medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC 4.0 International license .

Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture – Is it possible in Morogoro Rural District? Key nutrition stakeholder's ways practiced and awareness of its importance in Mvuha and Mkuyuni wards.

*Innocent Sanga[1] and John Msuya[1]

[1]Department of Human Nutrition and Consumer Sciences, College of Agriculture, Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O. Box 3006, Chuo Kikuu, Morogoro, Tanzania.

**Corresponding author email:* innocent_sanga@yahoo.com

Abstract

Nutrition sensitive agriculture is one of the interventions that can be positioned to address malnutrition especially in rural areas where majority of the people rely on agriculture as their main livelihood. Collaboration between farmers and other stakeholders is key to ensuring agriculture benefits nutrition. The study aimed at assessing ways nutrition sensitive agriculture is practiced and awareness about the concept among stakeholder's key to nutrition. The study found that home gardening (85.3%) and livestock keeping (57.4%) were the most practiced ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture. More than 90% of household heads were aware on importance of agriculture to nutrition on through being a source of income and employment while 71% to 88% were aware on other aspects such as enabling dietary diversity, easy access to nutrient dense foods and ensuring food security but still majority were not engaged in production of other nutrient dense foods or practicing other ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture. Majority of the stakeholders in the government and non-government sectors at district and ward levels were aware and practiced nutrition-sensitive agriculture in their roles while other stakeholders especially in the village levels

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC 4.0 International license .

were not aware about the concept. Low awareness about the importance of nutrition sensitive agriculture could be related to the observed low coverage of education on the importance of consuming nutrient dense foods (only 29%). Key informant interviews revealed that low practice of ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture such as production of biofortified food crops is linked to farmer's views that attach economic benefits to the crop before nutrition gains. It was concluded that, even though farmers and majority of district and ward level stakeholders were aware of the importance of the concept, the actual practices of agriculture that can deliver nutrition benefits to the farmers were still low.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture is an approach that seeks to ensure the production of a variety of affordable, nutritious, culturally appropriate and safe foods in adequate quantity and quality to meet the dietary requirements of populations in a sustainable manner (FAO, 2017). The concept has recently been a key focus area in a number of governments, donor agencies, and development organizations such as FAO, IFAD and IFPRI (Chipilli and Msuya, 2016; Ruel *et al.*, 2018)

Agriculture employs majority of poorer population in most of the developing countries who are in turn vulnerable to malnutrition (Gillespie *et al.*, 2015). Tanzania is faced with high malnutrition prevalence rates where-by nationally 34% children under five years of age are stunted and 58% women of reproductive age have anemia (URT, 2016). Malnutrition is more prevalent in rural areas where majority of the residents earn their living through agricultural production (Bundala *et al.*, 2019). For example, stunting affects children under five years of age more in rural areas, at 38%, than urban areas, at 25%; (URT, 2016; World Bank, 2013).

Malnutrition in Morogoro region has remained to be a huge problem despite the region being popular for producing large amounts of foods for own consumption and for selling to other regions in the country. The current data from Tanzania National Nutrition Survey (TNNS) indicates that 26.4 % of children underfive years of age are stunted, 12.1% are underweight and 6% are wasted (URT, 2018).

Agriculture becomes nutrition-sensitive when all activities in the whole food system from production to consumption incorporate nutrition objectives (Gillespie *et al.*, 2015). The production stage in the agro-food system provides an easy stage through which the household can produce, ensure availability and consumption of nutritious food items. Biofortification, home gardening, fish farming, livestock keeping, agriculture extension, nutrition-sensitive value chains, and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

irrigation programs are ways of Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture that are focused on promoting production diversity and increasing access to nutritious foods such as biofortified staple crops, nutrient-rich vegetables or fruits, and animal source foods (Ruel *et al.,* 2018).

Awareness and collaboration from different stakeholder of sectors key to nutrition such as education, agriculture and health are some of the key points that can support success of Nutrition-sensitive Agricultural practices (Jaenicke and Virchow, 2013)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

This study was conducted in Morogoro rural district which is one among the 9 Districts in Morogoro Region. The District is located at North East of Morogoro Region between 6º00' and 8º00' Latitudes South of Equator also between Longitudes 36º00' and 38º' East of Greenwich, covering 11,925 km² (URT, 2016). The district has a population of 286,248 inhabitants as of 2012 Population and Housing Census (NBS, 2012). The district is divided into 3 agro-ecological zones namely, mountainous areas, low mountainous zones and savannah zones, where about 82% of the adult population earns their livelihood from agriculture.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .



