medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

Andrew Mertens,[1]* Jade Benjamin-Chung,[2] John M Colford Jr,[1] Jeremy Coyle[1], Mark J van der Laan,[1] Alan E Hubbard,[1] Sonali Rosete,[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 Jung,[1] Esther O Chung,[1] Wendy Jilek,[1] Vishak Subramoney,[3] Ryan Hafen,[4] Jonas Häggström,[5] Thea Norman,[6] Kenneth H Brown,[7] Parul Christian,[8] Benjamin F. Arnold,[9,10]* 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] Department of Epidemiology & Population Health, Stanford University, Stanford University, 259 Campus Drive, HRP Redwood Building T152A, Stanford, CA 94305

[3] DVPL Tech

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

[5] Cytel Inc, 1050 Winter St Suite 2700 Waltham, MA 02451, USA

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

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

[8] Center for Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD 21205

[9] Francis I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, 490 Illinois St, San Francisco, CA 94158

[10] Department of Ophthalmology, University of California, San Francisco, 490 Illinois St, San Francisco, CA 94158

* Corresponding authors are Andrew Mertens (amertens@berkeley.edu) and Benjamin F. Arnold (ben.arnold@ucsf.edu).

**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
3. Tahmeed Ahmed, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
4. Asad Ali, Aga Khan University
5. Hasmot Ali, JiVitA Project, Bangladesh, Johns Hopkins
6. Per Ashorn, Center for Child, Adolescent, and Maternal Health Research, Faculty of Medicine and Health Technology, Tampere University and Tampere University Hospital, Finland
7. Rajiv Bahl, World Health Organization
8. Mauricio L. Barreto, Center of Data and Knowledge Integration for Health, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Salvador, Brazil.
9. Elodie Becquey, International Food Policy Research Institute
10. France Begín, UNICEF
11. Pascal Obong Bessong, HIV/AIDS & Global Health Research Programme, University of Venda
12. Maharaj Kishan Bhan, Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi, India
13. Zulfiqar A. Bhutta, Institute for Global Health & Development & Center of Excellence in Women and Child Health, The Aga Khan University South-Central Asia, East Africa & United Kingdom
14. Nita Bhandari, Centre for Health Research and Development, Society for Applied Studies, New Delhi, India
15. Santosh K. Bhargava, Senior Consultant Pediatrics, Sunder Lal Jain Hospital, Ashok Vihar

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

16. Robert E. Black, Johns Hopkins University
17. Ladaporn Bodhidatta, Armed Forces Research Institute of Medical Sciences, Bangkok, Thailand
18. Delia Carba, USC Office of Population Studies Foundation, Inc., University of San Carlos, Cebu, Philippines
19. William Checkley, Johns Hopkins University
20. Parul Christian, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
21. Jean E. Crabtree, Leeds Institute for Medical Research, St. James's University Hospital, University of Leeds
22. Kathryn G. Dewey, Institute for Global Nutrition, Department of Nutrition, University of California
23. Christopher P. Duggan, Center for Nutrition, Boston Children's Hospital
24. Caroline H.D. Fall, Emeritus Professor of International Paediatric Epidemiology, MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Centre, University of Southampton, UK
25. Abu Syed Golam Faruque, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
26. Wafaie W. Fawzi, Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health
27. José Quirino da Silva Filho, Federal University of Ceará
28. Robert H. Gilman, Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health
29. Richard L. Guerrant, University of Virginia, USA
30. Rashidul Haque, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
31. S. M. Tafsir Hasan, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
32. Sonja Y. Hess, Dept of Nutrition and Institute for Global Nutrition, University of California Davis
33. Eric R. Houpt, University of Virginia.edu
34. Jean H. Humphrey, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
35. Najeeha Talat Iqbal, Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Aga Khan University
36. Elizabeth Yakes Jimenez, Departments of Pediatrics and Internal Medicine, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center
37. Jacob John, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India
38. Sushil Matthew John, Professor, Low Cost Effective Care Unit, Christian Medical College, Vellore TN 632004 India
39. Gagandeep Kang, Translational Health Science and Technology Institute, Faridabad, Haryana, India
40. Margaret Kosek, University of Virginia
41. Michael S. Kramer, McGill University and McGill University Health Centre
42. Alain Labrique, Center of Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
43. Nanette R. Lee, USC-Office of Population Studies Foundation Inc., University of San Carlos, Cebu, Philippines
44. Aldo Ângelo Moreira Lima, Federal University of Ceará
45. Tjale Cloupas Mahopo, Department of Nutrition, School of Health Sciences, University of Venda
46. Kenneth Maleta, Department of Public Health, School of Public Health and Family Medicine, College of Medicine
47. Dharma S. Manandhar, Mother and Infant Research Activities
48. Karim P. Manji, Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Muhimbili University School of Health and Allied Sciences, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
49. Reynaldo Martorell, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

50. Sarmila Mazumder, Centre for Health Research and Development, Society for Applied Studies, New Delhi, India
51. Estomih Mduma, Haydom Lutheran Hospital, Haydom, Tanzania
52. Venkata Raghava Mohan, Professor, Community Medicine, Christian Medical College, Vellore TN 632004 India
53. 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, The Gambia
54. Robert Ntozini, Zvitambo Institute for Maternal and Child Health Research
55. Mzwakhe Emanuel Nyathi, Department of Animal Sciences, School of Agriculture, University of Venda
56. Maribel Paredes Olortegui, AB PRISMA
57. Césaire T. Ouédraogo, Institute for Global Nutrition, Department of Nutrition, University of California, Davis, CA, USA
58. William A. Petri, University of Virginia
59. Prasanna Samuel Premkumar, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India
60. Andrew M. Prentice, MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Banjul, The Gambia
61. Najeeb Rahman, Aga Khan University
62. Manuel Ramirez-Zea, INCAP Research Center for the Prevention of Chronic Diseases, Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama, Guatemala City, Guatemala
63. Harshpal Singh Sachdev, Senior Consultant Pediatrics and Clinical Epidemiology, Sitaram Bhartia Institute of Science and Research, B-16 Qutab Institutional Area, New Delhi, India
64. Kamran Sadiq, Aga Khan University
65. Rajiv Sarkar, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India
66. Monira Sarmin, International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh
67. Naomi M. Saville, Institute for Global Health, University College London
68. Saijuddin Shaikh, JiVitA Project, Bangladesh, Johns Hopkins
69. Bhim P. Shrestha, Health Research and Development Forum, Kathmandu, Nepal
70. Sanjaya Kumar Shrestha, MD, Walter Reed/AFRIMS Research Unit, Kathmandu, Nepal Centre for International Health, University of Bergen
71. Alberto Melo Soares, Federal University of Ceará
72. Bakary Sonko, MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Banjul, The Gambia
73. Aryeh D. Stein, Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University
74. Erling Svensen, Haukeland University Hospital
75. Sana Syed, Department of Pediatrics, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology & Nutrition University of Virginia School of Medicine, and Aga Khan University
76. Fayaz Umrani, Aga Khan University
77. Honorine D. Ward, Tufts Medical Center, Tufts University School of Medicine
78. Keith P. West Jr., Center for Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
79. Lee Shu Fune Wu, Center for Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
80. Seungmi Yang, McGill University
81. Pablo Penataro Yori, University of Virginia

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract limit ~200 words; current count 206

Main text limit 2000-3000 words; current count 3168

Summary

Growth faltering (low length-for-age or weight-for-length) in the first 1000 days — from conception to two years of age — influences short and long-term health and survival. Interventions such as nutritional supplementation during pregnancy and the postnatal period could help prevent growth faltering, but programmatic action has been insufficient to eliminate the high burden of stunting and wasting in low- and middle-income countries. Future preventive efforts will benefit from understanding age-windows and population subgroups in which to focus. Here, we use a population intervention effects analysis of 33 longitudinal cohorts (83,671 children, 662,763 measurements) and 30 separate exposures to show that improving maternal anthropometry and child condition at birth accounted for population increases in length-for-age Z of up to 0.40 and weight-for-length Z of up to 0.15 by age 24 months. Boys had consistently higher risk of all forms of growth faltering than girls. Early post-natal growth faltering predisposed children to subsequent and persistent growth faltering. Children with multiple growth deficits had higher mortality rates from birth to two years than those without deficits (hazard ratios 1.9 to 8.7). The importance of prenatal causes, and severe consequences for children who experienced early growth faltering, support a focus on pre-conception and pregnancy as key opportunities for new preventive interventions.

Introduction

Child growth faltering 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[4–6] and adult economic outcomes.[7]

Despite widespread recognition of the importance of growth faltering to global public health, preventive interventions in LMICs have had limited success.[8] A range of nutritional interventions targeting various life stages of the fetal and childhood periods, 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 complementary feeding, have all had a beneficial effect on child growth.[9–11] 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, and implementation remains a substantial challenge.[9,12,13] Additionally, water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) interventions, which aim to reduce childhood infections that may heighten the risk of wasting and stunting, have had no effect on child growth in several recent large randomized control trials.[14–16]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Modest effects of interventions to prevent stunting and wasting may reflect an incomplete understanding of the optimal way and time to intervene.[17] This knowledge gap has spurred renewed interest in recent decades to combine rich data sources with advances in statistical methodology[18] to more deeply understand the key causes of growth faltering.[19] Understanding the relationship between the causes and timing of growth faltering is also crucial because children who falter early could be at higher risk for more severe growth faltering later. In companion articles, we report that the highest rates of incident stunting and wasting occur by age 3 months.[20,21]

Pooled longitudinal analyses

Here, we report a pooled analysis of 33 longitudinal cohorts in 15 low- and middle-income countries in South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and Eastern Europe, with data collection initiated between 1987 and 2014. Our objective was to estimate relationships between child, parental, and household characteristics and measures of child anthropometry, including length-for-age Z-scores (LAZ), weight-for-length Z-scores (WLZ), weight-for-age Z-scores (WAZ), stunting, wasting, underweight, and length and weight velocities from birth to age 24 months. Details on the estimation of growth faltering outcomes are included in companion articles.[20,21] We also estimated associations between early growth faltering and more severe growth faltering or mortality by age 24 months.

Cohorts were assembled as part of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's Knowledge Integration (*ki*) initiative, which included studies of growth and development in the first 1000 days, beginning at conception.[22] 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 children with a median year of birth after 1990; 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 faltering among children who were broadly representative of populations in low- and middle-income countries. Thirty-three cohorts from 15 countries met inclusion criteria, and 83,671 children and 592,030 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 70,733 additional measurements were included in mortality analyses (97,988 total children, 662,763 total observations, Extended Data Table 1). Cohorts were distributed throughout South Asia, Africa, and Latin America, with a single European cohort from Belarus.

Population intervention effects on growth faltering

In a series of analyses, we estimated population intervention effects, the estimated change in population mean Z-score if all individuals in the population had their exposure shifted from observed levels to the lowest-risk reference level.[23] The PIE is a policy-relevant parameter; it estimates the improvement in outcome that could be achievable through intervention for modifiable exposures, as it is a function of the degree of difference between the unexposed and the exposed in a children's

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

anthropometry Z-scores, as well as the observed distribution of exposure in the population. We selected exposures that were measured in multiple cohorts, could be harmonized across cohorts for pooled analyses, and had been identified as important predictors of stunting or wasting in prior literature (Fig 1, Extended Data Table 2). Exposure measurement varied by cohort, but all 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 child birth weight, because low maternal height could increase stunting risk through lower child birth weight.[24] 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).[18,25] 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).[26] We chose as the reference exposure for PIEs the level of lowest risk across cohorts. We also estimated the effects of optimal dynamic interventions, where each child's individual low-risk level of exposure was estimated from potential confounders (details in Methods). Timing of exposures varied, from parental and household characteristics present before birth, to fetal or at-birth exposures, and postnatal exposures. We estimated associations with growth faltering that occurred after exposure measurements to ensure time-ordering of exposures and outcomes.

