Effect of a home-based health, nutrition, and responsive stimulation intervention and conditional cash transfers on child development and growth: a cluster-randomized controlled trial in Tanzania

Christopher R. Sudfeld, ScD[1,2], Lilia Bliznashka, MA[1], Geofrey Ashery, BA[3], Aisha K. Yousafzai, PhD[1], Honorati Masanja, PhD[3]

Affiliations
[1]Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
[2]Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
[3]Ifakara Health Institute, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Corresponding Author: Christopher R. Sudfeld, Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School, 665 Huntington Ave, Boston MA, 02115,
Email: csudfeld@hsph.harvard.edu
Phone: 617-432-5051

Keywords: Community Health Workers, Cash Transfer, Child Health, Child Development, Malnutrition

Word Count: 3,436

Abstract

Introduction: Evidence on the effect of community health worker (CHW) interventions and conditional cash transfers (CCTs) on child growth and development in sub-Saharan Africa remains sparse.

Methods: We conducted a single-blind, cluster-randomized controlled trial of an integrated home-visiting health, nutrition, and responsive stimulation intervention alone and in combination with CCTs to promote antenatal and child clinic attendance from 2017 to 2019 in rural Morogoro region, Tanzania. Pregnant women and caregivers with a child <1 year of age were enrolled. Twelve villages were randomized to either a (i) CHW (n=200 participants), (ii) CHW+CCT (n=200), or (iii) control arm (n=193). An intention-to-treat analysis was conducted for the primary trial outcomes of child cognitive, language and motor development assessed with the Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development and child length/height-for-age z-scores (HAZ) at 18-months of follow-up.

Results: The CHW and CHW+CCT interventions had beneficial effects on child cognitive development as compared to control (standardized mean difference (SMD): 0.14; 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.05, 0.23 and SMD: 0.17; 95% CI: 0.10, 0.23, respectively). The CHW+CCT intervention also had positive effects on language (SMD: 0.08; 95% CI: 0.02, 0.14) and motor development (SMD: 0.15; 95% CI: 0.03, 0.27). Both CHW and CHW+CCT interventions had no effect on HAZ in the primary analysis; however, there were statistically significant positive effects in multivariable analyses.

Conclusion: Integrated CHW home-visiting interventions can improve child cognitive development and may have positive effects on linear growth. Combining CHWs with cash transfers may provide additional benefits on selected outcomes.

Trial registration number: ISRCTN10323949

Key Questions Box

What is already known?

- Community health worker interventions that integrate health, nutrition and responsive stimulation components can improve child development but evidence from sub-Saharan Africa is limited.

- Conditional cash transfers can increase healthcare utilization but effects on child development and growth remain unclear.

What are the new findings?

- An integrated home-visiting community health worker intervention benefited child cognitive development and may have improved child linear growth in rural Tanzania.

- Combining conditional cash transfers with the community health worker intervention did not appear to provide additional benefit.

What do the new findings imply?

- An integrated home-visiting community health worker intervention benefited child cognitive development and appeared to improve child linear growth in rural Tanzania.

- Combining conditional cash transfers with the community health worker intervention may improve selected outcomes; however, trials and studies are needed to evaluate integrated supply- and demand-side interventions to promote child growth and development.

INTRODUCTION

Community-based interventions that integrate health, nutrition and responsive stimulation components are a promising strategy to improve child health, growth and development.[1-3] Home visit-based community health worker (CHWs) interventions primarily focused on health can increase the rate of facility births, uptake of child immunizations, and reduce newborn morbidity and mortality.[4 5] Trials integrating responsive stimulation components in CHW interventions in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) have also generally found positive effects on child development outcomes.[6-11] Nevertheless, evidence on the effect of integrated child health, nutrition and responsive stimulation interventions is limited, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. In addition, data on the effects of CHW interventions on child growth outcomes is sparse.[5 12]

While CHWs are a supply-side intervention providing additional demand-side conditional cash transfer (CCT) interventions to promote healthcare utilization have shown positive effects on maternal and child clinic visit attendance and child vaccination.[13] However, evidence on the effect of CCTs on child nutrition, growth and development in LMICs is mixed, with the majority coming from Latin America.[13-15] A meta-analysis of cash transfer programs on found no effect on child anthropometric outcomes; however, the analysis included both unconditional cash transfers and cash transfers linked to a range of health, work and education conditions.[16] Cash transfers, with conditionality linked to parenting or educational programs, have generally shown greater impacts than unconditional cash transfers, including potential benefits on child development.[13] Additionally, integration of parenting interventions (including responsive stimulation components) in CCT platforms has demonstrated positive effects on child development in Colombia [17] and Mexico[18]. No studies to date have linked CCTs for antenatal

care and routine child health growth monitoring clinic visits with supply-side integrated responsive stimulation, health, and nutrition home visits.

