scores (WAZ), and weight-for-length Z-scores (WLZ) using WHO 2006 growth standards.[31] We dropped 1,332 (0.2%) unrealistic measurements of LAZ (> 6 or < –6 Z), 1,493 (0.2%) measurements of WAZ (> 6 or < –5 Z), and 1,834 (0.3%) measurements of WLZ (> 5 or < –5 Z), consistent with WHO recommendations.[32] We defined stunting as LAZ < –2, severe stunting as LAZ < –3, underweight as WAZ < –2, severe underweight as WAZ < –3, wasting as WLZ < –2, severe wasting as WLZ < –3, concurrent stunting and wasting as LAZ < –2 and WLZ < –2, and persistent wasting as > 50% measurements of WLZ < –2 during an age period with at least 4 measurements (e.g., birth to 24 months).

Rank ordered causes of growth failure

We selected exposures of interest based on important predictors of stunting and wasting from prior literature that were measured in multiple cohorts and could be harmonized across cohorts for pooled analyses (Fig 1, Extended data table 2). All reported estimates were adjusted for all other measured exposures that we assumed were not on the causal pathway between the exposure of interest and the outcome. For example, the association between maternal height and stunting was not adjusted for a child's birthweight because low maternal height could increase stunting risk through lower child birthweight.[33] Parameters were estimated using targeted maximum likelihood estimation, a doubly-robust, semiparametric method that allows for valid inference while adjusting for potential confounders using ensemble machine learning (details in Methods).[27,34] We estimated cohort-specific parameters, adjusting for measured covariates within each cohort, and then pooled estimates across cohorts using random effects models (Extended data Fig 1).[35,36] When estimating relative risks, Z-score differences, and attributable risk parameters, we chose the reference as the mode of the level of lowest risk across cohorts. We also estimated the effects of optimal dynamic treatment interventions, where no a-priori reference level of low risk was specified, and each child's individual low-risk level of exposure was

260 estimated from covariates. Timing of exposures varied, from parental and household characteristics
261 present before birth, to fetal or at-birth exposures, and postnatal exposures including breastfeeding and
262 diarrheal disease. We estimated only associations for growth failure occurring after exposure
263 measurements to ensure time-ordering of exposures and outcomes.

264 Longer child birth length, higher maternal weight, earlier child birth order, higher maternal
265 educations, and more rooms in the household were five of the top six population-level predictors of
266 higher LAZ and WLZ at 24 months, as rank-ordered by population attributable difference, the estimated
267 shift in population mean Z-score if the whole population had their exposure shifted from observed levels
268 to the lowest-risk reference level (Fig 2a, 2b). The pooled, cross-validated R2 for models that included
269 these five key determinants, plus child sex and birthweight, was 0.29 for LAZ (N= 15 cohorts, 22,193
270 children) and 0.09 for WLZ (N=15 cohorts, 20,927 children). The dry season of the year was also an
271 important predictor of higher WLZ, and taller mother's height was an important predictor of higher LAZ.
272 Mother's height was a stronger predictor of both LAZ and WLZ than father's height, which may reflect
273 that maternal anthropometric status integrates across multiple distal and proximate causes, such as
274 family socio-economic status (SES), fetal growth environment, and breastmilk quality. Maternal height
275 and weight and child characteristics measured at birth were the strongest predictors of LAZ and WLZ at
276 age 24 months; beyond those, key predictors of higher Z-scores included markers of better household
277 socioeconomic status (e.g., number of rooms in the home, parental education, clean cooking fuel use,
278 household wealth index) and having a cesarean birth, which may reflect healthcare access or larger fetal
279 size. The findings underscore the importance of prenatal exposures for child growth outcomes, and at
280 the population-level growth failure may be difficult to shift without broad improvements in standard of
281 living.[10,37] Exclusive or predominant breastfeeding before 6 months of age, which was not a major
282 predictor of Z-scores at 24 months, was more strongly associated with higher WLZ than with higher LAZ
283 at 6 months of age (Extended Data Figs 2,3,4).

284 Maternal anthropometric status can influence child Z-scores by affecting fetal growth and birth
285 size.[38,39] In a secondary analysis, we estimated the association between parental anthropometric status
286 and child Z-scores controlling for child birth characteristics, which showed that the relationship of
287 maternal anthropometric status to child Z-scores was only partially mediated by child birth
288 characteristics (Extended data Fig 5). Maternal weight and BMI could directly affect postnatal health
289 through breastmilk quality, or reflect family poverty, genetics, undernutrition, or food insecurity, or
290 family lifestyle and diet.[40,41]

291 The strongest predictors of stunting and wasting estimated through population attributable
292 fractions closely matched those identified for child LAZ and WLZ at 24 months (Extended Data Fig 6),
293 suggesting that information embedded in continuous and binary measures of child growth provide
294 similar inference with respect to identifying public-health relevant causes. The magnitude of population
295 attributable effects was relatively modest. For example, if all children were born to taller mothers
296 (heights ≥155 cm) compared to the observed distribution of maternal height, one of the largest
297 predictors of stunting, we estimate it would reduce the incidence of stunting by age 24 months by 19%
298 (Extended Data Fig 6a). Patterns in associations across growth outcomes were broadly consistent,
299 except for preterm birth, which had a stronger association with stunting outcomes than wasting
300 outcomes, and rainy season, which had a stronger association with wasting outcomes than stunting

301 outcomes (Extended Data Fig 2). Direction of associations did not vary across regions, but magnitude
302 did, notably with male sex less strongly associated with low LAZ in South Asia, and higher parental
303 education and larger household size more strongly associated with higher WLZ in South Asia (Extended
304 Data Figs 7,8).
305

306 ## Age-varying effects on growth failure

307 Maternal height and weight consistently arose as key predictors of population attributable
308 differences in child growth failure (Fig 2), so we sought to elucidate the longitudinal relationship
309 between maternal anthropometry and child growth. We estimated trajectories of mean LAZ and WLZ
310 stratified by maternal height, weight, and BMI. We found that maternal height strongly influenced at-
311 birth LAZ, but that LAZ progressed along similar trajectories through age 24 months regardless of
312 maternal height (Fig 3a), with similar though slightly less pronounced differences when stratified by
313 maternal weight (Fig 3b). By contrast, children born to taller mothers had similar WLZ at birth and WLZ
314 trajectories until age 3-6 months, when they diverged substantially (Fig 3a); WLZ trajectory differences
315 were even more pronounced when stratified by maternal weight (Fig 3b). Maternal BMI strongly
316 influenced WLZ, but not LAZ, at birth (Fig 3c). The findings illustrate how maternal status strongly
317 influences where child growth trajectories start, but that growth trajectories evolve in parallel, seeming
318 to respond similarly to postnatal insults independent of their starting point.

319 Children who were stunted by age 3 months exhibited a different longitudinal growth trajectory
320 from those who were stunted later.[29] We hypothesized that causes of growth failure could differ by age
321 of growth failure onset. For key exposures identified in the population attributable effect analyses, we
322 conducted analyses stratified by age of onset and in many cases found age-varying effects (Fig 3d). For
323 example, most measures of socioeconomic status were associated with incident wasting or stunting only
324 after age 6 months, and higher birth order lowered growth failure risk under age 6 months, but
325 increased risk thereafter. Stronger relationships between key socio-demographic characteristics and
326 child wasting and stunting as children age likely reflects the accumulation of insults that result from a
327 child's household conditions, particularly as children begin complementary feeding, exploring their
328 environment, and potentially face higher levels of food insecurity in homes with multiple children.[42]
329 When viewed across multiple definitions of child growth failure, most causes had stronger associations
330 with severe stunting, severe wasting, or persistent wasting (> 50% of measurements < –2 WLZ), rarer
331 but more serious outcomes, than with incidence of any wasting or stunting (Fig 3e). Additionally, the
332 characteristics strongly associated with lower probability of recovering from a wasting episode in 90
333 days (birth size, small maternal stature, lower maternal education, later birth order, and male sex) were
334 also characteristics associated with higher risk of wasting prevalence and cumulative incidence
335 (Extended data fig 2). Age-specific risk factors were generally similar for different measures of linear
336 growth and wasting (Extended data fig 2).
337

338 ## Consequences of early growth failure

339 We documented high incidence rates of wasting and stunting from birth to age 6 months.[29,30]
340 Individual studies have suggested that early wasting could predispose children to later linear growth

failure.[43–46] We hypothesized that early wasting could contribute to subsequent linear growth restriction, and early growth failure could be consequential for persistent growth failure and mortality during the first 24 months of life. Among cohorts with monthly measurements, we examined age-stratified linear growth velocity by quartiles of WLZ at previous ages. We found a consistent, exposure-response relationship between higher mean WLZ and faster linear growth velocity in the following 3 months (Fig 4a), with a corresponding inverse relationship between WLZ and incident stunting at older ages (Extended data Fig 9). Persistent wasting from birth to 6 months (defined as > 50% of measurements wasted) was the wasting measure most strongly associated with incident stunting at older ages (Fig 4b).

We next examined the relationship between measures of growth failure in the first 6 months and serious growth-related outcomes: persistent wasting from 6-24 months and concurrent wasting and stunting at 18 months of age, both of which put children at high risk of mortality.[43,47–49] Concurrent wasting and stunting was measured at 18 months because stunting prevalence peaked at 18 months and the largest number of children were measured at 18 months across cohorts.[29] All measures of early growth failure were significantly associated with later, more serious growth failure, with measures of ponderal growth failure amongst the strongest predictors (Fig 4c).

Finally, we estimated the relative risk of mortality across measures of growth failure in the first 6 months within eight cohorts that reported mortality endpoints, including 2,510 child deaths by age 24 months (4.3% of children in the cohorts). Analyses used all-cause mortality occurring before children turned two years old (Extended data Fig 10). All measures of early growth failure were significantly associated with higher risk of death by age 24 months, and those most strongly associated with death were severely underweight before age 6 months (RR=4.8, 95% CI: 4.1, 5.6), concurrent wasting and stunting (RR=4.8, 95% CI: 3.9, 5.9), and persistent wasting under 6 months (RR=3.4, 95% CI: 3.0, 3.8) (Fig 4c).