Population level improvements in maternal height and birth size would be expected to improve child LAZ and WLZ at age 24 months substantially, owing to both the high prevalence of suboptimal anthropometry in the populations and their strong association with attained growth at 24 months (Fig 2, Fig 3). Beyond anthropometry, key predictors of higher Z-scores included markers of better household socioeconomic status (e.g., number of rooms in the home, parental education, clean cooking fuel use, household wealth index). The pooled, cross-validated R^2 for models that included the top 10 determinants for each Z-score, plus child sex, was 0.25 for LAZ (N= 20 cohorts, 25,647 children) and 0.07 for WLZ (N=18 cohorts, 17,853 children). The population level impact of season on WLZ was large, with higher WLZ in drier periods (Fig 3), consistent with seasonal differences shown in a companion article.[21] Exclusive or predominant breastfeeding before 6 months of age was associated with higher WLZ but not LAZ at 6 months of age and was not a major predictor of Z-scores at 24 months (Extended Data Figs 2,3,4).[27] Girls had consistently better LAZ and WLZ than boys, potentially from sex-specific differences in immunology, nutritional demands, care practices, and intrauterine growth.[28]

The findings underscore the importance of prenatal exposures for child growth outcomes, and at the population-level growth faltering may be difficult to shift without broad improvements in standard of living.[7,29] Maternal anthropometric status can influence child Z-scores by affecting fetal growth and birth size.[30,31] Maternal height and BMI could directly affect postnatal growth through breastmilk quality, or could reflect family poverty, genetics, undernutrition, or food insecurity, or family lifestyle and diet.[32,33] In a secondary analysis, we estimated the associations between parental anthropometry and child Z-scores controlling for birth characteristics, and found the associations were only partially mediated by birth size, order, hospital delivery, and gestational age at birth, with adjusted Z-score differences attenuated by a median of 30% (Extended data Fig 5).

The strongest predictors of stunting and wasting estimated through population attributable

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

fractions closely matched those identified for child LAZ and WLZ at 24 months (Extended Data Figs 6, 7), suggesting that information embedded in continuous and binary measures of child growth provide similar inference with respect to identifying public-health relevant causes. Potential improvements through population interventions were relatively modest. For example, if all children were born to higher BMI mothers (≥ 20) compared to the observed distribution of maternal BMI, one of the largest predictors of wasting, we estimate it would reduce the incidence of wasting by age 24 months by 8.2% (95% CI: 4.4, 12.0; Extended Data Fig 7). Patterns in associations across growth outcomes were broadly consistent, except for preterm birth, which had a stronger association with stunting outcomes than wasting outcomes, and rainy season, which was strongly associated with wasting but not stunting (Extended Data Fig 2). Direction of associations did not vary across regions, but magnitude did, notably male sex was less strongly associated with low LAZ in South Asia (Extended Data Figs 8,9).

Age-varying effects on growth faltering

We estimated trajectories of mean LAZ and WLZ stratified by maternal height and BMI. We found that maternal height strongly influenced at-birth LAZ, but that LAZ progressed along similar trajectories through age 24 months regardless of maternal height (Fig 4a), with similar though slightly less pronounced differences when stratified by maternal BMI (Fig 4b). By contrast, children born to taller mothers had similar WLZ at birth and WLZ trajectories until age 3-4 months, when they diverged substantially (Fig 4a); WLZ trajectory differences were even more pronounced when stratified by maternal BMI (Fig 4b). The findings illustrate how maternal status strongly influences where child growth trajectories start, but that growth trajectories evolve in parallel, seeming to respond similarly to postnatal insults independent of their starting point.

We hypothesized that causes of growth faltering could differ by age of growth faltering onset — for example, we expected children born preterm would have higher risk of incident growth faltering immediately after birth, while food insecurity might increase risk at older ages, after weaning. For exposures studied in the population intervention effect analyses, we conducted analyses stratified by age of onset and in many cases found age-varying effects (Fig 4c). For example, most measures of socioeconomic status were associated with incident wasting or stunting only after age 6 months, and higher birth order lowered growth faltering risk under age 6 months, but increased risk thereafter. First born babies are born thin and show rapid postnatal catch up in WLZ (Extended data Fig 10). This is likely because first-born babies suffer uterine constraint caused by a less developed uterine-placental-vascular supply[34,35] resulting in birth weights being lower by 100-200g in most cohorts studied; weight is generally more compromised than height.[36] The switch from a constrained uterine-placental nutrient supply line to oral nutrition permits post-natal catch up. Stronger relationships between key socio-demographic characteristics and wasting and stunting as children age likely reflects the accumulation of insults that result from household conditions, particularly as complementary feeding is initiated, and children begin exploring their environment and potentially face higher levels of food insecurity especially in homes with multiple children.[37] When viewed across multiple definitions of growth faltering, most exposures had stronger associations with severe stunting, severe wasting, or persistent wasting (> 50% of measurements < –2 WLZ), rarer but more serious outcomes, than with incidence of any wasting or stunting (Fig 4d). Additionally, the characteristics strongly associated with lower wasting

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

recovery by 90 days (birth size, small maternal stature, lower maternal education, later birth order, and male sex) increased risk of wasting prevalence and cumulative incidence (Extended data Fig 2).

Consequences of early growth faltering

We documented high incidence rates of wasting and stunting from birth to age 6 months in companion papers.[20,21] Based on previous studies, we hypothesized that early wasting could contribute to subsequent linear growth restriction, and early growth faltering could be consequential for persistent growth faltering and mortality during the first 24 months of life.[38–40] 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 5a). Persistent wasting from birth to 6 months (defined as >50% of measurements wasted) was the wasting exposure most strongly associated with incident stunting at older ages (Fig 5b).

We next examined the relationship between measures of growth faltering 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.[1,38] 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.[20] All measures of early growth faltering were significantly associated with later, more serious growth faltering, with measures of ponderal growth faltering amongst the strongest predictors (Fig 5c).

Finally, we estimated hazard ratios (HR) of all-cause mortality by 2 years of age associated with measures of growth faltering within eight cohorts that reported ages of death, which included 1,689 child deaths by age 24 months (2.4% of children in the eight cohorts). Included cohorts were highly monitored, and mortality rates were lower than in the general population in most cohorts (Extended Data Table 3). Additionally, data included only deaths that occurred after anthropometry measurements, so many neonatal deaths may have been excluded, and without data on cause-specific mortality, some deaths may have occurred from causes unrelated to growth faltering. Despite these caveats, growth faltering increased the hazard of death before 24 months for all measures except stunting alone, with strongest associations observed for severe wasting, stunting, and underweight (HR=8.7, 95% CI: 4.7 to 16.4) and severe underweight alone (HR=4.2, 95% CI: 2.0 to 8.6) (Fig 5d).

Discussion

This synthesis of LMIC cohorts during the first 1000 days of life has provided new insights into the principal causes and near-term consequences of growth faltering. Our use of a novel, semi-parametric method to adjust for potential confounding provided a harmonized approach to estimate population intervention effects that spanned child-, parent-, and household-level exposures with unprecedented breadth (30 exposures) and scale (662,763 anthropometric measurements from 33 cohorts). Our focus on effects of shifting population-level exposures on continuous measures of growth faltering reflect a growing appreciation that growth faltering is a continuous process.[41] Our results show children in LMICs stand to benefit from interventions to support optimal growth in the first 1000 days. Combining

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

information from high-resolution, longitudinal cohorts enabled us to study critically important outcomes not possible in smaller studies or in cross-sectional data, such as persistent wasting and mortality, as well as examine risk-factors by age.

Maternal, prenatal, and at-birth characteristics were the strongest predictors of growth faltering across regions in LMICs. Our results underscore prenatal exposures as key determinants of child growth faltering.[42] Limited impact of exclusive or predominant breastfeeding through 6 months (+0.01 LAZ) aligns with a meta-analysis of breastfeeding promotion,[27] but our finding of limited impact of reducing diarrhea through 24 months (+0.05 LAZ) contrasts with some observational studies.[43,44] Many predictors, like child sex, birth order, or season, are not modifiable but could guide interventions that mitigate their effects, such as seasonally targeted supplementation or enhanced monitoring among boys. Strong associations between maternal anthropometry and early growth faltering highlight the role of intergenerational transfer of growth deficits between mothers and their children.[32] Shifting several key population exposures (maternal height or BMI, education, birth length) to their observed low-risk level would improve LAZ by up to 0.40 z and WLZ by up to 0.15 z in target populations and could be expected to prevent 8% to 32% of incident stunting and wasting (Figs 2,3 Extended Data Figs 6,7). 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 4a-b). This accords with the transition from a placental to oral nutrient supply at birth.

The analyses have caveats. Population intervention effects were based on exposure distributions in the 33 cohorts, which were not necessarily representative of the general population in each setting. Use of external exposure distributions from population-based surveys would be difficult because many key exposures we considered, such as at-birth characteristics or longitudinal diarrhea prevalence, are not measured in such surveys. In some cases, detailed exposure measurements like longitudinal breastfeeding or diarrhea history were coarsened to simpler measures to harmonize definitions across cohorts, potentially attenuating their association with growth faltering. Other 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.[45,46] The absence of these exposures in the analysis, some of which have been found to be important within individual contributed cohorts,[46,47] means that our results emphasize exposures that were more commonly collected, but likely exclude some additional causes of growth faltering. A final caveat is that we studied consequences through age 24 months — the primary age range of contributed *ki* cohort studies — and thus have not considered effects on longer-term outcomes. Several studies have suggested that puberty could be another potential window for intervention to enhance catch-up growth.[48] Improving girls' stature at any point through puberty could help blunt the intergenerational transfer of growth faltering by improving maternal height,[49] which in turn could improve outcomes among their children (Figs 2, 3, 4a, 4b).

Countries that have reduced stunting most have undergone improvements in maternal education, nutrition, reductions in number of pregnancies, and maternal and newborn health care,[50] reinforcing the importance of interventions during the window from conception to one year, when fetal and infant growth velocity is high and energy expenditure for growth and development is about 50% above adult

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

values (adjusted for fat-free mass).[51] A stronger focus on prenatal interventions should not distract from renewed efforts for postnatal prevention. The observed pre- and postnatal growth faltering we observed reinforce the need for sustained support of mothers and children throughout the first 1000 days. Efficacy trials that delivered prenatal nutrition supplements to pregnant mothers,[52–54] therapeutics to reduce infection and inflammation for pregnant mothers,[55–59] and nutritional supplements to children 6-24 months[11,60] have reduced child growth faltering but have fallen short of completely preventing it. Our results suggest that the next generation of preventive interventions should focus on the early period of a child's first 1000 days — from preconception through the first months of life —because maternal status and at-birth characteristics are key determinants of growth faltering through 24 months. Halting the cycle of growth faltering early should reduce the risk of its severe consequences, including mortality, during this formative window of child development. Long-term investments and patience may be required, as it will take decades to eliminate the intergenerational factors limiting mothers' size.

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. 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).
8. Bhutta, Z. A. *et al.* What works? Interventions for maternal and child undernutrition and survival. *Lancet* **371**, 417–440 (2008).
9. 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).
10. 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).
11. Dewey, K. G. *et al.* Preventive small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements reduce severe wasting and severe stunting among young children: an individual participant data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* nqac232 (2022) doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqac232.
12. Dewey, K. G. *et al.* Characteristics that modify the effect of small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplementation on child growth: an individual participant data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *medRxiv* 2021.02.05.21251105 (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.02.05.21251105.
13. Stewart, C. P., Iannotti, L., Dewey, K. G., Michaelsen, K. F. & Onyango, A. W. Contextualising complementary feeding in a broader framework for stunting prevention. *Matern. Child. Nutr.* **9**, 27–45

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

(2013).