METHODS

Trial Design and Setting

We conducted a single-blind, cluster-randomized controlled trial of a home-based CHW-delivered health, nutrition, and responsive stimulation intervention alone and combined with CCTs to promote antenatal care and routine well child visits in rural Ifakara, Tanzania (trial registration: ISRCTN10323949). The full trial protocol is detailed elsewhere.[19] The trial was conducted in selected villages in the Kilombero and Ulanga districts in Morogoro region.[20]

Trial Participants

The trial recruited pregnant women and mother/caregiver-infant pairs who lived in the study villages through a house-to-house survey. The inclusion criteria were: (1) permanent residence in a study village, (2) pregnant (self-reported) or had a child <□1□year of age at the enrollment visit, (3) and provide written consent. The exclusion criteria were: (1) enrollment in any other clinical trial or intervention study, or (2) child with severe physical or mental impairment. Potential participants were not aware of their village's randomization arm at the time of seeking consent. In each study village, enrollment continued until all pregnant women and mothers/caregivers with a child <1 year of age were enrolled or until 50 participants were enrolled, whichever was reached first. If the mother had twins, one child was randomly selected for the trial and the same child was assessed at each time point. Written informed consent was obtained for all participants.

Randomization and Interventions

Village clusters were randomly allocated in a 1:1:1 ratio to one of the three trials arms: (i) CHW, (ii) CHW+CCT, or (iii) Control. Randomization was stratified by semi-urban (six villages) and rural (six villages) villages to increase the likelihood of baseline balance between arms. Randomization was done by a non-study statistician using a computer-generated randomization list with sequence blocks of three. The full details of the CHW, CHW+CCT and Control arms are described elsewhere.[19]

Briefly, in both the CHW and CHW+CCT arm, CHWs delivered an integrated health, nutrition, and responsive stimulation intervention in the home every 4-6 weeks for the trial duration of 18 months. The CHWs had received basic training on the national curriculum by the government. However, the national CHW program was not implemented in the study area during the trial due to resource constraints, and the CHW salary was paid by the project. The CHW intervention included activities and duties of the standardized Tanzanian CHW curriculum with the addition of a responsive stimulation component.[19] The full intervention package was provide after enrollment for all participants, including pregnant women. Supplemental Table 1 presents a Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) table for the intervention.[21] The Tanzanian government CHW curriculum did not include responsive stimulation or other direct early child development (ECD) promoting activities. The study team adapted the UNICEF and WHO Care for Child Development package to the local context.[22] One field coordinator supervised CHWs through bi-weekly one-on-one meetings with each CHW, a monthly meeting with all CHWs, and monthly home visit spot-checks where the field coordinator accompanied CHWs to home visits (~5% of visits).

A CCT intervention was also provided to participants in the CHW+CCT villages every 4-6 weeks at the time of the CHW visit. The conditions for the CCT were attendance of routine antenatal care or routine well-child health and growth monitoring clinic visits. CHWs assessed antenatal care and child health cards at each home visit and provided mothers with cash payments of 10,000 Tanzanian Shillings ($4.30) per antenatal care visit or 5,000 Tanzanian Shillings ($2.15) per routine child health and growth monitoring visit that was completed since the last study visit. CHWs communicated that the CCT payments could be used in any way without penalty but suggested that mothers use the money for resources to support the health and development of the child.

Villages allocated to the control arm had access to existing clinic-based maternal and child health services. No CHWs provided services to the control villages during the study period.

Assessments and Outcomes

Independent fieldworkers who were blinded to the randomized arm conducted home interviews with mothers at enrollment (baseline) and at 18 months after enrollment (endline). Standardized questionnaires were administered to collect demographic and socioeconomic data. In addition, the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL-25) was administered to assess symptoms of depression and anxiety[23]; symptoms consistent with depression were defined using the Tanzanian validated HSCL-25 cut-off.[24] Functional social support was assessed using the Duke University–University of North Carolina Functional Social Support Questionnaire.[25] The Caregiver Knowledge of Child Development Inventory (CKCDI) was administered at baseline.[26] Child anthropometric measures were taken in triplicate in the home at the baseline and endline visit. Child weight was measured to the nearest 100 g using a digital scale (Seca, Hamburg,

Germany). Child length (children < 24 months age) was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm using a length board (Seca, Hamburg, Germany) and child height was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm using a stadiometer (Seca, Hamburg, Germany). Anthropometric Z-scores were calculated using the 2006 WHO Child Growth Standards[27]. At endline, fieldworkers traveled outside the study area to conduct interviews and take anthropometric measurements for participants who moved temporarily or permanently outside the study area.

Female research nurses who were blinded to randomization arm administered a Tanzania adapted and Swahili translated version of the Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development, Third Edition (BSID-III).[28 29] The BSID-III was administered in quiet rooms at two health facilities serving the study area. The BSID-III nurses completed a three-week BSID-III training led by experts from Boston, USA and completed BSID-III assessments for a prior research study.[28] For participants who moved outside of the study area, BSID-III assessments were not conducted. The two assessors differed in mean BSID-III domain composite scores (Supplemental Table 2) and therefore all analyses adjusted for assessor. However, BSID-III showed high internal consistency for all domains (Cronbach's alphas ≥0.91) in the full sample and separately for each assessor (Supplemental Table 3).