Discussion

There were several limitations to this analysis. Measurement frequency and timing varied across cohorts, cohort locations were not geographically balanced, and Z-scores did not adjust for gestational age.[50] Key exposures such as dietary diversity, nutrient consumption, micronutrient status, maternal and child morbidity indicators, pathogen-specific infections, and sub-clinical inflammation and intestinal dysfunction were measured in only a few cohorts, so were not included.[51,52] The absence of these exposures in the analysis, some of which have been found to be important within individual contributed cohorts,[52,53] means that results emphasize exposures that were more commonly collected, but likely excludes some additional causes of growth failure. Confounders were not measured in every cohort, so there could be residual confounding. Covariate adjustment had a minimal effect on most estimates (Extended Data Fig 11), and an unmeasured confounder would on average need to almost double the risk of both the exposure and the outcome to explain away observed significant associations (median E-value: 1.45, Extended Data Fig 12).[54] Finally, included cohorts were highly monitored, so mortality rates were likely lower than in the general population, and without detailed medical histories, growth failure prior to death may have been a sequela of an underlying condition like malaria or a severe respiratory infection that caused death, rather than the cause itself.

Our large-scale assessment of principal causes and near-term consequences of child growth failure found that maternal, prenatal, and at-birth characteristics are the strongest predictors of growth failure in LMICs. Shifting several key population exposures to their observed low-risk level would modestly improve LAZ and WLZ in target populations and could be expected to prevent 20-30% of incident stunting and wasting and improve Z-scores by 0.2-0.4 Z in the study populations (Fig 2, Extended Data Fig 6). These results, along with the relative importance of prenatal and maternal exposures, accord with the limited success of numerous postnatal preventive interventions in recent decades.[15,16,55–57] Prevention of early growth failure before age 6 months is additionally important and should be a high priority for global health programs because we observed that early life growth failure puts children at substantially higher risk of death by age 24 months. Our results suggest that targeting the next generation of interventions toward reproductive age and pregnant women could be a promising path forward to prevent growth failure amongst their children.[58,59] The recent Women's First trial found prenatal nutrition supplements improved children's birth size, though there was no impact of giving supplements starting pre-conception compared to starting late in the first trimester.[60] Emerging evidence suggests that interventions beyond nutrition, such as those that address maternal infection and inflammation, may further contribute to decreasing in utero growth failure.[60–65] Nevertheless, a stronger focus on prenatal interventions should not distract from renewed efforts for postnatal prevention. Maternal anthropometric status strongly influenced birth size, but the parallel drop in postnatal Z-scores among children born to different maternal phenotypes was much larger than differences at birth, indicating that growth trajectories were not fully "programmed" at birth (Fig 3a-c). Wasting and stunting incidence was highest before age 6 months, but mean LAZ decreased until age 18 months,[29] the dangerous concurrence of wasting and stunting peaked at age 18 months,[30] and large, seasonally driven declines in WLZ were observed across all ages.[30] Targeting postnatal interventions by season or by population subgroups defined by sex, socioeconomic status, maternal, and child birth characteristics identified herein should help focus preventive interventions to reduce the substantial, persistent burden of postnatal growth failure.

References

1. McDonald, C. M. *et al.* The effect of multiple anthropometric deficits on child mortality: meta-analysis of individual data in 10 prospective studies from developing countries. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **97**, 896–901 (2013).
2. Forouzanfar, M. H. *et al.* Global, regional, and national comparative risk assessment of 79 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters of risks, 1990–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *The Lancet* **388**, 1659–1724 (2016).
3. WHO | Joint child malnutrition estimates - Levels and trends (2019 edition). *WHO* http://www.who.int/nutgrowthdb/estimates2018/en/.
4. Sudfeld, C. R. *et al.* Malnutrition and Its Determinants Are Associated with Suboptimal Cognitive, Communication, and Motor Development in Tanzanian Children. *J. Nutr.* **145**, 2705–2714 (2015).
5. Black, R. E. *et al.* Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet* **382**, 427–451 (2013).
6. Grantham-McGregor, S. *et al.* Developmental potential in the first 5 years for children in developing countries. *The Lancet* **369**, 60–70 (2007).
7. Martins, V. J. B. *et al.* Long-Lasting Effects of Undernutrition. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health* **8**, 1817–1846 (2011).

8. Crookston, B. T. *et al.* Impact of early and concurrent stunting on cognition. *Matern. Child. Nutr.* **7**, 397–409 (2011).
9. Reinhardt, K. & Fanzo, J. Addressing Chronic Malnutrition through Multi-Sectoral, Sustainable Approaches: A Review of the Causes and Consequences. *Front. Nutr.* **1**, 13 (2014).
10. McGovern, M. E., Krishna, A., Aguayo, V. M. & Subramanian, S. V. A review of the evidence linking child stunting to economic outcomes. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **46**, 1171–1191 (2017).
11. Bhutta, Z. A. *et al.* What works? Interventions for maternal and child undernutrition and survival. *Lancet* **371**, 417–440 (2008).
12. Luby, S. P. *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob. Health* **6**, e302–e315 (2018).
13. Null, C. *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Kenya: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob. Health* **6**, e316–e329 (2018).
14. Panjwani, A. & Heidkamp, R. Complementary Feeding Interventions Have a Small but Significant Impact on Linear and Ponderal Growth of Children in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J. Nutr.* **147**, 2169S-2178S (2017).
15. Bhutta, Z. A. *et al.* Evidence-based interventions for improvement of maternal and child nutrition: what can be done and at what cost? *The Lancet* **382**, 452–477 (2013).
16. Das, J. K. *et al.* Preventive lipid-based nutrient supplements given with complementary foods to infants and young children 6 to 23 months of age for health, nutrition, and developmental outcomes. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **5**, CD012611 (2019).
17. Kramer, M. S. *et al.* Breastfeeding and infant growth: biology or bias? *Pediatrics* **110**, 343–347 (2002).
18. Christian, P. *et al.* Effect of fortified complementary food supplementation on child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster-randomized trial. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **44**, 1862–1876 (2015).
19. Korpe, P. S. & Petri, W. A. Environmental enteropathy: critical implications of a poorly understood condition. *Trends Mol. Med.* **18**, 328–336 (2012).
20. Budge, S., Parker, A. H., Hutchings, P. T. & Garbutt, C. Environmental enteric dysfunction and child stunting. *Nutr. Rev.* **77**, 240–253 (2019).
21. Arnold, B. F., Null, C., Luby, S. P. & Colford, J. M. Implications of WASH Benefits trials for water and sanitation – Authors' reply. *Lancet Glob. Health* **6**, e616–e617 (2018).
22. Null, C. *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Kenya: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob. Health* **6**, e316–e329 (2018).
23. Luby, S. P. *et al.* Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob. Health* **6**, e302–e315 (2018).
24. Humphrey, J. H. *et al.* Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on child stunting and anaemia in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Glob. Health* **7**, e132–e147 (2019).
25. Young, H. & Marshak, A. A discussion paper on the scope of the problem, its drivers, and strategies for moving forward for policy, practice, and research. 55.
26. Peppard, T. *et al.* (submitted). Combined longitudinal growth cohorts from infants born in South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. (2020).
27. Coyle, J. *et al.* (submitted). Targeting Learning: Robust Statistics for Reproducible Research. (2020).
28. Lenters, L. M., Wazny, K., Webb, P., Ahmed, T. & Bhutta, Z. A. Treatment of severe and moderate acute malnutrition in low- and middle-income settings: a systematic review, meta-analysis and Delphi process. *BMC Public Health* **13**, S23 (2013).
29. Benjamin-Chung, J. et. al. (submitted). Early childhood linear growth failure in low-and middle-income

countries. (2020).

30. Mertens, A. *et al.* (submitted). Child wasting and concurrent stunting in low- and middle-income countries. (2020).
31. WHO | The WHO Child Growth Standards. *WHO* http://www.who.int/childgrowth/en/.
32. Organization, W. H. & Fund (UNICEF), U. N. C. *Recommendations for data collection, analysis and reporting on anthropometric indicators in children under 5 years old*. (World Health Organization, 2019).
33. Varela-Silva, M. I., Azcorra, H., Dickinson, F., Bogin, B. & Frisancho, A. R. Influence of maternal stature, pregnancy age, and infant birth weight on growth during childhood in Yucatan, Mexico: A test of the intergenerational effects hypothesis. *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* **21**, 657–663 (2009).
34. Gruber, S. & Laan, M. van der. Targeted Maximum Likelihood Estimation: A Gentle Introduction. *UC Berkeley Div. Biostat. Work. Pap. Ser.* (2009).
35. Viechtbauer, W. Bias and Efficiency of Meta-Analytic Variance Estimators in the Random-Effects Model. *J. Educ. Behav. Stat.* **30**, 261–293 (2005).
36. Raudenbush, S. W. Analyzing Effect Sizes: Random-Effects Models. in *The Handbook of Research Synthesis and Meta-Analysis* 295–315 (Russell Sage Foundation, 2009).
37. Haddad, L., Alderman, H., Appleton, S., Song, L. & Yohannes, Y. Reducing Child Malnutrition: How Far Does Income Growth Take Us? *World Bank Econ. Rev.* **17**, 107–131 (2003).
38. Young, M. F. *et al.* Role of maternal preconception nutrition on offspring growth and risk of stunting across the first 1000 days in Vietnam: A prospective cohort study. *PloS One* **13**, e0203201 (2018).
39. Addo, O. Y. *et al.* Maternal Height and Child Growth Patterns. *J. Pediatr.* **163**, 549-554.e1 (2013).
40. Martorell, R. & Zongrone, A. Intergenerational Influences on Child Growth and Undernutrition. *Paediatr. Perinat. Epidemiol.* **26**, 302–314 (2012).
41. Bzikowska-Jura, A. *et al.* Maternal Nutrition and Body Composition During Breastfeeding: Association with Human Milk Composition. *Nutrients* **10**, (2018).
42. Garg, A. & Morduch, J. Sibling rivalry and the gender gap: Evidence from child health outcomes in Ghana. *J. Popul. Econ.* **11**, 471–493 (1998).
43. Myatt, M. *et al.* Children who are both wasted and stunted are also underweight and have a high risk of death: a descriptive epidemiology of multiple anthropometric deficits using data from 51 countries. *Arch. Public Health* **76**, (2018).
44. Richard, S. A. *et al.* Wasting Is Associated with Stunting in Early Childhood123. *J. Nutr.* **142**, 1291–1296 (2012).
45. Stobaugh, H. C. *et al.* Children with Poor Linear Growth Are at Risk for Repeated Relapse to Wasting after Recovery from Moderate Acute Malnutrition. *J. Nutr.* **148**, 974–979 (2018).
46. Isanaka, S., Hitchings, M. D. T., Berthé, F., Briend, A. & Grais, R. F. Linear growth faltering and the role of weight attainment: Prospective analysis of young children recovering from severe wasting in Niger. *Matern. Child. Nutr.* **0**, e12817.
47. Briend, A., Khara, T. & Dolan, C. Wasting and stunting--similarities and differences: policy and programmatic implications. *Food Nutr. Bull.* **36**, S15-23 (2015).
48. McDonald, C. M. *et al.* The effect of multiple anthropometric deficits on child mortality: meta-analysis of individual data in 10 prospective studies from developing countries. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **97**, 896–901 (2013).
49. C, A., T, K., C, D., Ja, B. & Group, W. T. I. Research priorities on the relationship between wasting and stunting. *Field Exch. 53* 28 (2016).
50. Perumal, N. *et al.* Effect of correcting for gestational age at birth on population prevalence of early childhood undernutrition. *Emerg. Themes Epidemiol.* **15**, 3 (2018).
51. Black, R. E. *et al.* Maternal and child undernutrition: global and regional exposures and health consequences. *Lancet* **371**, 243–260 (2008).
52. Kosek, M. *et al.* Fecal markers of intestinal inflammation and permeability associated with the subsequent acquisition of linear growth deficits in infants. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **88**, 390–396 (2013).