14. 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).
15. 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).
16. 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).
17. 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.
18. Coyle, J. *et al.* (submitted). Targeting Learning: Robust Statistics for Reproducible Research. (2020).
19. Keats, E. C. *et al.* Effective interventions to address maternal and child malnutrition: an update of the evidence. *Lancet Child Adolesc. Health* **5**, 367–384 (2021).
20. Benjamin-Chung, J. et. al. (submitted). Early childhood linear growth faltering in low-and middle-income countries. (2020).
21. Mertens, A. *et al.* (submitted). Child wasting and concurrent stunting in low- and middle-income countries. (2020).
22. Peppard, T. *et al.* (submitted). Combined longitudinal growth cohorts from infants born in South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. (2020).
23. Westreich, D. From Patients to Policy: Population Intervention Effects in Epidemiology. *Epidemiol. Camb. Mass* **28**, 525–528 (2017).
24. Black RE *et al.* Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet* **382**, 427–451 (2013).
25. Gruber, S. & Laan, M. van der. Targeted Maximum Likelihood Estimation: A Gentle Introduction. *UC Berkeley Div. Biostat. Work. Pap. Ser.* (2009).
26. Raudenbush, S. W. Analyzing Effect Sizes: Random-Effects Models. in *The Handbook of Research Synthesis and Meta-Analysis* 295–315 (Russell Sage Foundation, 2009).
27. Giugliani, E. R. J., Horta, B. L., Mola, C. L. de, Lisboa, B. O. & Victora, C. G. Effect of breastfeeding promotion interventions on child growth: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Paediatr.* **104**, 20–29 (2015).
28. Thurstans, S. *et al.* Understanding Sex Differences in Childhood Undernutrition: A Narrative Review. *Nutrients* **14**, 948 (2022).
29. 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).
30. 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).
31. Addo, O. Y. *et al.* Maternal Height and Child Growth Patterns. *J. Pediatr.* **163**, 549-554.e1 (2013).
32. Martorell, R. & Zongrone, A. Intergenerational Influences on Child Growth and Undernutrition. *Paediatr. Perinat. Epidemiol.* **26**, 302–314 (2012).
33. Bzikowska-Jura, A. *et al.* Maternal Nutrition and Body Composition During Breastfeeding: Association with Human Milk Composition. *Nutrients* **10**, (2018).
34. Gluckman, P. D. & Hanson, M. A. Maternal constraint of fetal growth and its consequences. *Semin. Fetal. Neonatal Med.* **9**, 419–425 (2004).
35. Hafner, E., Schuchter, K., Metzenbauer, M. & Philipp, K. Uterine artery Doppler perfusion in the first and second pregnancies. *Ultrasound Obstet. Gynecol. Off. J. Int. Soc. Ultrasound Obstet. Gynecol.* **16**, 625–629 (2000).
36. Ong, K. K. L. *et al.* Size at birth and early childhood growth in relation to maternal smoking, parity and infant breast-feeding: longitudinal birth cohort study and analysis. *Pediatr. Res.* **52**, 863–867 (2002).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

37. Garg, A. & Morduch, J. Sibling rivalry and the gender gap: Evidence from child health outcomes in Ghana. *J. Popul. Econ.* **11**, 471–493 (1998).
38. 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).
39. Richard, S. A. *et al.* Wasting Is Associated with Stunting in Early Childhood123. *J. Nutr.* **142**, 1291–1296 (2012).
40. 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).
41. Perumal, N., Bassani, D. G. & Roth, D. E. Use and Misuse of Stunting as a Measure of Child Health. *J. Nutr.* **148**, 311–315 (2018).
42. Christian, P. *et al.* Risk of childhood undernutrition related to small-for-gestational age and preterm birth in low- and middle-income countries. *Int J Epidemiol* **42**, 1340–1355 (2013).
43. Schlaudecker, E. P., Steinhoff, M. C. & Moore, S. R. Interactions of diarrhea, pneumonia, and malnutrition in childhood: recent evidence from developing countries. *Curr. Opin. Infect. Dis.* **24**, 496–502 (2011).
44. Checkley, W. *et al.* Multi-country analysis of the effects of diarrhoea on childhood stunting. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **37**, 816–830 (2008).
45. Black, R. E. *et al.* Maternal and child undernutrition: global and regional exposures and health consequences. *Lancet* **371**, 243–260 (2008).
46. 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).
47. 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).
48. Prentice, A. M. *et al.* Critical windows for nutritional interventions against stunting123. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **97**, 911–918 (2013).
49. Georgiadis, A. *et al.* Growth recovery and faltering through early adolescence in low- and middle-income countries: Determinants and implications for cognitive development. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **179**, 81–90 (2017).
50. Bhutta, Z. A. *et al.* How countries can reduce child stunting at scale: lessons from exemplar countries. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **112**, 894S-904S (2020).
51. Pontzer, H. *et al.* Daily energy expenditure through the human life course. *Science* **373**, 808–812 (2021).
52. Lassi, Z. S. *et al.* Effects of nutritional interventions during pregnancy on birth, child health and development outcomes: A systematic review of evidence from low- and middle-income countries. *Campbell Syst. Rev.* **17**, e1150 (2021).
53. 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).
54. Callaghan-Gillespie, M. *et al.* Trial of ready-to-use supplemental food and corn-soy blend in pregnant Malawian women with moderate malnutrition: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **106**, 1062–1069 (2017).
55. *WHO Recommendations on Antenatal Care for a Positive Pregnancy Experience*. (World Health Organization, 2016).
56. ter Kuile, F. O., van Eijk, A. M. & Filler, S. J. Effect of sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine resistance on the efficacy of intermittent preventive therapy for malaria control during pregnancy: a systematic review. *JAMA* **297**, 2603–2616 (2007).
57. Kayentao, K. *et al.* Intermittent preventive therapy for malaria during pregnancy using 2 vs 3 or more doses of sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine and risk of low birth weight in Africa: systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA* **309**, 594–604 (2013).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

58. Hendrixson, D. T. *et al.* A novel intervention combining supplementary food and infection control measures to improve birth outcomes in undernourished pregnant women in Sierra Leone: A randomized, controlled clinical effectiveness trial. *PLOS Med.* **18**, e1003618 (2021).
59. Hallamaa, L. *et al.* Child Health Outcomes After Presumptive Infection Treatment in Pregnant Women: A Randomized Trial. *Pediatrics* **141**, (2018).
60. Dewey, K. G. *et al.* Characteristics that modify the effect of small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplementation on child growth: an individual participant data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **114**, 15S-42S (2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Cohort sample sizes and exposures measured. (**a**) Total number of children with each measured exposure, sorted from left to right by number of cohorts measuring the exposure. (**b**) Presence of 30 exposure variables in the *ki* data by within each included cohort. Cohorts are sorted by geographic region and sample size. (**c**) Number child anthropometry observations contributed by each cohort.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



552

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Population intervention effects and mean differences of child, parental, and household exposures on length-for-age z-scores at age 24 months.

Lighter points show adjusted mean differences (average treatment effects, ATEs) between the labeled higher-risk levels of exposures and reference levels, and black points show population intervention effects (PIEs), the estimated difference in length-for-age z-scores (LAZ) after shifting exposure levels for all children to the reference level. The number of children that contributed to each analysis is listed by exposure. The colored Y-axis label is either the level of exposure contrasted against the reference level to estimate the ATE, or the percentage of the population shifted to the lowest-risk level to estimate the PIE. Cohort-specific estimates were adjusted for all measured confounders using ensemble machine learning and TMLE, and then pooled using random effects (Methods). Estimates are shown only for exposures measured in at least 4 cohorts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



564

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 3. Population intervention effects and mean differences of child, parental, and household exposures on weight-for-length z-scores at age 24 months.

Lighter points show adjusted mean differences (average treatment effects, ATEs), between higher-risk exposure levels and reference levels, and black points show population intervention effects (PIEs), the estimated difference in weight-for-length z-scores (WLZ) after shifting exposure levels for all children to the reference level. The number of children that contributed to each analysis is listed by exposure. The colored Y-axis label is either the level of exposure contrasted against the reference level to estimate the ATE, or the percentage of the population shifted to the lowest-risk level to estimate the PIE. Cohort-specific estimates were adjusted for all measured confounders using ensemble machine learning and TMLE, and then pooled using random effects (Methods). Estimates are shown only for exposures measured in at least 4 cohorts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Effect of key exposures on the trajectories, timing, and severity of child growth faltering

(**a**) Child length-for-age Z-score (LAZ) and weight-for-length Z-score (WLZ) trajectories, stratified by categories of maternal height (N=413,921 measurements, 65,061 children, 20 studies). (**b**) Child LAZ and WLZ, stratified by categories of maternal BMI (N=373,382 measurements, 61,933 children, 17 studies). Growth trajectories stratified by all risk factors examined beyond maternal height and BMI are available online (https://child-growth.github.io/causes/rf-splines.html). (**c**) Associations between key exposures and wasting cumulative incidence, stratified by the age of the child during wasting incidence. Gray points indicate cohort-specific estimates. (**d**) Associations between key exposures and growth faltering of different severity. Cumulative incidence ratios contrast the highest and lowest risk categories of each exposure, which are printed in each panel title. Gray points indicate cohort-specific estimates.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Early life growth faltering increases risk of more severe growth faltering 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. Velocity was calculated from the closest measurements within 14 days of the start and end of the age period. (**b**) Relative risk of stunting onset between ages 6-24 months among children who experienced measures of early wasting before age 6 months compared to children who did not. Gray points indicate cohort-specific estimates. (**c**) Association between cumulative incidence of mutually exclusive definitions of growth faltering before age 6 months (reference: children with no measure of growth failure) and persistent wasting from ages 6-24 months (33 cohorts, 6,046 cases, and 68,645 children) or concurrent wasting and stunting at 18 months. (31 cohorts, 1,447 cases, and 22,565 children). Growth faltering definitions are sorted by estimates in panel **d**. (**d**) Hazard ratios between mutually exclusive definitions of growth faltering (reference: children with no measure of growth failure) and mortality before 24 months (8 cohorts, 1,689 deaths with ages of death, and 63,812 children). Gray points indicate cohort-specific estimates.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



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 exposures where the outcome is estimated have an increased probability of occurring compared to the reference level (harmful exposures except for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

recovery outcomes), while blue and green cells are exposures associated with a decreased probability of the outcome (protective exposures except for recovery outcomes). 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).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



629

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 3. Age-stratified population intervention effects in length-for-age Z-scores.

Exposures, rank ordered by population intervention effect on child LAZ, stratified by the age of the child at the time of anthropometry measurement. The population intervention effect is the expected difference in mean Z-score if all children had the reference level of the exposure rather than the observed exposure distribution. Reference levels are printed in the exposure label. Cohort-specific estimates were adjusted for all measured confounders using ensemble machine learning and TMLE, and then pooled using random effects (Methods). Estimates are shown only for exposures measured in at least 4 cohorts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



641

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 4. Age-stratified population intervention effects in weight-for-length Z-scores.

Exposures, rank ordered by population intervention effects on child WLZ,, stratified by the age of the child at the time of anthropometry measurement. The population intervention effect 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. Cohort-specific estimates were adjusted for all measured confounders using ensemble machine learning and TMLE, and then pooled using random effects (Methods). Estimates are shown only for exposures measured in at least 4 cohorts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Extended Data Figure 5. Mediation of parental anthropometry effects by birth size on child Z-scores at 24 months.