Sample Size

Sample size calculations were based on randomization of 12 village clusters, 50 mother/caregiver-child pairs per cluster, a nominal Type I error rate of 0.05 and an intra-cluster correlation of 0.01. We assumed 7.5% fetal loss or child death, 5% loss to follow-up (unknown vital status) and 15% missing data on LAZ. For child development, we originally planned to randomly select 60% of participants to have BSID-III assessed of which we assumed 10% would

not complete the assessment (resulting in approximately 50%). Based on these assumptions, we had 80% power to detect a standardized mean difference (SMD) of 0.40 in length/height-for-age z-score (HAZ) and 0.53 standard deviations of development z-scores. However, to increase statistical power, we decided to invite all participants for BSID-III assessment. In a post hoc power analysis based on the actual number BSID-III assessments and observed within village correlation, we had 80% power to detect effect sizes of 0.48, 0.86, and 0.46 SD for cognitive, language and motor scores, respectively.

Statistical Analysis

The intention-to-treat (ITT) principle was used for all primary analyses; participants who moved to neighboring villages were analyzed in the village originally randomized. All analyses accounted for clustering by village and urban/rural residence due to the stratified randomization scheme. Generalized linear regression models were used to assess the effect of the CHW and CHW+CCT interventions on the primary outcomes at endline: BSID-III sub-scale z-scores and HAZ. BSID-III z-scores were calculated using the internal mean and standard deviation. For the primary analysis, BSID-III z-scores were adjusted for urban/rural residence, child age, sex, and BSID-III assessor; the metric of HAZ internally accounts for child age and sex. We also present BSID-III composite scores as a secondary outcome; however, applying US norms for BSID-III scores to children in other settings can result in misclassification and cross-cultural bias.[30 31] The secondary outcomes of child weight-for-age z-scores (WAZ), weight-for-length/height z-scores (WHZ), and the number of child health and growth monitoring clinic visits were also assessed using generalized linear models. We did not analyze antenatal care visit attendance by randomized group since only 30% of women were pregnant at baseline and 60% of enrolled

pregnant women delivered within 60 days of enrollment. Log-poisson models were used to examine relative risks of stunting (HAZ < -2), wasting (WHZ< -2), underweight (WAZ < -2) and overweight (WHZ > 2).

We conducted sensitivity analyses that (i) adjusted for baseline factors which showed some degree of imbalance between randomization arms based on a p-value <0.20, and (ii) used stabilized inverse probability weights to account for dependent censoring (i.e. loss to follow-up).[32] We also present effect estimates collapsing the CHW and CHW+CCT intervention arms. In addition, we explored the potential for effect modification by predefined baseline variables.[19] The statistical significance of interaction was assessed with the likelihood ratio test and we did not adjust for multiple testing. Statistical analyses were performed with Stata Version 16 (StataCorp, College Station TX).

RESULTS

Trial recruitment began in September 2017 and endline follow-up activities were completed in May 2019. In the 12 randomized clusters, 593 pregnant women or mother-infant pairs were recruited for participation and were analyzed by intention-to-treat. Baseline characteristics were relatively comparable across intervention arms, but there was an indication of differences in household wealth, household sanitation, maternal education, parity, social support and CKCDI scores (Table 1 and Supplemental Table 4). The trial flow diagram is presented in Figure 1. The mean child age at endline assessment was 18.9 months (SD: 4.6). At endline anthropometric and BSID-III data was available for 91.5% and 67.7% of randomized participants, respectively. Children with endline anthropometric and BSID-III data were

generally comparable at baseline to those without (Supplemental Tables 5 and 6). There were no adverse events reported during the trial.

The CHW and CHW+CCT interventions were delivered every 4-6 weeks as expected. The median number of home visits for the CHW arm was 11 (Q1: 9, Q3:13) and for the CHW+CCT arm was 12 (Q1: 10, Q3: 13). The mean CHW visit duration in both intervention groups was approximately 35 minutes (mean 34.4 ± 3.3 CHW group and 35.2 ± 3.5 minutes CHW+CCT group). Process indicators and maternal opinions on the CHW and CCT interventions are presented in Table 2. Participants in the CHW+CCT attended 3.0 (95% CI: 2.1-4.0) more child health and growth monitoring clinic visits as compared to control, while participants in the CHW arm attended 1.5 additional clinic visits (95% CI 0.6-2.5) (Supplemental Table 7).

CHW and CHW+CCT intervention effects on BSID-III domain scores are presented in Table 3. In the primary analysis, both the CHW and CHW + CCT arms had beneficial effects on cognitive development scores and the CHW+CCT arm had positive effects on language and motor scores. The effect sizes were similar, and the findings were qualitatively the same in multivariable models that adjusted for potential baseline imbalance (Table 3). Findings for BSID-III composite scores were similar (Supplemental Table 8). In addition, the results were materially unchanged in a sensitivity analysis using inverse probability weighting accounting for dependent censoring (Supplemental Table 9). In secondary analyses, collapsing the CHW and CHW+CCT arms, there was a positive effect on cognitive scores but no effect on language or motor scores (Supplemental Table 10). We also explored potential modifiers of the effect of the interventions on BSID-III scores. There was indication that both the CHW and CHW+CCT interventions had stronger positive effects on cognitive scores for children who received ≥90%

of expected CHW home visits (Supplemental Table 11). The CHW+CCT intervention appeared to provide greater positive effects on language scores for infants whose mothers had lower baseline CKCDI scores and on motor scores for mothers with less than secondary education (Supplemental Table 12).