53. Investigators, M.-E. N. Relationship between growth and illness, enteropathogens and dietary intakes in the first 2 years of life: findings from the MAL-ED birth cohort study. *BMJ Glob. Health* **2**, (2017).

54. VanderWeele, T. J. & Ding, P. Sensitivity Analysis in Observational Research: Introducing the E-Value. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **167**, 268 (2017).

55. Bhutta, Z. A. *et al.* What works? Interventions for maternal and child undernutrition and survival. *The Lancet* **371**, 417–440 (2008).

56. Piwoz, E., Sundberg, S. & Rooke, J. Promoting Healthy Growth: What Are the Priorities for Research and Action?12. *Adv. Nutr.* **3**, 234–241 (2012).

57. Kristjansson, E. *et al.* Food supplementation for improving the physical and psychosocial health of socio-economically disadvantaged children aged three months to five years. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* CD009924 (2015) doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009924.pub2.

58. *WHO Recommendations on Antenatal Care for a Positive Pregnancy Experience*. (World Health Organization, 2016).

59. Ota, E., Hori, H., Mori, R., Tobe-Gai, R. & Farrar, D. Antenatal dietary education and supplementation to increase energy and protein intake. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* (2015) doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000032.pub3.

60. Hambidge, K. M. *et al.* A multicountry randomized controlled trial of comprehensive maternal nutrition supplementation initiated before conception: the Women First trial. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **109**, 457–469 (2019).

61. Ashorn, P. *et al.* Co-causation of reduced newborn size by maternal undernutrition, infections, and inflammation. *Matern. Child. Nutr.* **14**, e12585 (2018).

62. Unger, H. W. *et al.* Azithromycin-containing intermittent preventive treatment in pregnancy affects gestational weight gain, an important predictor of birthweight in Papua New Guinea – an exploratory analysis. *Matern. Child. Nutr.* **12**, 699–712 (2016).

63. Hallamaa, L. *et al.* The impact of maternal antenatal treatment with two doses of azithromycin and monthly sulphadoxine-pyrimethamine on child weight, mid-upper arm circumference and head circumference: A randomized controlled trial. *PLOS ONE* **14**, e0216536 (2019).

64. Hallamaa, L. *et al.* Child Health Outcomes After Presumptive Infection Treatment in Pregnant Women: A Randomized Trial. *Pediatrics* **141**, (2018).

65. Beeson, J. G. & Simpson, J. A. The potential benefit of scaling up malaria prevention to reduce low birth weight in Africa. *PLOS Med.* **14**, e1002244 (2017).



Figure 1 | Cohort sample sizes and exposures measured. (**a**) Total number of children with a measured exposure, sorted from left to right by number of cohorts measuring the exposure. (**b**) Presence of exposure variables in the *ki* data by within each included cohort. Cohorts are sorted by geographic region and sample size. (**c**) The number of observations of child anthropometry included in each cohort.



Figure 2 | Rank-ordered attributable differences between child, parental, and household characteristics and population attributable differences in anthropometry Z-scores.

(a) Exposures, ordered by pooled population attributable difference on child LAZ at 24 months. Inset figures plot the population attributable difference on the X-axis, and the optimal intervention attributable difference on the Y-axis, where the level the exposure is shifted to can vary by child. The optimal intervention attributable differences, which are not estimated with an a-priori specified low-risk reference level, were generally close to the static attributable differences, indicating that the chosen reference levels were the lowest risk strata in most or all cohorts. The largest outliers are marked: the crossed circle marks the single parent variable and the diamond marks the percent days with diarrhea under 6 months.

(b) Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on child WLZ at 24 months. The crossed circle marks the father's age variable and the diamond marks the child birth order variable.


a
Stratified by maternal height
b
Stratified by maternal weight
c
Stratified by maternal BMI
Mean LAZ
Mean WLZ
Child age in months
Maternal height
>=155 cm
[151-155) cm
<151 cm
Maternal weight
>=58 kg
[52-58) kg
<52 kg
Maternal BMI
>=18.5
<18.5
d
Stunting incidence
Wasting incidence
0-6 months
6-24 months
Exposure level
Birth order
Gestational age at birth
Full or late term
Early term
Preterm
HH food security
Food Secure
Mildly Food Insecure
Food Insecure
HH wealth
Q4
Q3
Q2
Q1
Mother's education
High
Medium
Low
Mother's height
>=155 cm
[151-155) cm
<151 cm
Adjusted CIR
e
HH wealth: Q1 vs Q4 (ref.)
Mother's education: low vs high (ref.)
Mother's weight: <52 kg vs >=58 kg (ref.)
Sex: boys vs girls (ref.)
Cumulative incidence of growth failure outcome from birth to 24 months
Persistently wasted
Severely wasted
Wasted
Severely stunted
Stunted
Adjusted cumulative incidence ratio comparing highest to lowest risk strata

585
586
587

Figure 3 | Effect of key exposures on the trajectories, timing, and severity of child growth failure

(**a**) Child length-for-age Z-score (LAZ) and weight-for-length Z-score (WLZ) trajectories, stratified by categories of maternal height (N=462,078 measurements, 71,286 children, 23 studies).

(**b**) Child LAZ and WLZ trajectories, stratified by categories of maternal weight (N=381,160 measurements, 63,551 children, 17 studies).

(**c**) Child LAZ and WLZ, stratified by categories of maternal BMI (N=373,382 measurements, 61,933 children, 17 studies).

(**d**) Associations between key exposures and wasting cumulative incidence, stratified by the age of the child during wasting incidence, show that many exposures strongly associated with wasting are only associated with wasting occurring after 6 months.

(**e**) Associations between key exposures and growth failure of different severities, showing that many exposures strongly associated with wasting and stunting have stronger associations with severe stunting and wasting or persistent wasting. Contrasts are between the highest and lowest risk exposure category of each exposure, which are printed in each panel title.



Figure 4 | Early life growth failure increases risk of more severe growth failure and mortality.

(**a**) Adjusted differences in linear growth velocity (in centimeters) across 3-month age bands, by quartile of weight-for-length z-score (WLZ) in the preceding three months. The reference group is children in the first quartile of WLZ in the previous age period. The panel with black points on the far right shows the pooled estimates, unstratified by child age. At all ages, children with higher mean WLZ over a three-month period had faster linear growth velocity in the next three-month period.
(**b**) Relative risk of stunting onset after age 6 months between children who experienced measures of early wasting compared to children who did not experience early wasting.
(**c**) Relative risk of short-term severe outcomes by measure of growth failure before age 6 months. Severe outcomes include: all-cause mortality (N included up to 8 cohorts, 2,418 deaths, and 57,903 children), persistent wasting from ages 6-24 months (N included up to 24 cohorts, 7,043 cases, and 76,347 children), and co-occurrent wasting and stunting at age 18 months (N included up to 21 cohorts, 1,635 cases, and 21,681 children).

Materials and Methods

1. Study designs and inclusion criteria

We included all longitudinal observational studies and randomized trials available through the *ki* project on April 1, 2018 that met five inclusion criteria: 1) conducted in low- or middle-income countries; 2) enrolled children between birth and age 24 months and measured their length and weight repeatedly over time; 3) did not restrict enrollment to acutely ill children; 4) enrolled at least 200 children; 5) collected anthropometry measurements at least quarterly. We included all children under 24 months of age, assuming months were 30.4167 days, and we considered a child's first measure recorded by age 7 days as their anthropometry at birth. Four additional studies with high-quality mortality information that measured children at least every 6 months were included in the mortality analyses (The Burkina Faso Zinc trial, The Vitamin-A trial in India, and the iLiNS-DOSE and iLiNS-DYAD-M trials in Malawi).

2. Statistical analysis

Analyses were conducted in R version 3.6.2. All pooled, regional, and cohort-specific results, results for secondary outcomes, and sensitivity analyses are available online at (https://child-growth.github.io/causes).