Mediating effect of adjusting for birth anthropometry and at-birth characteristics on the estimated Z-score differences between levels of parental anthropometry. Primary estimates were adjusted for all other measured exposures not on the causal pathway, while the mediation analysis estimates were additionally adjusted for birthweight, birth length, gestational age at birth, birth order, small-for-gestational age status, and home vs. hospital delivery. Only estimates from cohorts measuring at least 3 of the 6 at-birth characteristics were used to estimate the pooled Z-score differences (n = 6 cohorts, 17,124 observations). Mediation estimates were slightly attenuated toward the null, and only in the case of maternal height and child WLZ were they statistically different from the primary analysis. These results imply that the causal pathway between parental anthropometry and growth faltering operates through its effect on birth size, but most of the effect is through other pathways.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 6. Rank-ordered associations between child, parental, and household characteristics and adjusted relative risks or population attributable fractions of stunting by age 24 months.

Blue points in the left panel show adjusted cumulative incidence ratios (CIRs) between higher-risk exposure levels and reference levels, and black points in the right panel show population attributable fractions (PAFs), the estimated proportion of the risk in the whole population that would be removed if the exposure were set to its indicated reference level. The number of children that contributed to each analysis is listed by exposure. The colored Y-axis label is either the level of exposure contrasted against the reference level to estimate the CIR, or the percent of the population shifted to the lowest-risk level to estimate the PAF. For at-birth exposures, at-birth stunting and wasting were excluded to focus on incidence of new (postnatal) cases, and for postnatal exposures (breastfeeding practice and diarrheal disease), the cumulative incidence of stunting from 6-24 months was used. Cohort-specific estimates were adjusted for all measured confounders using ensemble machine learning and TMLE, and then pooled using random effects (Methods). Estimates are shown only for exposures measured in at least 4 studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



681

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 7. Rank-ordered associations between child, parental, and household characteristics and adjusted relative risks or population attributable fractions of wasting by age 24 months.

Blue points in the left panel show adjusted cumulative incidence ratios (CIRs) between higher-risk exposure levels and reference levels, and black points in the right panel show population attributable fractions (PAFs), the estimated proportion of the risk in the whole population that would be removed if the exposure were set to its indicated reference level. The number of children that contributed to each analysis is listed by exposure. The colored Y-axis label is either the level of exposure contrasted against the reference level to estimate the CIR, or the percent of the population shifted to the lowest-risk level to estimate the PAF. For at-birth exposures, at-birth stunting and wasting were excluded, and for postnatal exposures (breastfeeding practice and diarrheal disease), the cumulative incidence of wasting from 6-24 months was used. Cohort-specific estimates were adjusted for all measured confounders using ensemble machine learning and TMLE, and then pooled using random effects (Methods). Estimates are shown only for exposures measured in at least 4 studies. The PAF for diarrhea under 6 months was not calculable or plotted due to the unexpected CIR <1 for estimated higher diarrheal disease burden.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



697

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 8. Regionally-stratified population intervention effects for length-for-age Z-scores at age 24 months.

Exposures, rank ordered by population intervention effect on child length-for-age z-score (LAZ) at age 24 months, stratified by region. The population intervention effect 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. Cohort-specific estimates were adjusted for all measured confounders using ensemble machine learning and TMLE, and then pooled using random effects (Methods). Estimates are shown only for exposures measured in at least 4 cohorts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended Data Figure 9. Regionally-stratified population intervention effects for weight-for-length Z-scores at age 24 months.

Exposures, rank ordered by population attributable difference on child weight-for-length z-score (WLZ) at age 24 months, stratified by region. The population intervention effect 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. Cohort-specific estimates were adjusted for all measured confounders using ensemble machine learning and TMLE, and then pooled using random effects (Methods). Estimates are shown only for exposures measured in at least 4 cohorts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Extended Data Figure 10. Child growth trajectories stratified by birth order

(a) Child weight-for-length Z-score (WLZ) trajectories, stratified by categories of child birth order.
(b) Child length-for-age Z-score (LAZ) trajectories, stratified by categories of child birth order. Details on the estimation of growth trajectories are in the Methods. Child growth trajectories stratified by categories of all risk factors are available online (https://child-growth.github.io/causes/rf-splines.html).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Extended Data Figure 11 Comparing fixed-reference and optimal intervention estimates of the population intervention effect.

Pooled population intervention effects on child LAZ and WHZ at 24 months, with the X-axis showing attributable differences using a fixed, and the Y-axis showing the optimal intervention attributable difference, where the level the exposure is shifted to can vary by child. Points are labeled with the specific risk factor. Estimates farther from the diagonal line have larger differences between the static and optimal intervention estimates. 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 children.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Extended Data Figure 12 | 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 33 cohorts, 30 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Extended Data Figure 13 | 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. As an example, 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 for the birth length exposure.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

758 **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]
TDC	India	2008-2011	Quasi-experimental	160	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	3723	Sarkar et al. 2013 BMC Public Health
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	Colgate et al 2016 Clin Infect Dis[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]
NIH Birth Cohort	Bangladesh	2008 - 2009	Prospective Cohort	629	Birth, 3, 6, ..., 12	6216	Korpe et al. 2016 PLOS NTD[13]
JiVitA-4 Trial	Bangladesh	2012 - 2014	Cluster RCT	5444	6, 9, 12, 14, 18	36167	Christian et al 2015 IJE[14]
JiVitA-3 Trial	Bangladesh	2008 - 2012	Cluster RCT	27342	Birth, 1, 3, 6, 12, 24	109535	West et al JAMA 2014[15]
NIH Cryptosporidium Study	Bangladesh	2014 - 2017	Prospective cohort	758	Birth, 3, 6, ..., 24	9774	Steiner et al 2018 Clin Infect Dis[16]
Africa							
MAL-ED	Tanzania	2009 - 2014	Prospective cohort	262	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	5857	Mduma et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[17]
Tanzania Child 2	Tanzania	2007 - 2011	Individual RCT	2400	1, 2, ..., 20	32198	Locks et al Am J Clin Nutr 2016[18]
MAL-ED	South Africa	2009 - 2014	Prospective cohort	314	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	6478	Bessong et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[19]
MRC Keneba	Gambia	1987 - 1997	Cohort	2931	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	40952	Schoenbuchner et al. 2019, AJCN[20]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ZVITAMBO Trial	Zimbabwe	1997 - 2001	Individual RCT	14104	Birth, 6 wks, 3, 6, 9, 12	73651	Malaba et al 2005 Am J Clin Nutr[21]
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[22]
iLiNS-Zinc Study	Burkina Faso	2010 - 2012	Cluster RCT	3266	9, 12, 15, 18	10552	Hess et al 2015 Plos One[23]
CMIN GB94	Guinea Bissau	1994 - 1997	Prospective Cohort	870	Enrollment and every 3 months after	6459	Valentiner-Branth 2001 Am J Clin Nutr
Latin America							
MAL-ED	Peru	2009 - 2014	Prospective cohort	303	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	6442	Yori et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[24]
CONTENT	Peru	2007 - 2011	Prospective cohort	215	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	8339	Jaganath et al 2014 Helicobacter[25]
Bovine Serum RCT	Guatemala	1997 - 1998	Individual RCT	315	Baseline, 1, 2, ...,8	2551	Begin et al. 2008, EJCN[26]
MAL-ED	Brazil	2010 - 2014	Prospective cohort	233	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	5092	Lima et al 2014 Clin Infect Dis[27]
CMIN Brazil89	Brazil	1989-2000	Prospective Cohort	119	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	889	Moore et al. 2001 Int J Epidemiol.
CMIN Peru95	Peru	1995 - 1998	Prospective Cohort	224	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	3979	Checkley et al. 2003 Am J Epidemiol.
CMIN Peru89	Peru	1989 - 1991	Prospective Cohort	210	Birth, 1, 2, ..., 24	2742	Checkley et al. 1998 Am J Epidemiol.
Europe							
PROBIT Study	Belarus	1996 - 1997	Cluster RCT	16898	1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12	124509	Kramer et al 2001 JAMA[28]
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[29]
Vitamin A Trial	India	1995-1996	Cluster RCT	3983	1, 3, 6, 9, 12	32570	WHO CHD Vitamin A Group 1998 Lancet[30]
iLiNS-DOSE	Malawi	2009-2011	Individual RCT	1932	6, 9, 12, 18	13801	Maleta et al. 2015 J Nutr[22]
iLiNS-DYAD-M	Malawi	2011-2015	Individual RCT	1235	1, 6, 12, 18	9207	Ashorn et al 2015 J. Nutr[22]

*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.

759 **Extended data table 2**

760 All exposures included in the analysis, as well as the categories the exposures were classified into across all cohorts, categorization rules, the
761 total number of children, the percentage of children in each category, select evidence from prior literature, and comparisons to our results. We
762 selected the exposures of interest based on variables present in multiple cohorts that met our inclusion criteria, were found to be important
763 determinants of stunting and wasting in prior literature, and could be harmonized across cohorts for pooled analyses. Where possible, we cite
764 findings from recent randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews. All referenced results from this manuscript are available here:
765 https://child-growth.github.io/causes/RR-forest.html. *Bracketed codes at the end of each cell in the "Comparison to results in this analysis"
766 indicate limitations to comparisons with previous evidence due to differences in: P=population, CA=child age, AV=adjustment variables used in the
767 analysis, MOA=measure of association, SD=study design, EC=exposure classification.

768

Exposure variable	N children under 24 months with both measured exposure and length	Exposure levels [N (%)]	Categorization rules	Previous published evidence	Comparison to results in this analysis
Sex	78751	Female: 38444 (48.8%) Male: 40307 (51.2%)		In a meta-analysis of cohorts and surveys, boys had higher odds of being wasted and stunted than girls (pooled wasting OR 1.2, 95% CI 1.13 to 1.40, pooled stunting OR 1.29 95% CI 1.22 to 1.37). There was some evidence that the sex difference is smaller in South Asia.[31]	Supports our finding of increased risk of stunting (prevalence ratio (PR) of 1.15 (95% CI: 1.06, 1.26) at 24 months for wasting, 1.26 (95% CI: 1.13, 1.39) at 24 months for stunting), and slightly smaller prevalence ratios in South Asia (stunting PR: 1.06 [95% CI: 1.02, 1.09, wasting PR: 1.22 [95% CI: 1.10, 1.35]). [Different P, CA]*
Birth weight (kg)	65041	Normal or high birth weight: 50940 (78.3%) Low birth weight: 14101 (21.7%)		A meta-analysis of 19 birth cohorts found a stunting PR of 2.92 (95% CI: 2.56, 3.33) associated with low birth weight (LBW) in children 1-5 years old, and a wasting PR of 2.68 (95% CI: 2.23, 3.21).[32] A meta-analysis of sub-Saharan African DHS datasets found LBW was strongly associated with stunting (adjusted OR: 1.68 [95% CI: 1.58–1.78]) and wasting (aOR: 1.35 [95% CI: 1.20–1.38]) in children under 5. A systematic review of growth failure in sub-Saharan Africa consistently found LBW as a top risk factor for later wasting and stunting.[33]	Birthweight was also one of the strongest risk factors (PR of stunting at 24 months: 1.49 [95% CI: 1.37, 1.62], PR of wasting at 24 months: 1.87 [95% CI: 1.70, 2.06]), though with lower magnitude point estimates compared the cohort meta-analysis and more aligned with the DHS analysis of older children. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD]*
Birth length (cm)	61703	>=50 cm: 23313 (37.5%) [48-50) cm: 14136 (39.6%) <48 cm: 24426 (22.9%)		Birth length was the strongest predictor of stunting at in 2-year old children in the four country-specific cohorts included in the Women First trial (adjusted PR of 1.62 [95% CI: 1.39, 1.88] comparing children stunted at birth to children with a LAZ > -1 at birth).[34]	There was a very similar risk of low birth length. Children born with a length <48 cm (close to the stunting cutoff at birth) had 1.52 times the risk of stunting compared to children born with a length >50 cm (95% CI: 1.66, 2.58).