Intervention effects on child growth is presented in Table 4. In the primary analysis, there was no statistically significant effect on HAZ for either the CHW or CHW+CCT interventions. However, in multivariable models there were significant beneficial effects on HAZ in both the CHW and CHW+CCT arms as compared to control. Further, the results were similar in a sensitivity analysis accounting for dependent censoring (Supplemental Table 13). Secondary analyses of the collapsed CHW and CHW+CCT arms also found a significant beneficial effect on HAZ in the multivariable model (Supplemental Table 14). There did not appear to be a difference in effect on HAZ for those who received ≥90% of CHW visits as compared to <90% of visits (Supplemental Table 15). In exploratory analyses of potential effect modifiers (Supplemental Table 16), there was consistent evidence that the magnitude of the positive effects of both the CHW and CHW+CCT interventions on HAZ was greater for women with lower social support (p-values for interaction <0.01). There was also indication that the CHW intervention provided greater benefits for mothers with baseline depression and for mothers over 25 years of age as compared to younger mothers (p-values for interaction <0.05). As for secondary anthropometric outcomes, the CHW arm reduced the risk of underweight and the CHW+CCT intervention reduced the risk of overweight in multivariable models (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

In this single-blind, cluster-randomized controlled trial conducted in rural Tanzania, we found that both the CHW and CHW+CCT interventions had beneficial effects on child cognitive development. The CHW+CCT arm also had positive effects on language and motor development. In addition, we found no statistically significant effect of either intervention on child HAZ in the primary analysis; however, both the CHW and CHW+CCT interventions had beneficial effects on HAZ in multivariable analyses.

Responsive stimulations interventions have generally shown moderate positive effects on child development outcomes; a meta-analysis of 21 such interventions determined positive pooled effect sizes of 0.42 SD and 0.47 SD for cognitive and language development, respectively.[6 7] In our trial, we found beneficial effects of both the CHW and CHW+CCT interventions on cognitive development scores; however, the magnitude of the effect was only 0.1 SD; the CHW+CCT arm also had similar magnitude effects of 0.1 SD on language and motor scores. One potential explanation for the smaller effect size is that our trial provided a less intensive intervention by design as compared to prior trials and studies. In our study, CHW home visits were conducted every 4-6 weeks for an average of 35 minutes. Prior trials have found relatively large positive effects with 30-60 minute home visits; however, most conducted home visits every two weeks or more frequently.[7] A trial of an integrated responsive stimulation and nutrition intervention implemented in rural Pakistan also conducted monthly home visits and group sessions and found positive effects on child cognitive, language and motor scores at 24 months of age but the group sessions were almost three times longer at 1 hour and 20 minutes.[33] As a result, combining CHW interventions with group meetings or other supplemental activities that bolster behavior change may be important to enhance effects.

The CHW+CCT arm had similar magnitude of effect on cognitive and language scores relative to the CHW arm (although the effect on language was only statistically significant in the CHW+CCT arm). However, there was some suggestion, although not definitive, that the effect on motor development may be larger for CHW+CCT than CHW alone. In disadvantaged communities, toys and manipulatives that may enhance complex cognitive, language and motor skills are often scarce. Chang et al distributed a picture book and a puzzle (key examples of learning materials that support complex developmental skills) at well child visits to support a health-center based stimulation program in Jamaica that found positive effect on child cognitive development.[34] In our study, the majority of mothers in the CHW+CCT reported that the CCT funds were used directly for goods for the infants, including toys, although social desirability may affect these findings. Several previous interventions encourage making homemade toys or sharing toys in communities over the course of the program; however, research on provision of toys and manipulatives targeting complex or higher-order skills development in disadvantaged and resource-scarce settings should be pursued alongside supporting responsive caregiver-child interactions and play.

In addition, the CHW and CHW+CCT interventions may have had positive effects on linear growth. It is important to note these positive effects were only statistically significant in multivariable models and that even though the point estimates indicate large effects the confidence intervals are wide and indicate that moderately small to very large beneficial effects are possible. A recent systematic review determined that CHW home visits increased early initiation of breastfeeding and exclusive breastfeeding.[4] Provision of education on complementary feeding has also been shown to increase HAZ by 0.29 SD.[35] It is important to note that CHWs in our trial completed the one-year Tanzania government certified CHW

training program, which is significantly longer in duration and more comprehensive in terms of interventions to be delivered in the home than other CHW programs, which may have resulted in beneficial effects.

The CHW+CCT arm appeared to provide beneficial effects on linear growth that were similar in magnitude to the CHW arm in multivariable analyses. Evidence on the effect of cash transfers on child nutritional status is mixed, but there is relatively consistent evidence of positive effects on child diet and morbidity.[15] We found that the CHW+CCT increased child clinic visit attendance as compared to control, which is consistent with evidence that cash transfers can be used to increase health service utilization in LMICs.[13 36] Nevertheless, there remains a debate on the actual effectiveness of growth monitoring programs to provide beneficial effects on child growth.[37] As a result, the potential role of integrating cash transfers into home visit programs to promote child growth remains unclear.