3. Outcome definitions

Anthropometry Z-scores were calculated using the 2006 WHO standards.[1] We used the medians of triplicate measurements of heights and weights of children from pre-2006 cohorts to re-calculate Z-scores to the 2006 standard. We excluded extreme measurements of WLZ > 5 or < –5, WAZ > 5 or < –6, and LAZ > 6 or < –6, consistent with WHO growth standard recommendations.[2] See Benjamin-Chung (2020) for details on cohort inclusion and assessment of anthropometry measurement quality.[3] Children with length-for-age Z-scores (LAZ), weight-for-length Z-scores (WLZ), or weight-for-age Z-scores (WAZ) < –2 were classified as stunted, wasted, or underweight, respectively. Children with LAZ, WLZ, or WAZ < –3 were classified as severely stunted, severely wasted, or severely underweight, respectively. Children with ≥ 50% of WLZ measurements < –2 over a defined age range were classified as persistently wasted. Children were assumed to never recover from stunting episodes, but children were classified as recovered from wasting episodes (and at risk for a new episode of wasting) if their measured WLZ was ≥ –2 for at least 60 days (details in Mertens et. al (2020)).[4] Child mortality was all-cause and was restricted to children who died after birth and before age 24 months.

4. Estimating relationships between child, parental, and household exposures and measures of growth failure

4.1 Exposure definitions

We selected the exposures of interest based on variables present in multiple cohorts that met our inclusion criteria, were found to be important predictors of stunting and wasting in

689 prior literature and could be harmonized across cohorts for pooled analyses. Extended data
690 table 2 lists all exposures included in the analysis, as well as exposure categories used across
691 cohorts, and the total number of children in each category. For parental education and asset-
692 based household wealth, we categorized to levels relative to the distribution of educational
693 attainment within each cohort. Continuous biological characteristics (gestational age, birth
694 weight, birth height, parental weight, parental height, parental age) were classified based on a
695 common distribution, pooling data across cohorts. Our rationale was that the meaning of socio-
696 economic variables is culturally context-dependent, whereas biological variables should have a
697 more universal meaning.

698 **4.2 Risk set definition**

699 For exposures that occur or exist before birth, we considered the child at risk of incident
700 outcomes at birth. Therefore, we classified children who were born stunted (or wasted) as
701 incident episodes of stunting (or wasting) when estimating the relationship between household
702 characteristics, paternal characteristics, and child characteristics like gestational age, sex, birth
703 order, and birth location.

704 For postnatal exposures (e.g., breastfeeding practices, WASH characteristics, birth weight),
705 we excluded episodes of stunting or wasting that occurred at birth. Children who were born
706 wasted could enter the risk set for postnatal exposures if they recovered from wasting during
707 the study period (see Mertens et al. 2020 for details).[4] This restriction ensured that for postnatal
708 exposures, the analysis only included postnatal, incident episodes. Children born or enrolled
709 wasted were included in the risk set for the outcome of recovery from wasting within 90 days
710 for all exposures (prenatal and postnatal).

711

712 **4.3 Estimating differences in outcomes across categories of exposures**

713 We estimated measures of association between exposures and growth failure outcomes by
714 comparing outcomes across categories of exposures in four ways:

715 Mean difference of the comparison levels of the exposure on LAZ, WLZ at birth, 6 months, and
716 24 months. The Z-scores used were the measures taken closest to the age of interest and within
717 one month of the age of interest, except for Z-scores at birth which only included a child's first
718 measure recorded by age 7 days.

719 Prevalence ratios (PR) between comparison levels of the exposure, compared to the reference
720 level at birth, 6 months, and 24 months. Prevalence was estimated using anthropometry
721 measurements closest to the age of interest and within one month of the age of interest, except
722 for prevalence at birth which only included measures taken on the day of birth.

723 Cumulative incidence ratios (CIR) between comparison levels of the exposure, compared to the
724 reference level, for the incident onset of outcomes between birth and 24 months, 6-24 months,
725 and birth-6 months.

726 Mean Z-scores by continuous age, stratified by levels of exposures, from birth to 24 months
727 were fit within individual cohorts using cubic splines with the bandwidth chosen to minimize the
728 median Akaike information criterion across cohorts.[5] We estimated splines separately for each

729 exposure category. We pooled spline curves across cohorts into a single prediction, offset by
730 mean Z-scores at one year, using random effects models.[6]
731
732 **4.4 Estimating population attributable parameters**
733 We estimated three measures of the population-level effect of exposures on growth failure
734 outcomes:
735 Population attributable difference was defined as the change in population mean Z-score if the
736 entire population's exposure was set to an ideal reference level. For each exposure, we chose
737 reference levels as the category with the highest mean LAZ or WLZ across cohorts.
738 Population attributable fraction (PAF) was defined as the proportional reduction in cumulative
739 incidence if the entire population's exposure was set to an ideal low risk reference level. We
740 estimated the PAF for the prevalence of stunting and wasting at birth, 6, and 24 months and
741 cumulative incidence of stunting and wasting from birth to 24 months, 6-24 months, and from
742 birth to 6 months. For each exposure, we chose the reference level as the category with the
743 lowest risk of stunting or wasting.
744 Optimal individualized intervention impact We employed a variable importance measure (VIM)
745 methodology to estimate the impact of an optimal individualized intervention on an exposure.
746 The optimal intervention on an exposure was determined through estimating individualized
747 treatment regimes, which give an individual-specific rule for the lowest-risk level of exposure
748 based on individuals' measured covariates. The impact of the optimal individualized intervention
749 is derived from the VIM, which is the predicted change in the population-mean outcome from
750 the observed if every child's exposure was shifted to their optimal level. This differs from the
751 attributable difference and PAF parameters in that we did not specify the reference level, and
752 the reference level could vary across participants. A companion article provides additional
753 details Coyle et al. (2020).[7]
754 Attributable risk and difference parameters assume a causal relationship between exposure and
755 outcome. For some exposures we considered attributable effects have a pragmatic
756 interpretation — they represent a summary estimate of relative importance that combines the
757 exposure's strength of association and its in the population.[8]
758
759 **5. Estimating relationships between early life growth failure and severe outcomes including**
760 **mortality by age 24 months.**
761 We estimated unadjusted and adjusted relative risks of severe outcomes between children who
762 experienced measures of early life growth failure and children who did not.
763 **6.1 Outcomes**
764 All-cause mortality included all deaths among children ages 1-day to 24 months who had
765 anthropometry measurements prior to death.
766 Concurrent wasting and stunting prevalence at age 18 months was estimated using the
767 anthropometry measurement taken closest to age 18 months, and within 17-19 months

768 of age, and a child was considered concurrently stunted and wasted if they had both a
769 LAZ <-2 and a WLZ <-2.

770 Persistent wasting was estimated from child measurements between 6 and 24 months
771 of age, and a child was considered persistently wasted if ≥50% of measurements of WLZ
772 were < -2.

773 **6.2 Exposures**

774 We estimated associations between the outcomes listed in 6.1 and the cumulative
775 incidence of wasting, stunting, underweight, and concurrent wasting and stunting from
776 birth to 6 months of age, and persistent wasting before 6 months of age. In the analysis
777 of child mortality, we also estimated associations between mortality and the cumulative
778 incidence of wasting, stunting, underweight, and concurrent wasting and stunting from
779 birth to 24 months of age, and persistent wasting before 24 months of age.

780 **6.3 Parameter of interest**

781 We estimated cumulative incidence ratios, unadjusted and adjusting for all pre-birth
782 exposures, as well as birth month, month of measurement, and treatment arm of
783 randomized trials.

784

785 We were also interested in determining if low weight-for-length preceded slower linear growth
786 velocity or the onset of stunting. We estimated the difference in linear growth over three-month
787 periods across quartiles of mean WLZ in the prior three-month period and the relative risk of
788 stunting cumulative incidence over three-month periods across quartiles of mean WLZ in the prior
789 three-month period. We calculated linear growth velocity as the change in length in centimeters
790 within 3-month age intervals, including measurements within a two-week window around each age
791 in months to account for variation in the age of each length measurement.

792

793

794 **6. Estimation approach**

795 Estimation of cohort-specific effects

796 For each exposure, we used directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) to identify potential confounders from the
797 broader set of exposures used in the analysis.[9] We did not condition on characteristics that were
798 assumed to be intermediate on the causal path between any exposure and the outcome.[10]

799 For missing covariate observations, we imputed missing measurements as the median
800 (continuous variables) or mode (categorical variables) among all children within each cohort, and
801 analyses included an indicator variable for missingness in the adjustment set. When calculating the
802 median for imputation, we used children as independent units rather than measurements so that
803 children with more frequent measurements were not over-represented.

804 To flexibly adjust for potential confounders and reduce the risk of model misspecification, we
805 estimated adjusted PRs, CIRs, and mean differences using targeted maximum likelihood estimation
806 (TMLE), a two-stage estimation strategy that incorporates state-of-the-art machine learning algorithms

807 (super learner) while still providing valid statistical inference. [11,12] The super learner is an ensemble
808 machine learning method that uses cross-validation to select a weighted combination of predictions
809 from a library of algorithms.[13] We included in the library simple means, generalized linear models, LASSO
810 penalized regressions,[14] generalized additive models,[15] and gradient boosting machines.[16] The super
811 learner was fit to maximize the 10-fold cross-validated area under the receiver operator curve (AUC) for
812 binomial outcomes, and minimize the 10-fold cross-validated mean-squared error (MSE) for continuous
813 outcomes. That is, the super learner was fit using 9/10 of the data, while the AUC/MSE was calculated
814 on the remaining 1/10 of the data. Each fold of the data was held out in turn and the cross-validated
815 performance measure was calculated as the average of the performance measures across the ten folds.
816 This approach is practically appealing and robust in finite samples, since this cross-validation procedure
817 utilizes unseen sample data to measure the estimator's performance. Also, the super learner is
818 asymptotically optimal in the sense that it is guaranteed to outperform the best possible algorithm
819 included in the library as sample size grows. The initial estimator obtained via super learner is
820 subsequently updated to yield an efficient double-robust semi-parametric substitution estimator of the
821 parameter of interest.[11] To estimate the R^2 of models including multiple exposures, we fit super learner
822 models, without the targeted learning step, and within each cohort measuring the exposures. We then
823 pooled cohort-specific R^2 estimates using fixed effects models.