					Wasting risk was also increased (PR: 1.52 [95% CI: 1.21, 1.92]). [Different P, CA, AV]*
Gestational age at birth	45269	Full or late term: 23313 (51.5%) Preterm: 6328 (14%) Early term: 15628 (34.5%)	<260 days is preterm, [260-274) days is early term, >= 274 is full term	In a meta-analysis of 19 birth cohorts, infants born preterm had 1.69 times the odds (95% CI: 1.48, 1.93) of stunting and 1.55 times the odds (95% CI: 1.21, 1.97) of wasting from 1 to 5 years of age.[32]	The estimates are higher than in our study (PR of stunting at 24 months: 1.21 [95% CI: 1.13, 1.29], PR of wasting at 24 months: 1.13 [95% CI: 1.01, 1.26]), but support our finding of a significant increase in growth failure risk with preterm birth. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA]*
Small for gestational age	39934	Not small for gestational age 27161 (68%) Small for gestational age 12773 (32%)	Children were classified as small-for gestational age if they had birthweights below the 10th percentile based on INTERGROWTH gestational age adjusted weight-for-age Z-scores (< -1.282 WAZ).[35]	In a meta-analysis of 19 birth cohorts, infants born small for gestational age (SGA) had 2.32 times the odds (95% CI: 2.12, 2.54) of stunting from 1 to 5 years of age compared to children not SGA, and they had 2.36 times the odds (95% CI: 2.14, 2.60) of wasting. [32]	The estimates are higher than in our study (PR of stunting at 24 months: 1.33 [95% CI: 1.22, 1.46], PR of wasting at 24 months: 1.83 [95% CI: 1.51, 2.21]), but support our finding of a significant increase in growth failure risk with SGA [Different P, CA, AV, MOA]*
Birth order	46099	1: 17294 (37.5%) 2: 14107 (30.6%) 3+: 14698 (31.9%)		A systematic review found that later birth order was consistently associated with a higher risk of stunting and wasting in the 16% of studies that identified birth order as an important risk factor for malnutrition.[36] In an analysis of 35 country-specific DHS analyses, birth order had an inconsistent relationship with stunting and wasting, with a decreased risk in second and third-born children compared to firstborn, but an increased risk in fourth-born or later.[37] In the four country-specific cohorts included in the Women First trial, second-born or later children had an increased Z-score trajectory from birth to 24 months, but a lower LAZ and higher risk of stunting at 24 months (PR: 1.12 [95% CI: 1.02, 1.24]).[34]	Our results were somewhat incongruous with the previous research. Birth order had a complex association with child growth failure, with a decreased risk of wasting and stunting in thirdborn or later children before 6 months of age (compared to firstborn children), and an increased risk after 6 months (Figure 4c). Stunting risk was similarly increased at 24 months (PR: 1.11 [95% CI: 1.01, 1.22]), but Z-score trajectories were also lower, in contrast to the Women First trial. [Different P, AV]*
Delivery location	8487	0: 2793 (32.9%) 1: 5694 (67.1%)		In an urban matched case-control study of infants 0-3 months old in Nigeria, the adjusted odds ratio associated with home delivery was 2.33 for severe stunting (95% CI: 1.50–3.60) and 2.90 for severe wasting (95% CI: 1.32–6.37) compared to delivery in public hospitals.[38] In a cohort in Malawi, home delivery was associated with 1.7 times the odds of severe stunting at 1 year of age after confounder adjustment (95% CI: 1.1 to 2.7).[39]	Home delivery had a significant but smaller association with any wasting (PR: 1.34 [95% CI: 1.03, 1.74]) or stunting (PR: 1.14 [95% CI: 1.06, 1.23]) at 6 months, but a null association with severe stunting. Home delivery was still associated with stunting (PR: 1.14 [95% CI: 1.04, 1.24]) but not wasting or severe stunting at 24 months. Severe wasting was too rare among the cohorts that measured home delivery to estimate the association at either age. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Maternal height	60742	>=150 cm: 44831 (73.8%) <150 cm: 15911	Cutoff chosen because a 150cm tall, 19-year-old woman has a HAZ of -2	An analysis of 109 DHS surveys found a 1-cm increase in maternal height was associated with a decreased risk of child stunting (OR, 0.968; 95% CI,	Maternal height was also consistently and strongly associated with all measures of child growth failure at the different examined ages.

		(26.2%)		0.967-0.968), and wasting (OR, 0.994; 95% CI, 0.993-0.995).[40] An analysis of 35 DHS surveys also found consistent, significant, exposure-response curve between categories of maternal height and risk of stunting and wasting.[37]	For example, the risk of stunting at 24 months was 1.63 times higher (95% CI: 1.46, 1.82) for children of stunted mothers compared to non-stunted mothers, and the risk of wasting was 1.18 time higher (95% CI: 1.09, 1.29). [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Maternal body mass index (BMI)	57627	>=20 BMI: 34952 (60.7%) < 20 BMI: 22675 (39.3%)	Calculated from maternal height and weight. Excludes mothers whose only weight measurement was taken during pregnancy. A 45 kg, 150 cm woman (the cutoffs for height and weight) has a BMI of 20.	A pooled analysis of 35 DHS cohorts found a significant increase in child stunting (OR: 1.64, p-value: <0.001) and wasting (OR: 1.64, p-value: <0.001) when mothers had BMI < 18.5 during pregnancy compared to mothers with a BMI > 25.[37]	Maternal BMI was also consistently and strongly associated with all measures of child growth failure at the different examined ages. The risk of stunting at 24 months was 1.21 times higher (95% CI: 1.06, 1.38) for children of lower weight mothers and the risk of wasting was 1.81 time higher (95% CI: 1.33, 2.47). [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD]*
Maternal weight	59256	>=45 kg: 40338 (68.1%) <45 kg: 18918 (31.9%)	Cutoff chosen because a 45kg heavy, 19-year-old woman has a WAZ of -2	No studied examining maternal weight in kg were found; the studies identified all used BMI to examine associations between maternal weight and child growth failure.	
Mother's age	70548	[20-30): 41707 (59.1%) <20: 17826 (25.3%) >=30: 11015 (15.6%)		A systematic review found that children born to women under the age of 20 had a consistently greater risk of stunted children compared to women aged ≥ 20 years (OR from 1.37 to 7.56).[41]	We observed a similar increased risk of stunted children (at 24 months) born to teenage mothers (PR: 1.07 [95% CI: 1.02, 1.12] but a less consistent association with wasting (PR: 1.07 [95% CI: 0.83, 1.37]. However, the pooled risk in this study was much smaller, possibly because the children were younger than average, or a more complete control of confounding by SES and maternal size. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Maternal education	69971	High: 23013 (32.9%) Low: 23702 (33.9%) Medium: 23256 (33.2%)	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.	Multiple systematic reviews have found maternal education to be the most frequently reported significant factor associated with child malnutrition (reported in >50% of studies).[36,42] A meta-analysis of 182 DHS datasets found a strong association between maternal education and wasting and stunting.[43] At a country level, a systematic review found improvements in maternal educational attainment predicted 17% of the total HAZ change in Pakistan (49), between 11% and 14% in Nepal (33, 49–51), 10% in Guinea (29) and India (49), and 7% in Cambodia (55).[44] However, a SRMA found that, while several included studies found inconsistent associations between maternal education and wasting and stunting, the pooled estimates were insignificant for both.[45]	After tertiling years of education within studies, low and medium maternal education was significantly associated with prevalence of stunting at 24 months compared to children of high-education mothers (low education PR: 1.21 [95% CI: 1.13, 1.30], medium education PR: 1.10 [95% CI: 1.04, 1.17]). Education was not associated with wasting at 24 months, but it was associated with the cumulative incidence of wasting between birth and 2 years (low education CIR: 1.09 [95% CI: 1.05, 1.13], medium education CIR: 1.08 [95% CI: 1.04, 1.11]) as well as with the cumulative incidence of stunting. The inconsistent associations in this and prior studies may be due to inconsistent coding of maternal education and differences in educational systems. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*

Paternal height	15772	>=162 cm: 15079 (95.6%) <162 cm: 693 (4.4%)	Cutoff chosen because a 162cm tall, 19 year old man has a HAZ of -2	A meta-analysis of 14 DHS studies found a significant increase in the risk of child stunting (in children under 5 years) comparing the shortest to tallest quintiles of fathers (adjusted RR = 1.56 [95% CI: 1.47, 1.65]), though the association was stronger when using mother's heights. In a sensitivity analysis as part of a meta-analysis of 35 DHS studies, low paternal height (<155cm) was significantly associated with stunting (1.9 [95% CI: 1.7, 2.2]) and wasting (1.7 [95% CI: 1.4, 2.0]), but also less strongly than maternal height.[37]	We utilized a different cutoff than either study, comparing stunted fathers to non-stunted fathers, and found a significant, but smaller, association with the cumulative incidence of stunting in younger children than the DHS analysis (CIR: 1.12 [95% CI: 1.02, 1.23]). This was also smaller than the association between maternal stunting and child stunting, but the association with wasting was significant and of similar magnitude (CIR: 1.16 [95% CI: 1.04, 1.30]). [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Paternal age	18976	>=35: 2289 (12.1%) <30: 13002 (68.5%) [30-35): 3685 (19.4%)		No meta-analyses examining this risk factor were found, and in general there were limited studies analyzing the association between father's age and child growth failure. A repeated cross-sectional survey in Indonesia found no association with father's age and stunting, wasting, or underweight.[46]	Children of fathers older than 35 had higher WLZ's at 24 months than children of fathers younger than 30 after adjusting for potential confounders, but there were no other growth associations. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Paternal education	65728	High: 12684 (19.3%) Low: 23089 (35.1%) Medium: 29955 (45.6%)	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.	A meta-analysis of 182 DHS datasets found a similarly strong association between paternal and maternal education and child growth failure after confounder adjustment.[43]	We also found a similar association between paternal and maternal education and growth failure, with a null association with wasting and 24 months and significantly higher risk of stunting in children of low and medium education mothers compared to high education mothers. (Low education PR: 1.30 [95% CI: 1.08, 1.57], medium education PR: 1.26 [95% CI: 1.07, 1.47]). [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Caregiver partner status	38222	0: 36393 (95.2%) 1: 1829 (4.8%)	Caregivers were classified as single if they were unmarried, widowed, or with a long-term long-distance partner.	A meta-analysis found that single mothers had a higher risk of infant low birth weight (OR 1.54 [95%CI 1.39–1.72]).[47]	Caregiver status was not associated with child stunting at 24 months (wasting was too rare to examine) or wasting at 6 months, but children of unpartnered mothers were significantly more likely to be stunted at 6 months (PR: 1.25 [95% CI: 1.08, 1.44]) and the cumulative incidence of wasting before 2 years of age (CIR: 1.12 [95% CI: 1.02, 1.24]). [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Asset based household wealth index	36754	WealthQ4: 9618 (26.2%) WealthQ3: 9165 (24.9%) WealthQ2: 9012 (24.5%) WealthQ1: 8959 (24.4%)	First principal component of a principal components analysis of all recorded assets owned by the household (examples: cell phone, bicycle, car).	A meta-analysis of 35 DHS surveys from sub-Saharan Africa examined the associations between household wealth indices computed by principal components analyses and stunting in children under 5 years. It found an OR of 1.34 (95% CI: 1.27, 1.42) when comparing the lowest versus highest wealth quintile.[48] Related, a meta-analysis of cash transfer programs found significant effects on height-for-age z-scores (of 0.03 5% CI 0.00 to 0.06) and a 2.1% decrease in stunting (95% CI -3.5% to -0.7%). [49]	Asset based household wealth was significantly associated with stunting at 24 months (PR: 1.26 [95% CI: 1.17, 1.36]) but not wasting (PR: 1.12 [95% CI: 0.98, 1.27]). [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*