Study design and sampling

The study followed a cross - sectional study design where by data collection was be done at one point in time. Morogoro Rural District was purposively selected from Morogoro Region because of high likelihood of households practicing agriculture, both crop farming as well as livestock keeping. Two wards from the District namely, Mvuha and Mkuyuni were purposively selected because of differences in agro-ecological conditions. Whereby Mvuha has a relatively flatland topography and Mkuyuni is mountainous in nature. Random sampling was used to obtain the households that practice agriculture either through farming/crops cultivation or livestock keeping. Villages were obtained through purposive sampling, where by two villages were located around the ward center while one village was located far from the ward center. The selected villages from

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Mvuha ward were Dalla, Mvuha and Tulo. The latter being located relatively far from Mvuha ward centre. On the other hand, Mkuyuni, Kibwaya and Changa were villages were selected from Mkuyuni Ward, with Changa being located far from the ward centre.

Households were then randomly selected from the list of all households in each village by the means of the Table of Random Numbers. Stakeholders working in sectors related to nutrition were sampled basing on those who were identified in the study area.

Study population

The study involved two categories of respondents namely, household heads and stakeholders from sectors key to nutrition. A total of 115 household heads were recruited in the study. The sample size for the stakeholders working both with government and non-government sectors related with nutrition depended on the number of individuals working in the area and a total of 30 stakeholders were included in the study.

Data collection

Data were collected among the head of households using a semi-structured questionnaire Furthermore, participatory transect walks together with observation were employed to supplement information obtained from the collected data. Details of each is given in the sections below.

Semi structured questionnaire for the Heads of households

A special questionnaire was designed for use among the household heads in the study area. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of questions on socio-demographic variables such as: education level, age, marital status, time of residing in the area. Second section consisted of questions on socio-economic variables such as: land ownership and economic activity of the respondent, prior knowledge on nutrition. Other section assessed the ways households practice Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture and awareness about the concept.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

The questionnaire was administered to the subjects by face- to- face interview through household visits. The enumerator was responsible for filling in the responses into the questionnaire.

Stakeholder interviews (Key informant interviews)

The interviews were done among the stakeholders in the government and non-government sectors who are key to nutrition. They were conducted using a guide which was developed with questions specific for each stakeholder in relation to ways and awareness about Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture in the study area. It was designed to allow probing the respondent to obtain adequate information.

Transect walk and observation

Transect walks and observations were conducted to obtain information that was not captured by the interviews. Two transect walks were made, one in each ward. A group of six individuals comprising of the enumerator, three village executive officers, one from each village and two community members walked across each study ward, observing, asking questions and listening. The starting points of these walks were decided in such a way that they would allow the team to cover a large area for observing ways of Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture such as home gardening, livestock keeping, fish farming, watering technique in production of fruits and vegetables, soil fertility conserving techniques in each ward. The information were reported on the transect sketch.

DATA ANALYSIS

Statistical Product and Service Solutions IBM (SPSS) version 20 was used to analyze the quantitative data from the study. This was mostly data from the household interviews. Descriptive statistics were performed to show frequency and percentages for production of nutrient dense foods. Others were for showing consumption of nutrient dense foods. Overall, statistical tests were 2-tailed, and P values ≤ 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Data from the key informant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

interviews were summarized into key themes that came up, and were quoted as statements said by the respondents. Information from transect walks were summarized and presented in a transect sketch.

RESULTS

Sampled households

Six key characteristics of the sampled households were considered. These included:

- Demographic characteristics
- Ethnicity
- Place of origin
- Economic activity apart from farming
- Land ownership
- Source of food in the household

i. Demographic characteristics

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the household heads involved in this study depicting their sex, age, education level and marital status. Results indicate that there were more male headed households (73%) than those headed by females (27%). Mean age of the household heads was 43.2 years, 75 and 20 being the maximum and minimum age respectively. More than half of household heads were middle age adults of between 36 and 55 years of age (58.3%) and only about a quarter were young (18-35 years) or elderly of more than 55 years old (15.7%). About 80.9% of the household heads were married representing a larger portion of all household heads while 19.1% were single. About three quarters of all household heads ended at primary school education while only 6.1% reached secondary school education. On the other hand, 17.4% of all household heads did not get any formal education at all.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Distribution of the household heads according to sex, age, marital status and education level

Characteristic of the household head	n	%
(i) Sex of the household head		
Female	31	27
Male	84	73
Total	**115**	**100**
(ii) Age of household head (in years)		
18-35 (Young adults)	30	26.1
36-55 (Middle age adults)	67	58.3
≥56 (Elders)	18	15.6
Total	**115**	**100**
(iii) Marital status		
Married	93	80.9
Single	22	19.1
Total	**115**	**100**
(iv) Education level		
No formal education	20	17.4
Primary education	88	76.5
Secondary education	7	6.1
Total	**115**	**100**

ii. Ethnic and place of origin

Table 2 shows the ethnic and place of origin of the household heads. Majority of the household heads were Luguru by ethnicity followed by Kutu and a few belonged to other groups such as Masaai, Sukuma, Waha, Gogo and others who migrated into the district. Eighty seven percent of the household heads were born within the district, while only 13% had migrated from other places.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Distribution of household heads according to their ethnic and place of origin