824 Unadjusted PRs and CIRs between the reference level of each exposure and comparison levels
825 were estimated using logistic regressions.[17] Unadjusted mean differences for continuous outcomes were
826 estimated using linear regressions.

827 We estimated influence curve-based, clustered standard errors to account for repeated
828 measures in the analyses of recovery from wasting or progression to severe wasting. We assumed that
829 the children were the independent units of analysis unless the original study had a clustered design, in
830 which case the unit of independence in the original study were used as the unit of clustering. We used
831 clusters as the unit of independence for the iLiNS-Zinc, Jivita-3, Jivita-4, Probit, and SAS Complementary
832 Feeding trials. We estimated 95% confidence intervals for incidence using the normal approximation.

833

834 <u>Data sparsity</u>

835 We did not estimate relative risks between a higher level of exposure and the reference group if there
836 were 5 or fewer cases in either stratum. In such cases, we still estimated relative risks between other
837 exposure strata and the reference strata if those strata were not sparse.

838

839 **7. Pooling parameters**

840 We pooled adjusted estimates from individual cohorts using random effects models, fit using restricted
841 maximum likelihood estimation. The pooling methods are detailed in Benjamin-Chung (2020).[1] All
842 parameters were pooled directly using the cohort-specific estimates of the same parameter, except for
843 population attributable fractions. Pooled PAFs were calculated from random-effects pooled population
844 attributable risks (PARs), and pooled outcome prevalence in the population using the following
845 formulas:[18]

846

847 $$PAF = \frac{PAR}{Outcome\ prevalence} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

848 $$PAF\ 95\%CI = \frac{PAR\ 95\%\ CI}{Outcome\ prevalence} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

849

850 For PAFs of exposures on the cumulative incidence of wasting and stunting, the pooled cumulative
851 incidence was substituted for the outcome prevalence in the above equations. We used this method
852 instead of direct pooling of PAFs because, unlike PAFs, PARs are unbounded with symmetrical
853 confidence intervals.

854

855 **8. Figure-specific method details**

856 Figure 2.

857 (a) Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on child LAZ at 24
858 months. The population attributable difference is the expected difference in
859 population mean Z-score if all children had the reference level of the exposure rather
860 than the observed distribution. Inset figures plot the pooled population attributable
861 difference on the X-axis, and the pooled optimal intervention attributable difference
862 on the Y-axis, where the level the exposure is shifted to can vary by child, on the y-
863 axis.

864 (b) Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on child WLZ at 24
865 months. The population attributable difference is the expected difference in
866 population mean Z-score if all children had the reference level of the exposure rather
867 than the observed distribution.

868 In both panels, reference levels are printed next to the name of the exposure. Estimates
869 are adjusted for all other measured exposures not on the causal pathway.

870 Figure 3.

871 (a-c) Mean trajectories estimated using cubic splines in individual studies and then
872 curves were pooled using random effects.[6] Curves estimated from all anthropometry
873 measurements of children taken from birth to 24 months of age within studies that
874 measured the measure of maternal anthropometry.

875 (d) The cumulative incidence of stunting or severe stunting from 6-24 months is among
876 children who had not become stunted by 6 months, while the cumulative incidence of
877 wasting or severe wasting from 6-24 months is among children who were not wasted
878 at 6 months or who recovered from a wasting episode after 6 months. Persistent
879 wasting from 6-24 months is among all children with at least 4 measurements
880 between 6 months and 24 months. Children born stunted, and wasting episodes
881 starting at birth, are excluded from the analysis of gestational age.

882

883 Figure 4.

884 (a) Linear growth velocity was calculated as the change in length in centimeters from the
885 start of an age period to the end of an age period, using the closest anthropometry
886 measurements within 14 days of the start and end of the age period.

887 (b) The three wasting measures were defined as: child experienced any measure of
888 wasting (WLZ < –2) under 6 months, child was enrolled into the study wasted, and
889 child was persistently wasted under 6 months (≥50% of measurements of WLZ < –2,
890 and at least 4 measurements prior to age 6 months).

(c) Estimates compare risk among children with each measure of growth failure before age 6 months with risk among children who did not experience the specific measure of growth failure.

9. Sensitivity analyses

We compared estimates pooled using random effects models, which are more conservative in the presence of heterogeneity across studies, with estimates pooled using fixed effects, and we compared adjusted estimates with estimates unadjusted for potential confounders. We estimated associations between growth failure and mortality at different ages, after dropping the trials measuring children less frequently than quarterly, and we plotted Kaplan Meier curves of child mortality, stratified by measures of early growth failure. We also conducted a sensitivity analysis on methods of pooling splines of child growth trajectories, stratified by maternal anthropometry. We re-estimated the attributable differences of exposures on WLZ and LAZ at 24 months, dropping the PROBIT trial, the only European study. Results from secondary outcomes and sensitivity analyses are viewable online at https://child-growth.github.io/causes.

Data and code availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Knowledge Integration project upon reasonable request. Replication scripts for this analysis are available here: https://github.com/child-growth/ki-longitudinal-growth.

Methods References

1. WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group. WHO Child Growth Standards: Length/height-for-age, weight-for-age, weight-for-length, weight-for-height and body mass index-for-age: Methods and development. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2006 (312 pages).
2. Organization, W. H. & Fund (UNICEF), U. N. C. *Recommendations for data collection, analysis and reporting on anthropometric indicators in children under 5 years old*. (World Health Organization, 2019).
3. Benjamin-Chung, J. et. al. (submitted). Early childhood linear growth failure in low-and middle-income countries. (2020).
4. Mertens, A. *et al.* (submitted). Child wasting and concurrent stunting in low- and middle-income countries. (2020).
5. Wood, S. N., Pya, N. & Säfken, B. Smoothing Parameter and Model Selection for General Smooth Models. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **111**, 1548–1563 (2016).
6. Gasparrini, A., Armstrong, B. & Kenward, M. G. Multivariate meta-analysis for non-linear and other multi-parameter associations. *Stat. Med.* **31**, 3821–3839 (2012).
7. Coyle, J. *et al.* (submitted). Targeting Learning: Robust Statistics for Reproducible Research. (2020).
8. Jewell, N. P. *Statistics for epidemiology*. (Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC., 2004).
9. Greenland, S., Robins, J. M. & Pearl, J. Confounding and Collapsibility in Causal Inference. *Stat. Sci.* **14**, 29–46 (1999).
10. VanderWeele, T. J. & Shpitser, I. A new criterion for confounder selection. *Biometrics* **67**, 1406–1413 (2011).

11. Gruber, S. & Laan, M. van der. Targeted Maximum Likelihood Estimation: A Gentle Introduction. *UC Berkeley Div. Biostat. Work. Pap. Ser.* (2009).
12. Laan, M. J. van der & Rose, S. *Targeted Learning: Causal Inference for Observational and Experimental Data*. (Springer-Verlag, 2011).
13. van der Laan, M., Polley, E. & Hubbard, A. Super Learner. *UC Berkeley Div. Biostat. Work. Pap. Ser.* (2007).
14. Tibshirani, R. Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Methodol.* **58**, 267–288 (1996).
15. Hastie, T. & Tibshirani, R. Generalized Additive Models. *Stat. Sci.* **1**, 297–310 (1986).
16. Chen, T. & Guestrin, C. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. *Proc. 22nd ACM SIGKDD Int. Conf. Knowl. Discov. Data Min. - KDD 16* 785–794 (2016) doi:10.1145/2939672.2939785.
17. McNutt, L.-A., Wu, C., Xue, X. & Hafner, J. P. Estimating the relative risk in cohort studies and clinical trials of common outcomes. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **157**, 940–943 (2003).
18. Population attributable risk (PAR). in *Encyclopedia of Public Health* (ed. Kirch, W.) 1117–1118 (Springer Netherlands, 2008). doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-5614-7_2685.

Acknowledgments

This research was financially supported by a global development grant (OPP1165144) from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to the University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA. We would also like to thank the following collaborators on the included cohorts and trials for their contributions to study planning, data collection, and analysis: Muhammad Sharif, Sajjad Kerio, Ms. Urosa, Ms. Alveen, Shahneel Hussain, Vikas Paudel (Mother and Infant Research Activities), Anthony Costello (University College London), Noel Rouamba, Jean-Bosco Ouédraogo, Leah Prince, Stephen A Vosti, Benjamin Torun, Lindsey M Locks, Christine M McDonald, Roland Kupka, Ronald J Bosch, Rodrick Kisenge, Said Aboud, Molin Wang, Azaduzzaman, Abu Ahmed Shamim, Rezaul Haque, Rolf Klemm, Sucheta Mehra, Maithilee Mitra, Kerry Schulze, Sunita Taneja, Brinda Nayyar, Vandana Suri, Poonam Khokhar, Brinda Nayyar, Poonam Khokhar, Jon E Rohde, Tivendra Kumar, Jose Martines, Maharaj K Bhan, and all other members of the study staffs and field teams. We would also like to thank all study participants and their families for their important contributions. We are grateful to the LCNI5 and iLiNS research teams, participants and people of Lungwena, Namwera, Mangochi and Malindi, our research assistants for their positive attitude, support, and help in all stages of the studies.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: A.M., J.B., J.M.C., K.H.B., P.C., B.F.A

Funding Acquisition: J.M.C., A.E.H., M.J.V., B.F.A.

Data curation: A.M., J.B., J.C., O.S., W.C., A.N., N.N.P., W.J., E.O.C., S.D., N.H., I.M., H.L., R.H., V.S., J.H., T.N.

Formal analyses: A.M., J.B., J.C., O.S., W.C., A.N., N.N.P., W.J., E.O.C., S.D., N.H., I.M., H.L., V.S., B.F.A

Methodology: A.M., J.B., J.M.C, J.C., O.S., N.H., I.M., A.E.H., M.J.V.,K.H.B., P.C., B.F.A.

Visualization: A.M.,J.B., A.N., N.N.P., S.D., A.S., J.C., R.H., K.H.B., P.C., B.F.A.

Writing – Original Draft Preparation: A.M., J.B., B.F.A.