Household food security	24461	Food Secure: 12534 (51.2%) Mildly Food Insecure: 7921 (32.4%) Food Insecure: 4006 (16.4%)	Combination of three food security scales: 1. The Household Hunger Scale (HHS)[50] 2. Food Access Survey Tool (FAST)[51] 3. USAID Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS), with middle 2 categories classified as mildly food insecure.[52] 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.	A systematic review and meta-analysis of 21 studies found that food insecurity increased the risk of stunting (odds ratio [OR] = 1.17; 95% CI: 1.09–1.25) but not of wasting (OR = 1.04; 95% CI: 0.96–1.12). The associations were stronger in children older than 5 years old than those younger than 5 years, and in LMIC's.[53] Related to household food security, a recent meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements (SQ-LNSs) found a significant reduction in both stunting and wasting.[54]	Higher food insecurity was consistently but not significantly associated with wasting and stunting (PR of stunting at 24 months between food insecure and secure: 1.17 [95% CI: 0.96, 1.44] and PR of wasting 1.07 [95% CI: 0.95, 1.20], with similar associations with prevalence at 6 months and the cumulative incidence). [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Improved flooring	35354	1: 4693 (13.3%) 0: 30661 (86.7%)		No meta-analyses examining this risk factor were found. Overall, there are limited studies specifically intervening to improve flooring or on the associations between improved flooring and growth, but an Ethiopian DHS analysis found an increased risk of stunting among children in households with natural/earth/sand floors versus cement/wood floors (OR: 1.33 [95% CI:1.08, 1.64]).[55] Additional research in two cohorts found improved flooring reduces soil-transmitted helminth and Giardia infections, which are associated with reduced growth.[56]	We also found an increased risk of stunting in younger children than the DHS analysis (PR at 24 months: 1.17 [95% CI: 1.08, 1.28]), and a reduction in LAZ and WLZ, but no effect on wasting. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Improved sanitation	35086	1: 24119 (68.7%) 0: 10967 (31.3%)	WHO Joint Monitoring program definition	Two large trials of individual and combined WASH interventions (WASH Benefits Kenya and Bangladesh) found no effect of improved sanitation interventions on HAZ, WHZ, stunting, or wasting.[57,58] In contrast, a pooled meta-analysis of 35 DHS studies found an	Similar to the DHS analysis but in contrast to evidence from recent randomized trials, unimproved sanitation was associated with increased prevalence of stunting (PR: 1.09, [95% CI: 1.04, 1.14]) and wasting (PR: 1.22,

				effect on stunting (PR: 1.10, [95% CI: 1.06, 1.13]) and wasting PR: 1.07, [95% CI: 1.02, 1.12]), potentially indicating residual confounding in observational analyses of WASH condition.[37]	[95% CI: 1.08, 1.38]) at 24 months. This potentially indicated either residual confounding from wealth and health seeking behavior of those with improved sanitation, or increased density of improved sanitation around household in observational studies compared to intervention studies. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Improved water source	35284	1: 33777 (95.7%) 0: 1507 (4.3%)	WHO Joint Monitoring program definition	Two large trials of individual and combined WASH interventions (WASH Benefits Kenya and Bangladesh) found no effect of improved water interventions on HAZ, WHZ, stunting, or wasting.[57,58] A pooled meta-analysis of 35 DHS studies also found no effect on stunting, but did find an association with wasting (PR: 1.07, [95% CI: 1.02, 1.12]).[37]	Improved water source was not associated with wasting or stunting, aligned with the randomized trial findings. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Clean cooking fuel usage	1401	1: 407 (29.1%) 0: 994 (70.9%)		A meta-analysis of clean cookstove interventions found a reduction in stunting in children ages 0-59 months (Odds Ratio: 0.79 [95% CI: 0.70–0.89].[59] A different meta-analysis found a similar reduction in low birthweight (Odds Ratio: 0.73 [95% CI: 0.61–0.87], but did not examine growth in older children.[60]	Like the meta-analysis, clean cooking fuel use also associated with reduced stunting (PR at 24 months: 0.81, [95% CI: 0.68, 0.97]), and was also associated with reduced wasting at 24 months (PR: 0.59, [95% CI: 0.43, 0.83]). Clean cooking fuel use was also associated with the cumulative incidence of stunting in the first 6 months, but the studies with cooking fuel data didn't measure children at birth. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Number of children <5 in the household	31610	1: 18963 (60%) 2+: 12647 (40%)		No meta-analyses or systematic reviews examining this risk factor were found. A case-control study from Malaysia found an increased risk of any form of growth failure in children under 5 years old with more children in the household (PR comparing households 4 or more children to three or less: 5.86 [95% CI: 1.96-17.55]).[61]	Other children in the household were associated with increased stunting (PR: 1.19 [9%% CI: 1.04, 1.35]) but not wasting at 24 months. [Different P, CA, AV, SD]*
Number of individuals in the household	1805	3 or less: 363 (20.1%) 4-5: 745 (41.3%) 6-7: 452 (25%) 8+: 245 (13.6%)		No meta-analyses or systematic reviews examining this risk factor were found. A cross-sectional study from Madagascar found an increased risk of stunting and wasting in children 5-14 years with more people in the household (stunting PR comparing households with 5 or more people children to four or less: 1.17 [95% CI: 1.03-1.33], wasting PR: 1.24 [95% CI: 1.04–1.48).[62]	There was a small but non-significant increase in risk of stunting and wasting with more individuals in the household. [Different P, CA, AV, SD]*
Number of rooms in household	35929	4+: 2492 (6.9%) 1: 20210 (56.2%) 2: 9484 (26.4%) 3: 3743 (10.4%)		No meta-analyses examining this risk factor were found, and DHS surveys generally measure the number rooms used for sleeping, not the total number of rooms.	The number of rooms in the household was not associated with increased risk of stunting or wasting.

Rain season	9769	Opposite max rain: 2469 (25.3%) Pre max rain: 2248 (23.0%) Max rain: 2718 (27.8%) Post max rain: 2334 (23.9%)	Rainfall data was extracted from Terraclimate, a dataset that combines readings from WorldClim data, CRU Ts4.0, and the Japanese 55-year Reanalysis Project.[63] For each study region, we averaged all readings within a 50 km radius from the study coordinates. If GPS locations were not in the data for a cohort, we used the approximate location of the cohort based on the published descriptions of the cohort. 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.	In a SRMA, drought conditions were significantly associated with wasting (OR: 1.46 [95% CI: 1.05, 2.04]).[64] A meta-analysis of 55 DHS datasets found that both abnormally high and low rainfall was associated with reduced HAZ and WHZ.[65] A systematic review found extreme rainfall was associated with an increased risk of wasting, but found crop growing season rainfall was protective for wasting.[66] A different systematic review found consistent associations between rainfall and HAZ, but the magnitude and direction of effect varied by study and the timing of the rainfall that the study examined.[67]	WHZ was significantly lower and wasting significantly higher during the three months of highest rainfall and the three months after the highest rainfall period, but there was no significant association between rain and stunting of HAZ. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Breastfed in the hour after birth	49168	1: 11609 (23.6%) 0: 37559 (76.4%)		Early initiation of breastfeeding was significantly associated with stunting in most cross-sectional studies evaluated in a systematic review, but most of these estimates were not adjusted for confounding.[68] A cohort study found no association with stunting and wasting,[69] while a pooled analysis of 35 DHS surveys found an increase in stunting odds (OR: 1.037, P-value <0.001) but a decreased risk of wasting (OR: 0.937, P-value <0.001).[37]	Early breastfeeding was not significantly associated with reduced stunting or wasting, in contrast to prior cross-sectional studies but aligned with prior evidence from analyses of cohorts. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD]*
Exclusive or predominant breastfeeding in the first 6 months of life	26173	1: 18285 (69.9%) 0: 7888 (30.1%)	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	A SRMA of studies of exclusive breastfeeding found a reduction in stunting (OR = 0.73 [95% CI = 0.55, 0.95]),[70] but a SRMA of breastfeeding promotion interventions found no impact on LAZ and an unexpected reduction in WLZ.[71]	Non-exclusive breastfeeding was associated with a smaller but still significant increase in the prevalence of stunting at 6 months (PR: 1.11 [95% CI: 1.03, 1.21]) and 24 months (PR: 1.05 [95% CI: 1.00, 1.10]), but there was no association with wasting. [Different P, CA, AV, MOA, SD, EC]*
Cumulative percent of days with diarrhea under 6 months	3735	[0%, 2%]: 2245 (60.1%) >2%: 1490 (39.9%)	Percent days defined as proportion of disease surveillance days a child had diarrhea during the time interval. Diarrhea defined by 3 or more	A pooled analysis of nine cohorts and trials found that the adjusted odds of stunting at 24 months increased by 1.16 for every 5% absolute increase in longitudinal prevalence of diarrheal disease prior to 24 months (95% CI 1.07–1.25).[72] A separate analysis	We found a similar magnitude in the reduction of LAZ at 24 months (-0.14 z [95% CI: -0.21 - 0.06]) associated with increased diarrhea, but no association with WLZ, stunting, or wasting. [Different P, AV, EC]*

			loose stools, or bloody stool, in a 24 hour period. Only included studies with at least 100 disease surveillance measurements during age range.	of 7 cohorts found WHZ, but not LAZ was reduced 30 days after diarrheal disease, while a higher cumulative burden of diarrhea reduced linear growth at 24 months (-0.1 LAZ per 10 days of diarrhea.[73]	
Cumulative percent of days with diarrhea under 24 months	12639	[0%, 2%]: 6133 (48.5%) >2%: 6506 (51.5%)	Same as above.	In the second study detailed above, it was estimated that a child with the average diarrhea burden during the first 6 months of life who then went on to have no diarrhea did not have a significantly lower LAZ at 24 months than a child with no diarrhea.[73] Because there was an overall effect of diarrhea on LAZ at 24 months, this indicated the potential for catch-up growth, or a lower impact of infant diarrhea on growth.	We also found no association between diarrhea before 6 months and growth at 24 months, and there was also no association with growth outcomes at 6 months. [Different P, AV, EC]*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Extended data table 3

Under 1-year country-specific mortality rate is from UNICEF (https://data.unicef.org/country), and is higher than the cohort-specific under 2-year mortality rate for all cohorts used in the mortality analysis.