This study has several important limitations. First, due to the small number of clusters and participant sample size; there was an inherent risk of baseline imbalances. However, multivariable analyses including adjustment for these factors resulted in similar findings. Second, our analyses of potential effect modifiers, although prespecified, were at risk of type I errors due to multiple testing and these results should be used for hypothesis generation. Third, BSID-III data was available for 67% of participants and therefore there is a risk of selection bias; however, there appeared to be no difference between children who were assessed versus not assessed for development outcomes. Fourth, the effects of the interventions were evaluated after 18 months of delivery and therefore it is not clear if the impact is sustained later in childhood. Finally, we did not have a CCT only arm and were therefore not able to directly assess interaction between CHW and CCT interventions. In addition, the CHW intervention included

the responsive stimulation component in addition to the standard Tanzania CHW program by design, as a result, we are not able to directly assess if the responsive stimulation component provided additional benefit beyond the standard CHW program. Last, in our trial intervention delivery was carefully monitored and therefore determined efficacy of the interventions and consequently the effectiveness of the interventions in large-scale programs needs to be evaluated.

Conclusions

Implementation research is needed to determine how to best integrate responsive stimulation components into CHW programs considering programmatic constraints that can vary by country, program, and context. Future studies should evaluate the cost-effectiveness of integrating responsive stimulation into CHW programs at scale. Our study also suggested that there may be beneficial effects of integrating CHWs with CCTs on some outcomes but additional research on integrated supply- and demand-side strategies to promote child growth and development is needed.

Acknowledgements: We would like to acknowledge the study staff and the all the mothers, in and for making the study possible.

Contributors: CRS and HM conceptualized the study. CRS, LB, GA, AKY, and HM developed the intervention and trial protocol, GA coordinated, and supervised data collection, MB and CRS conducted the statistical analysis. CRS wrote the first draft of the paper. All authors reviewed and contributed to the draft paper. All authors approved the final submission.

Funding: This work was supported by Grand Challenges Canada grant number #R-SB-POC-1707-09024. The funder had no involvement in the study design, data collection, analysis or interpretation of the study.

Competing interests: None declared.

Patient and public involvement: Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

Patient consent for publication: Not required.

Ethics approval: The trial protocol was approved by the Ifakara Health Institute IRB (reference number 007–2017), the Tanzanian National Health Research Ethics Sub-Committee (NatHREC; reference no. NIMR/HQ/R.8a/Vol.IX/2538), and the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health Institutional Review Board (reference no. IRB17–1001).

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement: Deidentified individual participant data (including data dictionaries) may be made available, in addition to study protocols, the statistical analysis plan, and the informed consent form. The data will be made available upon publication to researchers who provide a methodologically sound proposal for use in achieving the goals of the approved proposal and obtain ethical approval. Proposals should be submitted to csudfeld@hsph.harvard.edu.

References

1. Richter LM, Daelmans B, Lombardi J, et al. Investing in the foundation of sustainable development: pathways to scale up for early childhood development. *The Lancet* 2017;389:103-18. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31698-1
2. Engle PL, Fernald LCH, Alderman H, et al. Strategies for reducing inequalities and improving developmental outcomes for young children in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet* 2011;378:1339-53. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60889-1
3. Ruel MT, Alderman H. Nutrition-sensitive interventions and programmes: how can they help to accelerate progress in improving maternal and child nutrition? *Lancet* 2013;382:536-51. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60843-0
4. Lassi ZS, Bhutta ZA. Community-based intervention packages for reducing maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality and improving neonatal outcomes. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015(3):CD007754. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007754.pub3
5. Lewin S, Munabi-Babigumira S, Glenton C, et al. Lay health workers in primary and community health care for maternal and child health and the management of infectious diseases. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2010(3):CD004015. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004015.pub3
6. Aboud FE, Yousafzai AK. Global Health and Development in Early Childhood. *Annual Review of Psychology* 2015;66:433=57. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015128
7. Grantham-Mcgregor SM, Fernald LCH, Kagawa RMC, et al. Effects of integrated child development and nutrition interventions on child development and nutritional status. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 2014;1308:11-32. doi: 10.1111/nyas.12284
8. Prado EL, Larson LM, Cox K, et al. Do effects of early life interventions on linear growth correspond to effects on neurobehavioural development? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Global Health* 2019;7:e1398-e413. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30361-4
9. Singla DR, Kumbakumba E, Aboud FE. Effects of a parenting intervention to address maternal psychological wellbeing and child development and growth in rural Uganda: a community-based, cluster randomised trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2015;3(8):e458-e69. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(15)00099-6
10. Boivin MJ, Nakasujja N, Familiar-Lopez I, et al. Effect of Caregiver Training on the Neurodevelopment of HIV-Exposed Uninfected Children and Caregiver Mental Health: A Ugandan Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 2017;38(9):753-64. doi: 10.1097/DBP.0000000000000510
11. Potterton J, Stewart A, Cooper P, et al. The effect of a basic home stimulation programme on the development of young children infected with HIV. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2010;52(6):547-51. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8749.2009.03534.x
12. Janmohamed A, Sohani N, Lassi ZS, et al. The Effects of Community Home Visit and Peer Group Nutrition Intervention Delivery Platforms on Nutrition Outcomes in Low and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Nutrients* 2020;12(2) doi: 10.3390/nu12020440
13. De Walque D, Fernald L, Gertler P, et al. Cash transfers and child and adolescent development. Child and adolescent health and development. Washington (DC): The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, 2017.