Writing – Review & Editing: A.M., J.B., J.M.C., K.H.B., P.C., B.F.A., *ki* Child Growth Consortium members

Competing interest declaration

Thea Norman is an employee of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF). Kenneth H Brown and Parul Christian are former employees of BMGF. Jeremy Coyle, Vishak Subramoney, Ryan Hafen, and Jonas Häggström work as research contractors funded by the BMGF.

Additional information

Supplementary Information is available for this paper at https://child-growth.github.io/causes.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Andrew Mertens (amertens@berkeley.edu) and Benjamin F. Arnold (ben.arnold@ucsf.edu).


Associations between sex and stunting incidence
from birth-24 months: cohort-specific and pooled results
Cohort
PROBIT, Belarus
MAL-ED, Peru
MAL-ED, Brazil
Guatemala BSC, Guatemala
CONTENT, Peru
COHORTS, Guatemala
ZVITAMBO, Zimbabwe
TanzaniaChild2, Tanzania
MAL-ED, Tanzania
MAL-ED, South Africa
LCNI-5, Malawi
Keneba, Gambia
iLiNS-Zinc, Burkina faso
SAS-FoodSuppl, India
SAS-CompFeed, India
ResPak, Pakistan
PROVIDE, Bangladesh
NIH-Crypto, Bangladesh
NIH-Birth, Bangladesh
MAL-ED, Nepal
MAL-ED, India
MAL-ED, Bangladesh
JiVitA-4, Bangladesh
JiVitA-3, Bangladesh
IRC, India
GMS-Nepal, Nepal
EE, Pakistan
COHORTS, Philippines
COHORTS, India
CMIN, Bangladesh
CMC-V-BCS-2002, India
Pooled - Latin America
Pooled - Africa
Pooled - South Asia
Pooled - FE
Pooled - RE
Region
Pooled
Asia
Africa
Latin America
Europe
0.75
1.00
1.50
2.00
Girls have higher risk
Boys have higher risk

1013

Extended Data Figure 1 | Example forest plot of cohort-specific and pooled parameter estimates

Cohort-specific estimates of the cumulative incidence ratio of stunting are plotted on each row, comparing the risk of any stunting from birth to 24 months among boys compared to a reference level of girls. Below the solid horizontal line are region-specific pooled measures of association, pooled using random-effects models. Below the dashed line are overall pooled measures of association, comparing pooling using random or fixed effects models. The primary results reported throughout the manuscript are overall (not region stratified) estimates pooled using random effects models.



Extended Data Figure 2 | Heatmap of significance and direction across exposure-outcome combinations.

The heatmap shows the significance and direction of estimates through the cell colors, separated across primary outcomes by child age. Red and orange cells are harmful exposures, while blue and green cells are protective exposures. The

outcomes are labeled at the top of the columns, with each set of three columns the set of three ages analyzed for that outcome. Each row is a level of an exposure variable, with reference levels excluded. Rows are sorted top to bottom by increasing average p-value. Grey cells denote comparisons that were not estimated or could not be estimated because of data sparsity in the exposure-outcome combination. All point estimates and confidence intervals for exposure-outcome pairs with P-values plotted in this figure are viewable online at (https://child-growth.github.io/causes).



Extended Data Figure 3 | Age-stratified population attributable differences in length-for-age Z-scores.

Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on child LAZ at 24 months, stratified by the age of the child at the time of anthropometry measurement.

The population attributable difference is the expected difference in population mean Z-score if all children had the reference level of the exposure rather than the observed distribution. For all plots, reference levels are printed next to the name of the exposure. Estimates are adjusted for all other measured exposures not on the causal pathway.



Extended Data Figure 4 | Age-stratified population attributable differences in weight-for-length Z-scores.

Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on child WLZ at 24 months, stratified by the age of the child at the time of anthropometry measurement. The population attributable difference is the expected difference in population mean Z-

score if all children had the reference level of the exposure rather than the observed distribution. For all plots, reference levels are printed next to the name of the exposure. Estimates are adjusted for all other measured exposures not on the causal pathway.



Extended Data Figure 5 | Mediation by birth characteristics of associations between parental anthropometry and child Z-scores at 24 months.

The plot panels show the mediating effect of adjusting for child birth anthropometry and at-birth characteristics on the estimated Z-score differences between levels of parental anthropometry. There is little to partial mediation of the association between parental anthropometry and child LAZ and WLZ at 24 months by at-birth characteristics, implying that the causal pathway between parental stature and child growth failure operates through both affecting birth size as well as other pathways. Primary estimates were adjusted for all other measured exposures not on the causal pathway, while the mediation analysis estimates are adjusted for the same set of measured exposures, plus birth weight, birth length, gestational age at birth, birth order, vaginal birth vs. C-section, and home vs. hospital delivery. Only estimates from cohorts measuring at least 4 of the 6 at-birth characteristics are used to estimate the pooled Z-score differences.



Extended Data Figure 6 | Rank-ordered associations between child, parental, and household characteristics and population attributable fractions of stunting and wasting.

(a) Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on the cumulative incidence of child stunting between birth and 24 months. The population attributable fraction is the estimated proportion of the observed outcome in the whole population attributable to the exposure. For postnatal and at-birth exposures, including birth characteristics, breastfeeding practice, food security, and diarrheal disease, the cumulative incidence of stunting from 6-24 months is used.

(b) Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on the cumulative incidence of child wasting between birth and 24 months. The population

attributable fraction is the estimated proportion of the observed outcome in the whole population attributable to the exposure. For postnatal and at-birth exposures, including birth characteristics, breastfeeding practice, food security, and diarrheal disease, the cumulative incidence of wasting from 6-24 months is used.

For all plots, reference levels are printed next to the name of the exposure. Estimates are adjusted for all other measured exposures not on the causal pathway.



Extended Data Figure 7 | Regionally-stratified population attributable differences in length-for-age Z-scores.

Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on child LAZ at 24 months, stratified by region. The population attributable difference is the expected

difference in population mean Z-score if all children had the reference level of the exposure rather than the observed distribution. For all plots, reference levels are printed next to the name of the exposure. Estimates were adjusted for all other measured exposures not on the causal pathway. The confidence intervals extend beyond the scale for diarrhea under 24 months in Africa and for safe water source in Latin America.



Extended Data Figure 8 | Regionally-stratified population attributable differences in weight-for-length Z-scores.

Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on child WLZ at 24 months, stratified by region. The population attributable difference is the expected difference in population mean Z-score if all children had the reference level of the

exposure rather than the observed distribution. For all plots, reference levels are printed next to the name of the exposure. Estimates were adjusted for all other measured exposures not on the causal pathway



Extended Data Figure 9 | Risks of subsequent linear-growth faltering across categories of prior WLZ.

Relative risk of stunting onset within 3-month age bands, comparing cohort-specific quartiles on mean WLZ in the prior 3-month age to the reference level of the first quartile. Children are assumed to not recover from stunting, so only the first measure of LAZ < –2 is used to define stunting onset.



Extended Data Figure 10 | Age at death and preceding anthropometry measurements among recorded deaths within the included *ki* cohorts

Each row is a child, with the furthest right grey dots marking the age at death, and the colored points mark anthropometry measurements prior to death. Children are sorted to show the cumulative distribution of mortality by age 24 months (marked on the right Y-axis), illustrating that more than half of child deaths occurred before 6 months. The figure is based on 2,247 recorded child deaths in children under the age of 2 years from 8 cohorts. Deaths were not plotted for 206 children with missing ages of death.



Extended Data Figure 11 | Difference between adjusted and unadjusted Z-score effects by number of selected adjustment variables.

Points mark the difference in estimates unadjusted and adjusted estimates of the difference in average Z-scores between exposed and unexposed children across 31 cohorts, 33 exposures and length-for-age and weight-for-length Z-score outcomes included in the analysis. Different cohorts measured different sets of exposures, and a different number of adjustment covariates were chosen for each cohort-specific estimate based on outcome sparsity, so cohort-specific estimates adjust for different covariates and numbers of covariates. The plot shows no systematic bias between unadjusted and adjusted estimates based on number of covariates chosen. The blue line shows the average difference between adjusted estimates from unadjusted estimates, fitted using a cubic spline.



Extended Data Figure 12 | Assessing sensitivity of estimates to unmeasured confounding using E-values

An E-value is the minimum strength of association in terms of relative risk that an unmeasured confounder would need to have with both the exposure and the outcome to explain away an estimated exposure–outcome association.[1] Orange points mark the E-values for the pooled estimates of relative risk for each exposure. Grey points are cohort-specific E-values for each exposure-outcome relationship. Non-significant pooled estimates have points plotted at 1.0. Orange points are median E-values among statistically significant estimates for each exposure.