Study	Country	Number of deaths under 2	Under 2 mortality rate in cohort (%)	Infant (Under 1) mortality rate in cohort (%)	Infant (Under 1) mortality country rate (UNICEF
Burkina Faso Zn	Burkina Faso	39	0.54	0.42	5.4
iLiNS-DOSE	Malawi	53	2.74	1.92	3.1
iLiNS-DYAD-M	Malawi	54	4.37	3.48	3.1
JiVitA-3	Bangladesh	934	3.41	2.85	2.6
JiVitA-4	Bangladesh	49	0.9	0.39	2.6
Keneba	The Gambia	65	2.22	1.52	3.6
VITAMIN-A	India	108	2.70	2.7	2.8
ZVITAMBO	Zimbabwe	1113	7.89	6.57	3.8

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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. Colgate, E. R. *et al.* Delayed Dosing of Oral Rotavirus Vaccine Demonstrates Decreased Risk of Rotavirus Gastroenteritis Associated With Serum Zinc: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **63**, 634–641 (2016).
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. 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).
14. 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).
15. 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).
16. 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).
17. Mduma, E. R. *et al.* The Etiology, Risk Factors, and Interactions of Enteric Infections and Malnutrition and the Consequences for Child Health and Development Study (MAL-ED): Description of the Tanzanian Site. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S325–S330 (2014).
18. Locks, L. M. *et al.* Effect of zinc and multivitamin supplementation on the growth of Tanzanian children aged 6–84 wk: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial12. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **103**, 910–918 (2016).
19. Bessong, P. O., Nyathi, E., Mahopo, T. C. & Netshandama, V. Development of the Dzimauli Community in Vhembe District, Limpopo Province of South Africa, for the MAL-ED Cohort Study. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S317–S324 (2014).
20. Schoenbuchner, S. M. *et al.* The relationship between wasting and stunting: a retrospective cohort analysis of longitudinal data in Gambian children from 1976 to 2016. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqy326.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

21. Malaba, L. C. *et al.* Effect of postpartum maternal or neonatal vitamin A supplementation on infant mortality among infants born to HIV-negative mothers in Zimbabwe. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **81**, 454–460 (2005).
22. Mangani, C. *et al.* Effect of complementary feeding with lipid-based nutrient supplements and corn–soy blend on the incidence of stunting and linear growth among 6- to 18-month-old infants and children in rural Malawi. *Matern. Child. Nutr.* **11**, 132–143 (2015).
23. Hess, S. Y. *et al.* Small-Quantity Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements, Regardless of Their Zinc Content, Increase Growth and Reduce the Prevalence of Stunting and Wasting in Young Burkinabe Children: A Cluster-Randomized Trial. *PLOS ONE* **10**, e0122242 (2015).
24. Yori, P. P. *et al.* Santa Clara de Nanay: The MAL-ED Cohort in Peru. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S310–S316 (2014).
25. Jaganath, D. *et al.* First Detected Helicobacter pylori Infection in Infancy Modifies the Association Between Diarrheal Disease and Childhood Growth in Peru. *Helicobacter* **19**, 272–279 (2014).
26. Bégin, F., Santizo, M.-C., Peerson, J. M., Torún, B. & Brown, K. H. Effects of bovine serum concentrate, with or without supplemental micronutrients, on the growth, morbidity, and micronutrient status of young children in a low-income, peri-urban Guatemalan community. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* **62**, 39–50 (2008).
27. Lima, A. A. M. *et al.* Geography, Population, Demography, Socioeconomic, Anthropometry, and Environmental Status in the MAL-ED Cohort and Case-Control Study Sites in Fortaleza, Ceará, Brazil. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **59**, S287–S294 (2014).
28. Kramer, M. S. *et al.* Promotion of Breastfeeding Intervention Trial (PROBIT): A Randomized Trial in the Republic of Belarus. *JAMA* **285**, 413–420 (2001).
29. Becquey, E. *et al.* Comparison of Preventive and Therapeutic Zinc Supplementation in Young Children in Burkina Faso: A Cluster-Randomized, Community-Based Trial. *J. Nutr.* **146**, 2058–2066 (2016).
30. Randomised trial to assess benefits and safety of vitamin A supplementation linked to immunisation in early infancy. *The Lancet* **352**, 1257–1263 (1998).
31. Thurstans, S. *et al.* Boys are more likely to be undernourished than girls: a systematic review and meta-analysis of sex differences in undernutrition. *BMJ Glob. Health* **5**, e004030 (2020).
32. Christian, P. *et al.* Risk of childhood undernutrition related to small-for-gestational age and preterm birth in low- and middle-income countries. *Int J Epidemiol* **42**, 1340–1355 (2013).
33. Akombi, B. J. *et al.* Stunting, Wasting and Underweight in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Systematic Review. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health* **14**, (2017).
34. Krebs, N. F. *et al.* Birth length is the strongest predictor of linear growth status and stunting in the first 2 years of life after a preconception maternal nutrition intervention: the children of the Women First trial. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **116**, 86–96 (2022).
35. Villar, J. *et al.* International standards for newborn weight, length, and head circumference by gestational age and sex: the Newborn Cross-Sectional Study of the INTERGROWTH-21st Project. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* **384**, 857–868 (2014).
36. Katoch, O. R. Determinants of malnutrition among children: A systematic review. *Nutrition* **96**, 111565 (2021).
37. Li, Z., Kim, R., Vollmer, S. & Subramanian, S. V. Factors Associated With Child Stunting, Wasting, and Underweight in 35 Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *JAMA Netw. Open* **3**, e203386 (2020).
38. Olusanya, B. O. & Renner, J. K. Is home birth a marker for severe malnutrition in early infancy in urban communities of low-income countries? *Matern. Child. Nutr.* **8**, 492–502 (2012).
39. Espo, M. *et al.* Determinants of linear growth and predictors of severe stunting during infancy in rural Malawi. *Acta Paediatr.* **91**, 1364–1370 (2002).
40. Özaltin, E., Hill, K. & Subramanian, S. V. Association of Maternal Stature With Offspring Mortality, Underweight, and Stunting in Low- to Middle-Income Countries. *JAMA* **303**, 1507–1516 (2010).
41. Astuti, F. D., Azka, A. & Rokhmayanti, R. Maternal age correlation of stunting in children: Systematics

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

review. *J. Matern. Child Health* **7**, 479–448 (2022).

42. Verma, P. & Prasad, J. B. Stunting, wasting and underweight as indicators of under-nutrition in under five children from developing Countries: A systematic review. *Diabetes Metab. Syndr. Clin. Res. Rev.* **15**, 102243 (2021).
43. Vollmer, S., Bommer, C., Krishna, A., Harttgen, K. & Subramanian, S. The association of parental education with childhood undernutrition in low- and middle-income countries: comparing the role of paternal and maternal education. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **46**, 312–323 (2017).
44. Vaivada, T. *et al.* Stunting in childhood: an overview of global burden, trends, determinants, and drivers of decline. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **112**, 777S-791S (2020).
45. Mensch, B. S., Chuang, E. K., Melnikas, A. J. & Psaki, S. R. Evidence for causal links between education and maternal and child health: systematic review. *Trop. Med. Int. Health* **24**, 504–522 (2019).
46. Rachmi, C. N., Agho, K. E., Li, M. & Baur, L. A. Stunting, Underweight and Overweight in Children Aged 2.0–4.9 Years in Indonesia: Prevalence Trends and Associated Risk Factors. *PLoS ONE* **11**, e0154756 (2016).
47. Shah, P. S., Zao, J. & Ali, S. Maternal Marital Status and Birth Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses. *Matern. Child Health J.* **15**, 1097–1109 (2011).
48. Abate, K., Assen, W., Ali, R., Kalkidan, H. & Waseyehon, A. wasihun hassen. Varying Relationship of Wealth of Households and Stunting of Under Five Children in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Meta-Analysis of Demographic Health Surveys. 616–623 (2019).
49. Manley, J. *et al.* Cash transfers and child nutritional outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Glob. Health* **5**, e003621 (2020).
50. Ballard, T., Coates, J., Swindale, A. & Deitchler, M. Household Hunger Scale: Indicator Definition and Measurement Guide. 23.
51. Coates, J. Measuring Food Insecurity: Going Beyond Indicators of Income and Anthropometry. 106 (1825).
52. Coates, J., Swindale, A. & Bilinsky, P. Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) for Measurement of Food Access: Indicator Guide: Version 3: (576842013-001). (2007) doi:10.1037/e576842013-001.
53. Moradi, S. *et al.* Food insecurity and the risk of undernutrition complications among children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nutrition* **62**, 52–60 (2019).
54. Dewey, K. G. *et al.* Preventive small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements reduce severe wasting and severe stunting among young children: an individual participant data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* nqac232 (2022) doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqac232.
55. Ayelign, A. & Zerfu, T. Household, dietary and healthcare factors predicting childhood stunting in Ethiopia. *Heliyon* **7**, e06733 (2021).
56. Benjamin-Chung, J. *et al.* Household finished flooring and soil-transmitted helminth and Giardia infections among children in rural Bangladesh and Kenya: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Glob. Health* **9**, e301–e308 (2021).
57. 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).
58. 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).
59. Bruce, N. G. *et al.* Control of household air pollution for child survival: estimates for intervention impacts. *BMC Public Health* **13**, S8 (2013).
60. Woolley, K. E. *et al.* Effectiveness of interventions to reduce household air pollution from solid biomass fuels and improve maternal and child health outcomes in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Indoor Air* **32**, e12958 (2022).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

61. Wong, H. J., Moy, F. M. & Nair, S. Risk factors of malnutrition among preschool children in Terengganu, Malaysia: a case control study. *BMC Public Health* **14**, 785 (2014).
62. Aiga, H. *et al.* Risk factors for malnutrition among school-aged children: a cross-sectional study in rural Madagascar. *BMC Public Health* **19**, 773 (2019).
63. Abatzoglou, J. T., Dobrowski, S. Z., Parks, S. A. & Hegewisch, K. C. TerraClimate, a high-resolution global dataset of monthly climate and climatic water balance from 1958–2015. *Sci. Data* **5**, 170191 (2018).
64. Lieber, M., Chin-Hong, P., Kelly, K., Dandu, M. & Weiser, S. D. A systematic review and meta-analysis assessing the impact of droughts, flooding, and climate variability on malnutrition. *Glob. Public Health* **17**, 68–82 (2022).
65. Le, K. & Nguyen, M. In-utero Exposure to Rainfall Variability and Early Childhood Health. *World Dev.* **144**, 105485 (2021).
66. Brown, M. E. *et al.* Empirical studies of factors associated with child malnutrition: highlighting the evidence about climate and conflict shocks. *Food Secur.* **12**, 1241–1252 (2020).
67. Phalkey, R. K., Aranda-Jan, C., Marx, S., Höfle, B. & Sauerborn, R. Systematic review of current efforts to quantify the impacts of climate change on undernutrition. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, E4522–E4529 (2015).
68. Susianto, S. C., Suprobo, N. R. & Maharani, M. Early Breastfeeding Initiation Effect in Stunting: A Systematic Review. *Asian J. Health Res.* **1**, 1–6 (2022).
69. Smith, E. R. *et al.* Delayed Breastfeeding Initiation Is Associated with Infant Morbidity. *J. Pediatr.* **191**, 57-62.e2 (2017).
70. Mardani, R. A. D., Wu, W.-R., Nhi, V. T. & Huang, H.-C. Association of breastfeeding with undernutrition among children under 5 years of age in developing countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Nurs. Scholarsh.*
71. Giugliani, E. R. J., Horta, B. L., Mola, C. L. de, Lisboa, B. O. & Victora, C. G. Effect of breastfeeding promotion interventions on child growth: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Paediatr.* **104**, 20–29 (2015).
72. Checkley, W. *et al.* Multi-country analysis of the effects of diarrhoea on childhood stunting. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **37**, 816–830 (2008).
73. Richard, S. A. *et al.* Diarrhea in Early Childhood: Short-term Association With Weight and Long-term Association With Length. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **178**, 1129–1138 (2013).