14. Owusu-Addo E, Cross R. The impact of conditional cash transfers on child health in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Int J Public Health* 2014;59(4):609-18. doi: 10.1007/s00038-014-0570-x
15. de Groot R, Palermo T, Handa S, et al. Cash Transfers and Child Nutrition: Pathways and Impacts. *Dev Policy Rev* 2017;35(5):621-43. doi: 10.1111/dpr.12255
16. Manley J, Gitter S, Slavchevska V. How Effective are Cash Transfers at Improving Nutritional Status? *World Development* 2013;48:133-55. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.03.010
17. Attanasio OP, Fernández C, Fitzsimons EOA, et al. Using the infrastructure of a conditional cash transfer program to deliver a scalable integrated early child development program in Colombia: cluster randomized controlled trial. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2014;349:g5785. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g5785
18. Fernald LCH, Kagawa RMC, Knauer HA, et al. Promoting child development through group-based parent support within a cash transfer program: Experimental effects on children's outcomes. *Developmental Psychology* 2017;53:222-36. doi: 10.1037/dev0000185
19. Sudfeld CR, Bliznashka L, Ashery G, et al. Effect of a community health worker delivered health, nutrition and responsive stimulation package and conditional cash transfers on child development and growth in rural Tanzania: protocol for a cluster-randomized trial. *BMC Public Health* 2019;19(1):641. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-7008-6
20. Geubbels E, Amri S, Levira F, et al. Health & Demographic Surveillance System Profile: The Ifakara Rural and Urban Health and Demographic Surveillance System (Ifakara HDSS). *Int J Epidemiol* 2015;44(3):848-61. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv068
21. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, et al. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ* 2014;348:g1687. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g1687
22. World Health Organization and UNICEF. Care for child development: improving the care of young children. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2012.
23. Derogatis LR, Lipman RS, Rickels K, et al. The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): a self-report symptom inventory. *Behav Sci,* 1974; 19(1).
24. Kaaya SF, Fawzi MS, Mbwambo J, et al. Validity of the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25 amongst HIV-positive pregnant women in Tanzania. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 2002;106(1):9-19.
25. Broadhead WE, Gehlbach SH, de Gruy FV, et al. The Duke-UNC Functional Social Support Questionnaire. Measurement of social support in family medicine patients. *Med Care* 1988;26(7):709-23.
26. Ertem IO, Atay G, Dogan DG, et al. Mothers' knowledge of young child development in a developing country. *Child Care Health Dev* 2007;33(6):728-37.
27. World Health Organization. WHO Child Growth Standards based on length/height, weight and age. *Acta Paediatr Suppl,* 2006;450:76-85.
28. Sudfeld CR, McCoy DC, Fink G, et al. Malnutrition and Its Determinants Are Associated with Suboptimal Cognitive, Communication, and Motor Development in Tanzanian Children. *J Nutr* 2015;145(12):2705-14.
29. Bayley N. Bayley scales of infant and toddler development. San Antonio, TX: NCS Pearson, 2006.
30. Cromwell EA, Dube Q, Cole SR, et al. Validity of US norms for the Bayley Scales of Infant Development-III in Malawian children. *Eur J Paediatr Neurol* 2014;18(2):223-30. doi: 10.1016/j.ejpn.2013.11.011
31. Geisinger KF. Cross-cultural normative assessment: translation and adaptation issues influencing the normative interpretation of assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment* 1994;6(4):304.
32. Seaman SR, White IR. Review of inverse probability weighting for dealing with missing data. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2013;22(3):278-95. doi: 10.1177/0962280210395740

33. Yousafzai AK, Rasheed MA, Rizvi A, et al. Effect of integrated responsive stimulation and nutrition interventions in the Lady Health Worker programme in Pakistan on child development, growth, and health outcomes: a cluster-randomised factorial effectiveness trial. *Lancet* 2014;384(9950):1282-93. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60455-4
34. Black MM, Walker SP, Fernald LC, et al. Early childhood development coming of age: science through the life course. *The Lancet* 2017;389(10064):77-90.
35. Lassi ZS, Rind F, Irfan O, et al. Impact of Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) Nutrition Interventions on Breastfeeding Practices, Growth and Mortality in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Systematic Review. *Nutrients* 2020;12(3) doi: 10.3390/nu12030722
36. Lagarde M, Haines A, Palmer N. The impact of conditional cash transfers on health outcomes and use of health services in low and middle income countries. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009(4):CD008137. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD008137
37. Garner P, Panpanich R, Logan S. Is routine growth monitoring effective? A systematic review of trials. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2000;82(3):197-201.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of trial participant stratified by randomized arm