1232 **Extended data table 1**

Region, Study ID	Country	Study Years	Design	Children Enrolled*	Anthropometry measurement ages (months)	Total measurements*	Primary References
South Asia							
Biomarkers for EE	Pakistan	2013-2015	Prospective cohort	380	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 18	8918	Iqbal et al 2018 Nature Scientific Reports[2]
Resp. Pathogens	Pakistan	2011 - 2014	Prospective cohort	284	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 17	3177	Ali et al 2016 Journal of Medical Virology[3]
Growth Monitoring Study	Nepal	2012 - Ongoing	Prospective cohort	698	Birth, 1, 2, …, 24	13487	Not yet published
MAL-ED	Nepal	2010 - 2014	Prospective cohort	240	Birth, 1, 2, …, 24	5936	Shrestha et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[4]
CMC Birth Cohort, Vellore	India	2002 - 2006	Prospective cohort	373	Birth, 0.5, 1, 1.5, ..., 24	9131	Gladstone et al. 2011 NEJM[5]
MAL-ED	India	2010 - 2012	Prospective cohort	251	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	5947	John et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[6]
Vellore Crypto Study	India	2008 - 2011	Prospective cohort	410	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	9825	Kattula et al. 2014 BMJ Open[7]
CMIN	Bangladesh	1993 - 1996	Prospective Cohort	280	Birth, 3, 6, ..., 24	5399	Pathela et al 2007 Acta Paediatrica[8]
MAL-ED	Bangladesh	2010 - 2014	Prospective cohort	265	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	5816	Ahmed et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[9]
PROVIDE RCT	Bangladesh	2011 - 2014	Individual RCT	700	Birth, 6, 10, 12, 14. 17, 18, 24, 39, 40, 52, 53 (weeks)	12165	Kirkpatrick et al 2015 Am J Trop Med Hyg[10]
Food Suppl RCT	India	1995 - 1996	Individual RCT	418	Baseline, 6, 9, 12	2242	Bhandari et al 2001 J Nutri[11]
Optimal Infant Feeding	India	1999 - 2001	Cluster RCT	1535	Birth, 3, 6, ..., 18	9539	Bhandari et al 2004 J Nutri[12]
New Delhi Birth Cohort	India	1969 - 2002	Prospective cohort	7452	Birth, 3, 6, 9, 12, 18, 24	32463	Bhargava et al 2009 NEJM[13]
NIH Birth Cohort	Bangladesh	2008 - 2009	Prospective Cohort	629	Birth, 3, 6, ..., 12	6216	Korpe et al. 2016 PLOS NTD[14]
JiVitA-4 Trial	Bangladesh	2012 - 2014	Cluster RCT	5444	6, 9, 12, 14, 18	36167	Christian et al 2015 IJE[15]
JiVitA-3 Trial	Bangladesh	2008 - 2012	Cluster RCT	27342	Birth, 1, 3, 6, 12, 24	109535	West et al JAMA 2014[16]
NIH Cryptosporidium Study	Bangladesh	2014 - 2017	Prospective cohort	758	Birth, 3, 6, ..., 24	9774	Steiner et al 2018 Clin Infect Dis[17]
The Cebu Longitudinal Health and Nutrition Survey	Philippines	1983 - 2005	Prospective cohort	3073	Birth, 2, 4, ..., 24	32636	Adair 2007 Am J Hum Biol[18]
Africa							
MAL-ED	Tanzania	2009 - 2014	Prospective cohort	262	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	5857	Mduma et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[19]
Tanzania Child 2	Tanzania	2007 - 2011	Individual RCT	2400	1, 2, ..., 20	32198	Locks et al Am J Clin Nutr 2016[20]
MAL-ED	South Africa	2009 - 2014	Prospective cohort	314	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	6478	Bessong et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[21]
MRC Keneba	Gambia	1987 - 1997	Cohort	2931	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	40952	Schoenbuchner et al. 2019, AJCN[22]

ZVITAMBO Trial	Zimbabwe	1997 - 2001	Individual RCT	14104	Birth, 6 wks, 3, 6, 9, 12	73651	Malaba et al 2005 Am J Clin Nutr[23]
Lungwena Child Nutrition RCT	Malawi	2011 - 2014	Individual RCT	840	Birth, 1-6 wk, 6, 12 18	4346	Mangani et al. 2015, Mat Child Nutr[24]
iLiNS-Zinc Study	Burkina Faso	2010 - 2012	Cluster RCT	3266	9, 12, 15, 18	10552	Hess et al 2015 Plos One[25]
Latin America							
MAL-ED	Peru	2009 - 2014	Prospective cohort	303	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	6442	Yori et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[26]
CONTENT	Peru	2007 - 2011	Prospective cohort	215	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	8339	Jaganath et al 2014 Helicobacter[27]
Bovine Serum RCT	Guatemala	1997 - 1998	Individual RCT	315	Baseline, 1, 2, ...,8	2551	Begin et al. 2008, EJCN[28]
MAL-ED	Brazil	2010 - 2014	Prospective cohort	233	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	5092	Lima et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[29]
INCAP Nutrition Supplementation Trial Longitudinal Study	Guatemala	1969 - 1977	Cluster RCT	1406	Birth, 3, 6, ..., 24	7965	Habicht et al 1995 J Nutr[30]
Europe							
PROBIT Study	Belarus	1996 - 1997	Cluster RCT	16898	1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12	124509	Kramer et al 2001 JAMA[31]
Mortality analysis only							
Burkina Faso Zinc trial	Burkina Faso	2010-2011	Cluster RCT	7167	6, 10, 14, 17, 22	15155	Becquey et al 2016 J Nutr[32]
Vitamin A Trial	India	1995-1996	Cluster RCT	3983	1, 3, 6, 9, 12	32570	WHO CHD Vitamin A Group 1998 Lancet[33]
iLiNS-DOSE	Malawi	2009-2011	Individual RCT	1932	6, 9, 12, 18	13801	Maleta et al. 2015 J Nutr[24]
iLiNS-DYAD-M	Malawi	2011-2015	Individual RCT	1235	1, 6, 12, 18	9207	Ashorn et al 2015 J. Nutr[24]
*Children enrolled is for children with measurements under 2 years of age. Total measurements are number of measurements of anthropometry on children under 2 years of age.							

1249 **Extended data table 2**

1250 All exposures included in the analysis, as well as the categories the exposures were classified into
1251 across all cohorts, categorization rules, and the total number of children and percent of children in each
1252 category. We selected the exposures of interest based on variables present in multiple cohorts that met
1253 our inclusion criteria, were found to be important determinants of stunting and wasting in prior
1254 literature, and could be harmonized across cohorts for pooled analyses.

Exposure variable	**N children under 24 months with both measured exposure and length**	**Exposure levels [N (%)]** **First listed level is reference**	**Categorization rules**
Sex	93756	Female: 45638 (48.7%) Male: 48118 (51.3%)	
Gestational age at birth	53500	Full or late term: 27079 (50.6%) Early term: 18377 (34.3%) Preterm: 8044 (15%)	<260 days is preterm, [260-274) days is early term, >= 274 is full term
Birthweight (kg)	80162	Normal or high birthweight: 63631 (79.4%) Low birthweight: 16531 (20.6%)	
Birth length (cm)	75832	>=50 cm: 26909 (35.5%) [48-50) cm: 19308 (25.5%) <48 cm: 29615 (39.1%)	
Birth order	58044	Firstborn: 20041 (34.5%) Secondborn: 17125 (29.5%) Thirdborn or later: 20878 (36%)	
Delivery location	17158	Hospital or clinic: 9123 (53.2%) Home: 8035 (46.8%)	
Delivery method	66826	C-section: 5684 (8.5%) Vaginal birth: 61142 (91.5%)	
Maternal weight	63917	>=58 kg: 20534 (32.1%) [52-58) kg: 9868 (15.4%) <52 kg: 33515 (52.4%)	
Maternal height	71666	>=155 cm: 35237 (49.2%) [151-155) cm: 12996 (18.1%) <151 cm: 23433 (32.7%)	
Maternal body mass index (BMI)	62281	Normal weight: 49423 (79.4%) Underweight: 12858 (20.6%)	WHO categories (<18.5 BMI is underweight) Excludes mothers whose only weight measurement was taken during pregnancy.
Mother's age	85002	[20-30): 50917 (59.9%) <20: 19310 (22.7%) >=30: 14775 (17.4%)	
Maternal education	84912	High: 26564 (31.3%) Medium: 30319 (35.7%) Low: 28029 (33%)	Classified by splitting distribution of numbers of years of educations into thirds within each cohort, or grouping ordered categories of educational attainment into three levels.
Paternal height	16268	>=167 cm: 13569 (83.4%)	

		[162-167) cm: 1713 (10.5%) <162 cm: 986 (6.1%)	
Paternal age	23328	>=38: 1873 (8%) [32-38): 3912 (16.8%) <32: 17543 (75.2%)	
Paternal education	75358	High: 15623 (20.7%) Medium: 32968 (43.7%) Low: 26767 (35.5%)	Classified by splitting distribution of numbers of years of educations into thirds within each cohort, or grouping ordered categories of educational attainment into three levels.
Caregiver marital status	50468	Married/partnered: 48223 (95.6%) Single/widow/partner overseas: 2245 (4.4%)	
Asset based household wealth index	44263	Wealth Q4: 11671 (26.4%) Wealth Q1: 10844 (24.5%) Wealth Q2: 10496 (23.7%) Wealth Q3: 11252 (25.4%)	First principal component of a principal components analysis of all recorded assets owned by the household (examples: cell phone, bicycle, car).
Household food security	25848	Food Secure: 13082 (50.6%) Mildly Food Insecure: 8632 (33.4%) Food Insecure: 4134 (16%)	Combination of three food security scales: 1. The Household Hunger Scale (HHS)[34] 2. Food Access Survey Tool (FAST)[35] 3. USAID Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS), with middle 2 categories classified as mildly food insecure.[36] And one survey question from the NIH Bangladesh birth cohort and NIH Bangladesh Cryptosporidium cohort: "In terms of household food availability, how do you classify your household?" 1. Deficit in whole year 2. Sometimes deficit 3. Neither deficit nor surplus 4. Surplus Where the middle two categories were classified as mildly food insecure.
Improved floor	37686	Yes: 6477 (17.2%) No: 31209 (82.8%)	
Improved sanitation	44216	Yes: 27350 (61.9%) No: 16866 (38.1%)	WHO Joint Monitoring program definition
Improved water source	36980	Yes: 35392 (95.7%) No: 1588 (4.3%)	WHO Joint Monitoring program definition
Clean cooking fuel usage	2678	Yes: 1338 (50%) No: 1340 (50%)	
Number of children <5 in the	35453	One: 21653 (61.1%)	