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 children with a median year of birth after 1990; 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Analyses were conducted in R version 4.0.5. 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

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.[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 dropped 1,190 (0.2%) unrealistic measurements of LAZ (>+6 or <–6 Z), 1,330 (0.2%) measurements of WAZ (> 5 or < –6 Z), and 1,670 (0.3%) measurements of WLZ (>+5 or –5 Z), consistent with WHO recommendations.[2] See Benjamin-Chung (2020) for more details on cohort inclusion and assessment of anthropometry measurement quality.[3] We also calculated the difference in linear and ponderal growth velocities over three-month periods. We calculated the change in LAZ, WAZ, length in centimeters, and weight in kilograms within 3-month age intervals, including measurements within a two-week window around each age in months to account for variation in the age at each length measurement.

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. Children with ≥ 50% of WLZ measurements < –2 and at least 4 measurements over a defined age range were classified as persistently wasted (e.g., birth to 24 months, median interval between measurements: 80 days, IQR: 62-93). 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] Stunting reversal was defined as children stunted under 3 months whose final two measurements before 24 months were non-stunted. Child mortality was all-cause and was restricted to children who died after birth and before age 24 months. For child morbidity outcomes (Figure 4c), concurrent wasting and stunting prevalences at age 18 months were estimated using the anthropometry measurement taken closest to age 18 months, and within 17-19 months of age, while persistent wasting was estimated from child measurements between 6 and 24 months of age. We chose 18 months to calculate concurrent wasting and stunting because it maximized the number of child observations at later ages when concurrent wasting and stunting was most prevalent, and used ages 6-24 months to define persistent wasting to maximize the number of anthropometry measurements taken after the early growth faltering exposure measurements.[4]

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

4.2 Risk set definition

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

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

4.3 Estimating differences in outcomes across categories of exposures

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

Mean difference of the comparison levels of the exposure on LAZ, WLZ at birth, 6 months, and 24 months. The Z-scores used were the measures taken closest to the age of interest and within one month of the age of interest, except for Z-scores at birth which only included a child's first measure recorded by age 7 days. We also calculated mean differences in LAZ, WAZ, weight, and length velocities.

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

and birth-6 months.

Mean Z-scores by continuous age, stratified by levels of exposures, from birth to 24 months were fit within individual cohorts using cubic splines with the bandwidth chosen to minimize the median Akaike information criterion across cohorts.[5] We estimated splines separately for each exposure category. We pooled spline curves across cohorts into a single prediction, offset by mean Z-scores at one year, using random effects models.[6]

4.4 Estimating population attributable parameters

We estimated three measures of the population-level effect of exposures on growth faltering outcomes:

Population intervention impact (PIE), a generalization of population attributable risk, was defined as the change in population mean Z-score if the entire population's exposure was set to an ideal reference level. For each exposure, we chose reference levels based on prior literature or as the category with the highest mean LAZ or WLZ across cohorts.

Population attributable fraction (PAF) was defined as the proportional reduction in cumulative incidence if the entire population's exposure was set to an ideal low risk reference level. We estimated the PAF for the prevalence of stunting and wasting at birth, 6, and 24 months and cumulative incidence of stunting and wasting from birth to 24 months, 6-24 months, and from birth to 6 months. For each exposure, we chose the reference level as the category with the lowest risk of stunting or wasting.

Optimal individualized intervention impact We employed a variable importance measure (VIM) methodology to estimate the impact of an optimal individualized intervention on an exposure.[7] The optimal intervention on an exposure was determined through estimating individualized treatment regimes, which give an individual-specific rule for the lowest-risk level of exposure based on individuals' measured covariates. The covariates used to estimate the low-risk level are the same as those used for the adjustment documented in section 6 below. The impact of the optimal individualized intervention is derived from the VIM, which is the predicted change in the population-mean outcome from the observed outcome if every child's exposure was shifted to the optimal level. This differs from the PIE and PAF parameters in that we did not specify the reference level; moreover, the reference level could vary across participants.

PIE and PAF parameters assume a causal relationship between exposure and outcome. For some exposures, we considered attributable effects to have a pragmatic interpretation — they represent a summary estimate of relative importance that combines the exposure's strength of association and its prevalence in the population.[8] Comparisons between optimal intervention estimates and PIE estimates are shown in Extended Data Fig 11.

5. Estimation approach

Estimation of cohort-specific effects

For each exposure, we used the directed acyclic graph (DAG) framework to identify potential

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

confounders from the broader set of exposures used in the analysis.[9] We did not adjust for characteristics that were assumed to be intermediate on the causal path between any exposure and the outcome, because while controlling for mediators may help adjust for unmeasured confounders in some conditions, it can also lead to collider bias.[10,11] Detailed lists of adjustment covariates used for each analysis are available online (https://child-growth.github.io/causes/dags.html). Confounders were not measured in every cohort, so there could be residual confounding in cohort-specific estimates.

Analyses used a complete case approach that only included children with non-missing exposure and outcome measurements. For additional covariates in adjusted analyses, we used the following approach to impute missing covariate values.[12] Within each cohort, if there was <50% missingness in a covariate, we imputed missing measurements as the median (continuous variables) or mode (categorical variables) among all children, and analyses included an indicator variable for missingness in the adjustment set. Covariates with >50% missingness were excluded from the potential adjustment set. When calculating the median for imputation, we used children as independent units rather than measurements so that children with more frequent measurements were not over-represented.

Unadjusted PRs and CIRs between the reference level of each exposure and comparison levels were estimated using logistic regressions.[13] Unadjusted mean differences for continuous outcomes were estimated using linear regressions.

To flexibly adjust for potential confounders and reduce the risk of model misspecification, we estimated adjusted PRs, CIRs, and mean differences using targeted maximum likelihood estimation (TMLE), a two-stage estimation strategy that incorporates state-of-the-art machine learning algorithms (super learner) while still providing valid statistical inference. [14,15] The effects of covariate adjustment on estimates compared to unadjusted estimates is shown in Extended Data Fig 12, and E-values, summary measures of the strength of unmeasured confounding needed to explain away observed significant associations, are plotted in Extended Data Fig 13.[16] The super learner is an ensemble machine learning method that uses cross-validation to select a weighted combination of predictions from a library of algorithms.[17] We included in the library simple means, generalized linear models, LASSO penalized regressions,[18] generalized additive models,[19] and gradient boosting machines.[20] The super learner was fit to maximize the 10-fold cross-validated area under the receiver operator curve (AUC) for binomial outcomes, and minimize the 10-fold cross-validated mean-squared error (MSE) for continuous outcomes. That is, the super learner was fit using 9/10 of the data, while the AUC/MSE was calculated on the remaining 1/10 of the data. Each fold of the data was held out in turn and the cross-validated performance measure was calculated as the average of the performance measures across the ten folds. This approach is practically appealing and robust in finite samples, since this cross-validation procedure utilizes unseen sample data to measure the estimator's performance. Also, the super learner is asymptotically optimal in the sense that it is guaranteed to outperform the best possible algorithm included in the library as sample size grows. The initial estimator obtained via super learner is subsequently updated to yield an efficient double-robust semi-parametric substitution estimator of the parameter of interest.[14] To estimate the R^2 of models including multiple exposures, we fit super learner models, without the targeted learning step, and within each cohort measuring the exposures. We then pooled cohort-specific R^2 estimates using fixed effects models.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

Mortality analyses estimated hazard ratios using Cox proportional hazards models with a child's age in days as the timescale, adjusting for potential confounders, with the growth faltering exposure status updated at each follow-up that preceded death or censoring by age 24 months. Growth faltering exposures included moderate (between –2 Z and –3 Z) wasting, stunting, and underweight, severe (below –3 Z) wasting, stunting, and underweight, and combinations of concurrent wasting, stunting, and underweight. Growth faltering categories were mutually exclusive within moderate or severe classifications, so children were classified as only wasted, only stunted, or only underweight, or some combination of these categories. We estimated the hazard ratio associated with different anthropometric measures of CGF in separate analyses, considering each as an exposure in turn with the reference group defined as children without the deficit. For children who did not die, we defined their censoring date as the administrative end of follow-up in their cohort, or age 24 months (730 days), whichever occurred first. Because mortality was a rare outcome, estimates are adjusted only for child sex and trial treatment arm. To avoid reverse causality, we did not include child growth measures occurring within 7 days of death. Extended Data Table 3 lists the cohorts used in the mortality analysis, the number of deaths in each cohort, and a comparison to country-level infant mortality rates.

<u>Data sparsity</u>

We did not estimate relative risks between a higher level of exposure and the reference group if there were 5 or fewer cases in either stratum. In such cases, we still estimated relative risks between other exposure strata and the reference strata if those strata were not sparse. For rare outcomes, we only included one covariate for every 10 observations in the sparsest combination of the exposure and outcome, choosing covariates based on ranked deviance ratios.

6. Pooling parameters

We pooled adjusted estimates from individual cohorts using random effects models, fit using restricted maximum likelihood estimation. The pooling methods are detailed in Benjamin-Chung (2020).[1] All parameters were pooled directly using the cohort-specific estimates of the same parameter, except for population attributable fractions. Pooled PAFs were calculated from random-effects pooled population intervention impacts (PIEs), and pooled outcome prevalence in the population using the following formulas:[21]

$$PAF = \frac{PIE}{Outcome\ prevalence} \times 100 \qquad (1)$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

$$PAF\ 95\%CI\ = \frac{PIE\ 95\%\ CI}{Outcome\ prevalence} \times 100 \qquad (2)$$

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

For figures 3a-c, mean trajectories estimated using cubic splines in individual studies and then curves were pooled using random effects.[6] Curves estimated from all anthropometry measurements of children taken from birth to 24 months of age within studies that measured the measure of maternal anthropometry.

7. 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 faltering and mortality at different ages, after dropping the trials measuring children less frequently than quarterly, and using TMLE instead of Cox proportional hazard models, and we plotted Kaplan Meier curves of child mortality, stratified by measures of early growth faltering. 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 & Melinda Gates Foundation Knowledge Integration project upon reasonable request. Replication scripts for this analysis are available here: https://osf.io/9xyqv/.

Methods References

1. WHO | The WHO Child Growth Standards. *WHO* http://www.who.int/childgrowth/en/.
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 faltering 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).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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. Luedtke, A. R. & van der Laan, M. J. Super-Learning of an Optimal Dynamic Treatment Rule. *Int. J. Biostat.* **12**, 305–332 (2016).
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. Groenwold, R. H. H., Palmer, T. M. & Tilling, K. To Adjust or Not to Adjust? When a "Confounder" Is Only Measured After Exposure. *Epidemiol. Camb. Mass* **32**, 194–201 (2021).
12. Stuart, E. A. Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. *Stat. Sci. Rev. J. Inst. Math. Stat.* **25**, 1 (2010).
13. 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).
14. Gruber, S. & Laan, M. van der. Targeted Maximum Likelihood Estimation: A Gentle Introduction. *UC Berkeley Div. Biostat. Work. Pap. Ser.* (2009).
15. Laan, M. J. van der & Rose, S. *Targeted Learning: Causal Inference for Observational and Experimental Data*. (Springer-Verlag, 2011).
16. VanderWeele, T. J. & Ding, P. Sensitivity Analysis in Observational Research: Introducing the E-Value. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **167**, 268 (2017).
17. van der Laan, M., Polley, E. & Hubbard, A. Super Learner. *UC Berkeley Div. Biostat. Work. Pap. Ser.* (2007).
18. Tibshirani, R. Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Methodol.* **58**, 267–288 (1996).
19. Hastie, T. & Tibshirani, R. Generalized Additive Models. *Stat. Sci.* **1**, 297–310 (1986).
20. 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.
21. 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,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100; this version posted December 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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.C, 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.C, 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., E.C, 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).