	Community Health Worker Mean ± SD or N (%)	**Community Health Worker + Conditional Cash Transfer Mean ± SD or N (%)**	**Control Mean ± SD or N (%)**
Households/Mothers (n)	200	200	193
Household characteristics			
Household size (persons)	4.0 ± 1.7	3.6 ± 2.0	3.4 ± 1.7
House has a dirt floor	85 (42.5%)	125 (63.5%)	86 (44.6%)
Improved sanitation	175 (87.5%)	103 (51.5%)	123 (63.7%)
Poorest wealth quintile	28 (14.0%)	50 (25.4%)	46 (23.8%)
At least 1 toy in the home	12 (8.3%)	20 (23.8%)	4 (3.3%)
Maternal characteristics at baseline			
Age, years	26.9 ± 5.3	27.0 ± 6.3	26.4 ± 6.1
Married or living with partner	172 (86.0%)	167 (83.5%)	149 (77.2%)
Education			
No formal education	8 (4.0%)	36 (18.0%)	8 (4.2%)
Primary education	179 (89.5%)	139 (69.5%)	155 (80.3%)
Secondary or higher education	13 (6.5%)	25 (12.5%)	30 (15.5%)
Pregnant at time of enrollment	55 (27.5%)	75 (37.5%)	67 (34.7%)
Multiparous	187 (93.5%)	179 (89.5%)	151 (78.2%)
Social support score	2.1 ± 0.4	2.9 ± 0.6	2.9 ± 0.9
Number of stimulation activities in the past 3 days	1.6 ± 1.1	2.2 ± 0.8	2.5 ± 0.7
Caregiver Knowledge of Child Development Inventory score (CKCDI)	17.2 ± 4.4	13.8 ± 5.0	15.7 ± 5.2
Infant characteristics at baseline			
Infants (n; 0-1 year at enrollment)	145	125	125
Male	75 (51.7%)	70 (56.0%)	62 (49.6%)
Age, months	5.3±3.6	5.0±3.5	4.6±3.1
Length-for-age z-score (LAZ)	-1.2±2.0	-1.0±1.4	0.2±2.1
Weight-for-length z-score (WLZ)	0.0±1.1	-0.3±1.3	-0.2±1.4
Weight-for-age z-score (WAZ)	0.8±2.2	0.5±1.7	-0.4±2.3

Table 2. Process indicators and maternal feedback on community health worker (CHW) and conditional cash transfer (CCT) interventions

	CHW (N=184)	**CHW+CCT (N= 187)**
Caregiver recall of receiving messages		
Child health (i.e. prevention/treatment diarrhea)	183 (99.5%)	182 (97.3%)
Breastfeeding/ nutrition	168 (91.3%)	160 (85.6%)
Child vaccination	174 (95.1%)	128 (68.5%)
Early child development and responsive stimulation	165 (90.2%)	185 (98.9%)
Maternal feedback on CHW visit frequency (every 4-6 weeks)		
Not frequent enough	37 (20.1%)	8 (4.3%)
About right	145 (78.8%)	173 (92.5%)
Too often	2 (1.1%)	6 (3.2%)
Maternal feedback CHW counselling duration (35 minutes on average)		
Too short	2 (1.1%)	2 (1.1%)
About right	171 (92.9%)	178 (95.2%)
Too long	11 (6.0%)	7 (3.7%)
Maternal feedback on number of topics discussed per visit		
Too few	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
About right	175 (95.1%)	175 (93.6%)
Too many	9 (4.9%)	12 (6.4%)
Maternal report of problems trying stimulation activities		
No, none	162 (87.6%)	175 (93.1%)
Yes, not enough time	12 (6.5%)	3 (1.6%)
Yes, no play materials	11 (6.0%)	5 (2.7%)
Yes, other reasons	0 (0%)	5 (2.7%)
Father present at any visit	114 (62.0%)	106 (56.7%)
Discussed CHW intervention with friends or neighbors	137 (85.1%)	96 (68.1%)
CCT intervention indicators		
Reported receiving at least one CCT	-	187 (99.5%)
CCT primarily used for		
Transport to health clinic	-	10 (5.3%)
Medical care or medicines for the child	-	1 (0.5%)
Food for child or family	-	8 (4.3%)
Clothes/toys/goods for the baby	-	169 (89.9%)
Decision-maker for use of CCT funds		
Mother alone	-	181 (96.3%)
Father alone	-	4 (2.1%)
Mother and father together	-	3 (1.6%)

Table 3. Effect of Integrated Community Health Worker Intervention (CHW) and CHW plus conditional cash transfer (CCT) on standardized mean difference in Bayley Scales of Infant Development Scores –III at 18 months of follow-up

				Primary minimally adjusted analysis[a]		**Multivariable adjusted analysis[b]**	
	CHW Mean ± SD (N=136)	**CHW+CCT Mean ± SD (N=135)**	**Control Mean ± SD (N=134)**	**CHW vs. Control Mean Difference (95% CI)**	**CHW+CCT vs. Control Mean Difference (95% CI)**	**CHW vs. Control Mean Difference (95% CI)**	**CHW+CCT vs. Control Mean Difference (95% CI)**
Cognitive	0.10 ± 1.12	0.01 ± 0.85	-0.10 ± 1.01	0.14 (0.05, 0.23)[c]	0.17 (0.10, 0.23)[c]	0.14 (0.05, 0.22)[c]	0.14 (0.07, 0.21)[c]
Language	0.07 ± 1.06	-0.13 ± 0.93	0.06 ± 1.00	0.04 (-0.06, 0.14)	0.08 (0.02, 0.14)[c]	0.03 (-0.07, 0.13)	0.07 (-0.02, 0.17)
Motor	0.03 ± 1.08	0.04 ± 0.90	-0.07 ± 1.02	0.03 (-0.09, 0.15)	0.15 (0.03, 0.27)[c]	0.04 (-0.08, 0.16)	0.18 (0.01, 0.35)[c]