household		Two or more: 13800 (38.9%)	
Number of individuals in the household	3732	3 or less: 692 (18.5%) 4-5: 1609 (43.1%) 6-7: 887 (23.8%) 8+: 544 (14.6%)	
Number of rooms in household	42851	Four or more: 2819 (6.6%) Three: 4155 (9.7%) Two: 11351 (26.5%) One: 24526 (57.2%)	
Rain season	7462	Opposite max rain: 1579 (21.1%) Pre max rain: 1884 (25.3%) Max rain: 2170 (29.1%) Post max rain: 1829 (24.5%)	Rainfall data was extracted from the University of East Anglia Climate Research Unit CRU TS dataset (version 3.23, 23 October 2015) and averaged by month over the duration of cohorts.[37] The three-month period opposite the three months of maximum rainfall was used as the reference level (e.g., if June-August was the period of maximum rainfall, the reference level is child mean WLZ during January-March). Due to the time-varying nature of this exposure, N's are reported for children with length measures at 24 months and measures of rain season.
Breastfed hour after birth	50188	Yes: 12483 (24.9%) No: 37705 (75.1%)	
Exclusive or predominant breastfeeding in the first 6 months of life	26948	Yes: 18471 (68.5%) No: 8477 (31.5%)	Exclusive breastfeeding: mother reported only feeding child breastmilk on all dietary surveys Predominant breastfeeding: mother reported only feeding child breastmilk, other liquids, or medicines on all dietary surveys
Cumulative percent of days with diarrhea under 6 months	4812	[0%, 2%]: 2668 (55.4%) >2%: 2144 (44.6%)	Percent days defined as proportion of disease surveillance days a child had diarrhea during. Diarrhea defined by 3 or more loose stools, or bloody stool, in a 24 hour period. Only included studies with at least 100 disease surveillance measurements during age range.
Cumulative percent of days with diarrhea under 24 months	13430	[0%, 2%]: 6536 (48.7%) >2%: 6894 (51.3%)	Percent days defined as proportion of disease surveillance days a child had diarrhea during. Diarrhea defined by 3 or more loose stools, or bloody stool, in a 24 hour period. Only included studies with at least 100 disease surveillance measurements during age range.
Enrolled or born stunted	96217	No: 79110 (82.2%) Yes: 17107 (17.8%)	
Enrolled or born wasted	8664189263	No: 73722 (85.1%)	

		Yes: 12919 (14.9%)No: 76610 (85.8%) Yes: 12653 (14.2%)	
Any wasting under 6 months	10328	No: 7849 (76%) Yes: 2479 (24%)	
Persistently wasting under 6 months	9631	No: 9176 (95.3%) Yes: 455 (4.7%)	

Supplementary References

1. VanderWeele, T. J. & Ding, P. Sensitivity Analysis in Observational Research: Introducing the E-Value. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **167**, 268 (2017).
2. Iqbal, N. T. *et al.* Promising Biomarkers of Environmental Enteric Dysfunction: A Prospective Cohort study in Pakistani Children. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 2966 (2018).
3. Ali, A. *et al.* Respiratory viruses associated with severe pneumonia in children under 2 years old in a rural community in Pakistan. *J. Med. Virol.* **88**, 1882–1890 (2016).
4. Shrestha, P. S. *et al.* Bhaktapur, Nepal: The MAL-ED Birth Cohort Study in Nepal. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S300–S303 (2014).
5. Gladstone, B. P. *et al.* Protective Effect of Natural Rotavirus Infection in an Indian Birth Cohort. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **365**, 337–346 (2011).
6. John, S. M. *et al.* Establishment of the MAL-ED Birth Cohort Study Site in Vellore, Southern India. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S295–S299 (2014).
7. Kattula, D. *et al.* The first 1000 days of life: prenatal and postnatal risk factors for morbidity and growth in a birth cohort in southern India. *BMJ Open* **4**, e005404 (2014).
8. Pathela, P. *et al.* Diarrheal illness in a cohort of children 0-2 years of age in rural Bangladesh: I. Incidence and risk factors: Risk factors for diarrhea in Bangladeshi children. *Acta Paediatr.* **95**, 430–437 (2007).
9. Ahmed, T. *et al.* The MAL-ED Cohort Study in Mirpur, Bangladesh. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S280–S286 (2014).
10. Kirkpatrick, B. D. *et al.* The “Performance of Rotavirus and Oral Polio Vaccines in Developing Countries” (PROVIDE) Study: Description of Methods of an Interventional Study Designed to Explore Complex Biologic Problems. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **92**, 744–751 (2015).
11. Bhandari, N. *et al.* Food Supplementation with Encouragement to Feed It to Infants from 4 to 12 Months of Age Has a Small Impact on Weight Gain. *J. Nutr.* **131**, 1946–1951 (2001).
12. Bhandari, N. *et al.* An Educational Intervention to Promote Appropriate Complementary Feeding Practices and Physical Growth in Infants and Young Children in Rural Haryana, India. *J. Nutr.* **134**, 2342–2348 (2004).
13. Bhargava, S. K. *et al.* Relation of Serial Changes in Childhood Body-Mass Index to Impaired Glucose Tolerance in Young Adulthood. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **350**, 865 (2004).
14. Korpe, P. S. *et al.* Natural History of Cryptosporidiosis in a Longitudinal Study of Slum-Dwelling Bangladeshi Children: Association with Severe Malnutrition. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **10**, (2016).
15. Christian, P. *et al.* Effect of fortified complementary food supplementation on child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster-randomized trial. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **44**, 1862–1876 (2015).
16. West, K. P. *et al.* Effect of Maternal Multiple Micronutrient vs Iron–Folic Acid Supplementation on Infant Mortality and Adverse Birth Outcomes in Rural Bangladesh: The JiVitA-3 Randomized Trial. *JAMA* **312**, 2649–2658 (2014).
17. Steiner, K. L. *et al.* Species of Cryptosporidia Causing Subclinical Infection Associated With Growth Faltering in Rural and Urban Bangladesh: A Birth Cohort Study. *Clin. Infect. Dis. Off. Publ. Infect. Dis. Soc. Am.* **67**, 1347–1355 (2018).
18. Adair, L. S. Size at birth and growth trajectories to young adulthood. *Am. J. Hum. Biol. Off. J. Hum. Biol. Counc.* **19**, 327–337 (2007).

1299 19. Mduma, E. R. *et al.* The Etiology, Risk Factors, and Interactions of Enteric Infections and Malnutrition
1300 and the Consequences for Child Health and Development Study (MAL-ED): Description of the
1301 Tanzanian Site. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S325–S330 (2014).
1302 20. Locks, L. M. *et al.* Effect of zinc and multivitamin supplementation on the growth of Tanzanian
1303 children aged 6–84 wk: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial12. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **103**,
1304 910–918 (2016).
1305 21. Bessong, P. O., Nyathi, E., Mahopo, T. C. & Netshandama, V. Development of the Dzimauli
1306 Community in Vhembe District, Limpopo Province of South Africa, for the MAL-ED Cohort Study.
1307 *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S317–S324 (2014).
1308 22. Schoenbuchner, S. M. *et al.* The relationship between wasting and stunting: a retrospective cohort
1309 analysis of longitudinal data in Gambian children from 1976 to 2016. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*
1310 doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqy326.
1311 23. Malaba, L. C. *et al.* Effect of postpartum maternal or neonatal vitamin A supplementation on infant
1312 mortality among infants born to HIV-negative mothers in Zimbabwe. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **81**, 454–460
1313 (2005).
1314 24. Mangani, C. *et al.* Effect of complementary feeding with lipid-based nutrient supplements and corn–
1315 soy blend on the incidence of stunting and linear growth among 6- to 18-month-old infants and
1316 children in rural Malawi. *Matern. Child. Nutr.* **11**, 132–143 (2015).
1317 25. Hess, S. Y. *et al.* Small-Quantity Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements, Regardless of Their Zinc
1318 Content, Increase Growth and Reduce the Prevalence of Stunting and Wasting in Young Burkinabe
1319 Children: A Cluster-Randomized Trial. *PLOS ONE* **10**, e0122242 (2015).
1320 26. Yori, P. P. *et al.* Santa Clara de Nanay: The MAL-ED Cohort in Peru. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S310–S316
1321 (2014).
1322 27. Jaganath, D. *et al.* First Detected Helicobacter pylori Infection in Infancy Modifies the Association
1323 Between Diarrheal Disease and Childhood Growth in Peru. *Helicobacter* **19**, 272–279 (2014).
1324 28. Bégin, F., Santizo, M.-C., Peerson, J. M., Torún, B. & Brown, K. H. Effects of bovine serum
1325 concentrate, with or without supplemental micronutrients, on the growth, morbidity, and micronutrient
1326 status of young children in a low-income, peri-urban Guatemalan community. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* **62**,
1327 39–50 (2008).
1328 29. Lima, A. A. M. *et al.* Geography, Population, Demography, Socioeconomic, Anthropometry, and
1329 Environmental Status in the MAL-ED Cohort and Case-Control Study Sites in Fortaleza, Ceará,
1330 Brazil. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S287–S294 (2014).
1331 30. Habicht, J.-P., Martorell, R. & Rivera, J. A. Nutritional Impact of Supplementation in the INCAP
1332 Longitudinal Study: Analytic Strategies and Inferences. *J. Nutr.* **125**, 1042S-1050S (1995).
1333 31. Kramer, M. S. *et al.* Promotion of Breastfeeding Intervention Trial (PROBIT): A Randomized Trial in
1334 the Republic of Belarus. *JAMA* **285**, 413–420 (2001).
1335 32. Becquey, E. *et al.* Comparison of Preventive and Therapeutic Zinc Supplementation in Young
1336 Children in Burkina Faso: A Cluster-Randomized, Community-Based Trial. *J. Nutr.* **146**, 2058–2066
1337 (2016).
1338 33. Randomised trial to assess benefits and safety of vitamin A supplementation linked to immunisation
1339 in early infancy. *The Lancet* **352**, 1257–1263 (1998).
1340 34. Ballard, T., Coates, J., Swindale, A. & Deitchler, M. Household Hunger Scale: Indicator Definition and
1341 Measurement Guide. 23.
1342 35. Coates, J. Measuring Food Insecurity: Going Beyond Indicators of Income and Anthropometry. 106
1343 (1825).
1344 36. Coates, J., Swindale, A. & Bilinsky, P. Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) for
1345 Measurement of Food Access: Indicator Guide: Version 3: (576842013-001). (2007)
1346 doi:10.1037/e576842013-001.
1347 37. Harris, I., Jones, P. D., Osborn, T. J. & Lister, D. H. Updated high-resolution grids of monthly climatic
1348 observations – the CRU TS3.10 Dataset. *Int. J. Climatol.* **34**, 623–642 (2014).
1349