Variable	n	%
(i) Ethnic origin		
Kutu	22	19.1
Luguru	76	66.1
Others (Gogo, Mang'ati, Masai, Mkwere, Muha, Mwera, Ngoni, Nyamwezi, Sukuma, Zaramo)	17	14.8
Total	**115**	**100**
(ii) Place of origin		
Born in the area	100	87.0
Moved from another area	15	13.0
Total	**115**	**100**

iii. Other economic activities apart from farming

Results in Table 3 show that, 2.6% of the households were engaged in farming only, about 67.8% were involved in keeping one or more type of livestock while 22.7% were involved in trading and 5.2% were artisans while others were civil servants (1.7%). It was common for a household to engage in more than one economic activity. It is important to note that all households surveyed were engaged in farming (100%) because this was the primary inclusion criteria of any household in the study.

Table 3: Distribution of the household heads indicating the economic activities apart from farming

Economic activity	n	%
Farming only	3	2.6
Livestock keeping (mainly chicken, cattle and goats)	78	67.8
Civil servant (local government employees)	2	1.7
Trading	26	22.7
Artisans (bicycles and motorbike repairs, shoe repairs, hair plating, basket weavers)	6	5.2
Total	**115**	**100**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

iv. Land ownership, size and food sources

Results in Table 4 show that in total 79.1% of the households owned land while only 20.9% of households rented land for farming activities. The owned land in the household was either a single plot or several plots scattered in different locations within the area.

As shown in Table 4, 49.6% of respondents owned small pieces of land classified as low (0.5 to 2 hectares), followed by those who owned medium pieces of land (15.7%) , of 3 to 5 hectares and lastly by those who owned six or more hectares (13.8%)

The results also show that all the households (100%) use own produced and purchased food as their food source while about 71.3% of all households reported to use wild foods mainly leafy vegetables varieties such as "Mwidu" and "Mchunga".

Table 4: Distribution of the sampled households showing land ownership and their source of food

Variable	n	%
(i) Land ownership		
Own land and do not rent	80	69.6
Own land but rent to add	6	5.2
Own land and rent to others	5	4.3
Rent land (do not own)	24	20.9
Total	**115**	**100**
(ii) Land size in acres		
Zero acres	24	20.9
Low (0.5 –2)	57	49.6
Medium (3-5)	18	15.7
Large (≥6)	16	13.8
Total	**115**	**100**
(iii) Source of food [**]		
Own production	115	100
Purchasing from the market	115	100
Wild foods (mainly leafy vegetables such as *Mwidu* and *Mchunga*)	82	71.3

[**] Multiple answers

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Stakeholders/Key informants

Officials/individuals working in agriculture and nutrition sectors in the study area were included as key informants. The government officials were from three levels including district, ward and village levels. Other individuals were from non-government institutions such as NGOs, agriculture inputs suppliers and grain millers. These included a total of 30 respondents. Table 5 shows a summary of key informants.

Table 5: Distribution of various key informants (stakeholders) that were interviewed according to their sex

Key informant/Category	Sex		Total
Government Official at District level	**Male**	**Female**	**n**
Livestock and Fishery officer	1	0	1
Agriculture officer	0	1	1
Nutrition officer	1	0	1
Community Development officer	0	1	1
Total	**2**	**2**	**4**
Government Official at Ward level			
Ward Executive Officers	1	1	2
Livestock and Fishery officer	1	1	2
Agriculture officer	1	1	2
Community Development officer	1	1	2
Total	**4**	**4**	**8**
Government Official at Village level			
Village Executive Officer/village chairperson (from six villages)	5	1	6
Non-Government and private Official/ individuals			
Nutrition officer	1	0	1
Agriculture officer	1	0	1
Agricultural inputs suppliers	0	2	2
Grain millers	4	0	4
Food vendors	2	2	4
Total	**8**	**4**	**12**
	19	**11**	**30**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Ways Nutrition - Sensitive Agriculture is implemented

Given the actual situation in the study area, eight nutrition sensitive ways were assessed in the way agriculture practices were being undertaken. The eight ways include: home gardening, livestock keeping (include small livestock), biofortified food crops, improved food crop varieties, watering techniques in production of fruits and vegetables. Others were fish farming, sustaining production of nutrient dense crops through applying soil fertility conserving techniques and minimizing the use of industrial fertilizer through the use of farm yard manures.