[a]Minimally adjusted model included covariates for urban/rural residence (randomization scheme), child age at assessment, sex, and BSID-III assessor and accounted for clustering

[b]Multivariate model included covariates for urban/rural residence (randomization scheme), baseline household wealth quintile, household having access to an improved latrine, maternal education, parity, social support, CKCDI, child sex, child age at assessment, sex, and BSID-III assessor and accounted for clustering

[c] p-value <0.05

Table 4. Effect of the integrated Community Health Worker (CHW) intervention and CHW plus conditional cash transfer (CCT) intervention on anthropometric outcomes at 18 months of follow-up

				Primary minimally adjusted analysis*		Multivariable adjusted*	
	CHW Mean ± SD or n (%) N=185	**CHW+CCT Mean ± SD or n (%) N=188**	**Control Mean ± SD or n (%) N=174**	**CHW vs. Control Mean Difference or Relative Risk (95% CI)**	**CHW+CCT vs. Control Mean Difference or Relative Risk (95% CI)**	**CHW vs. Control Mean Difference or Relative Risk (95% CI)**	**CHW+CCT vs. Control Mean Difference or Relative Risk (95% CI)**
Length/Height-for-age z-score (HAZ)	-0.86 ± 1.31	-0.26 ± 1.31	-1.65 ± 1.78	0.79 (-0.63, 2.21)	1.39 (-0.06, 2.84)	0.96 (0.19, 1.74)[c]	1.10 (0.27, 1.94)[c]
Stunting (HAZ < -2)	37 (20.2%)	19 (10.1%)	66 (38.2%)	0.53 (0.15, 1.83)	0.26 (0.08, 0.86)	0.42 (0.20, 0.87)[c]	0.48 (0.21, 1.08)
Weight-for-age z-score (WAZ)	0.01 ± 0.91	-0.07 ± 0.93	-0.27 ± 0.98	0.28 (-0.07, 0.62)	0.20 (-0.14, 0.54)	0.26 (-0.01, 0.52)	0.17 (-0.13, 0.48)
Underweight (WAZ < -2)	3 (1.6%)	5 (2.7%)	9 (5.2%)	0.31 (0.08, 1.21)	0.51 (0.14, 1.87)	0.23 (0.06, 0.93)[c]	0.49 (0.13, 1.88)
Weight-for-height z-score (WHZ)	0.62 ± 1.28	0.07 ± 1.23	0.78 ± 1.54	-0.16 (-1.06, 0.75)	-0.71 (-1.68, 0.27)	-0.29 (-0.91, 0.33)	-0.56 (-1.13, 0.02)
Wasting (WHZ < -2)	4 (2.2%)	10 (5.3%)	6 (3.5%)	0.63 (0.13, 3.09)	1.54 (0.45, 5.30)	0.96 (0.31, 2.92)	0.81 (0.26, 2.52)
Overweight (WHZ > 2)	28 (15.2%)	10 (5.3%)	35 (20.1%)	0.76 (0.27, 2.13)	0.26 (0.06, 1.17)	0.56 (0.26, 1.18)	0.33 (0.11, 0.96)[c]

[a]Minimally adjusted model included a covariate for urban/rural residence (randomization scheme) and accounted for clustering

[b]Multivariate model included covariates for urban/rural residence (randomization scheme), baseline household wealth quintile, household having access to an improved latrine, maternal education, parity, social support, CKCDI, child sex, and child age at assessment and accounted for clustering

[c] p-value <0.05

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Trial flow diagram stratified by randomized arm


Randomized Villages
n=12
CHW
Villages, n=4
CHW+CCT
Villages, n=4
Control
Villages, n=4
Enrolled
Participants, n=200
Pregnant women, n=55
Mothers-infant <1 year, n=145
Enrolled
Participants, n=200
Pregnant women, n=75
Mothers-infant <1 year, n=125
Enrolled
Participants, n=193
Pregnant women, n=68
Mothers-infant <1 year, n=125
Withdrawal of consent, n=3
Fetal loss / child death, n=3
Loss to follow-up, n=9
Withdrawal of consent, n=1
Fetal loss / child death, n=10
Loss to follow-up, n=1
Withdrawal of consent, n=0
Fetal loss / child death, n=9
Loss to follow-up, n=10
Analyzed Endline Anthropometry
n=185
Analyzed Endline Anthropometry
n=188
Analyzed Endline Anthropometry
n=174
BSID-III not conducted, n=49
BSID-III not conducted, n=53
BSID-III not conducted, n=40
Analyzed Endline BSID-III
n=136
Analyzed Endline BSID-III
n=135
Analyzed Endline BSID-III
n=134