Results of the assessment are shown in Table 6. Accordingly, home gardening was the most practiced way by more than 85% of the households followed by livestock keeping (57%). Other less important ways included the use of biofortified food crops (8.8%), the use of improved food crop varieties (5.2%), watering techniques in production of fruits and vegetables (0.85%), sustaining production of nutrient dense crops through applying soil fertility conserving techniques (0.85%) and minimizing the use of industrial fertilizers through the use of farm yard manures in production of food crops and fish farming (0.85%).

Only production of biofortified food crops showed significant difference in terms of practice in the two study wards ($\chi^2 = 8.125$, df = 1, p=0.004). Other ways of Nutrition-sensitive agriculture showed no significant difference in terms of practice in the two study wards.

In terms of other characteristics of household heads, only sex and age indicated significant difference with some ways of Nutrition-sensitive agriculture. There was a significant difference between sex and practicing home gardening ($\chi^2 = 5.715$, df = 1, p=0.017) with majority of female headed households engaged with the practice. Also there was a significant difference between sex and production of biofortified food crops ($\chi^2 = 6.627$, df = 1, p=0.010) whereby only male headed households were found to be engaged with the practice. There was a significant difference between

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

the age categories and keeping livestock where by majority of the respondents belonged to the middle age adults' group ($\chi^2 = 10.562$, df = 2, p=0.005)

Table 6: Distribution of households practicing different ways of Nutrition - sensitive Agriculture in the study wards

Ways Nutrition-sensitive agriculture is being practiced	Mkuyuni (%) n=57	Mvuha (%) n=58	Total (%) n=115	P-value
Home gardening	89.5	81	85.3	0.202
Livestock keeping (including small livestock)	73.7	62.1	67.8	0.182
Biofortified food crops	15.8	1.7	8.8	0.004*
Improved food crop varieties	5.3	5.2	5.2	0.983
Watering techniques in production of fruits and vegetables	0	1.7	0.85	0.096
Fish farming	0	1.7	0.85	0.235
Sustaining production of nutrient dense crops through applying soil fertility conserving techniques	0	1.7	0.85	0.092
Minimizing the use of industrial fertilizers through the use of farm yard manures in production of food crops	0	1.7	0.85	0.241

*Way of Nutrition-sensitive agriculture with significant difference in terms of practice in the study wards. P-value is from the chi-square test

Interviews with the key informants, namely District and Wards agriculture officers reported that it is not surprising that people in the area do practice home gardening because there has been strong promotion of the practice through farm field schools to sensitize the people to learn how to grow fruits and vegetables around their homes. They also reported other ways of agriculture which people are taught, including the use of biological/organic materials in handling crop pests and diseases, use of mulching in home gardens and use of sacks and cans for growing vegetables and applying simple watering techniques. Others are also encouraged to use farm yard manure instead of industrial made fertilizers and use of improved crop varieties.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

One ward agriculture officer reported that adoption of the ways of agriculture that the community are trained is low especially cultivation of nutrient dense crops such as yellow maize and Orange Fleshed Sweet Potatoes. The officer went further to state that there is low response of the farmers in attending training sessions as a result very few obtain appropriate knowledge. Livestock officer from one of the study wards stated that "*people in this area avoid keeping large animals such as cattle and goats because they assume the activity is labour extensive".* The officer went further to report this as one of the major reasons for low availability of animal source foods especially meat and milk in the area. This was also highlighted by the District nutrition officer who added that *"the native people do not keep cattle, they leave this to other tribes such as Maasai and Sukuma, they hardly participate in production groups and they even have low responses to health services"*

From the transect walks presented in Figure 1, it was observed that respondents were engaged in various ways of Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture, such as home gardening were by some gardens were established systematically in small nurseries around homes and others in small farm plots while other vegetables were grown randomly near to the home garbage places. Livestock keeping is practiced at small scale and majority keep poultry birds mainly chicken while a very few of them keep other livestock such as cattle, goats and sheep. As a result, very few individuals were observed to engage in using manure to improve fertility of their farm lands. On the other hand, the walks revealed low use of watering techniques in production of fruits, vegetables and other crops, this was only practiced by very few individuals who grew vegetables along the river banks. Very few individuals in Mkuyuni ward (which is mountaneous by nature) were engaged in contour farming, zero tillage and mulching to grow crops as a means to reduce soil erosion. Observations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

revealed that a very few of the respondents produced biofortified food crops in both study wards, where by yellow maize was produced by very few households.



Figure 1: Transect sketch depicting ways of Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture and other observations in the study area

Preference of the ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture

Also, the interviewed respondents were asked to show their preference of the ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture using five-point ranking scale (i.e. dislike completely, dislike, neutral, likes somehow, likes the most) regardless of whether the respondent was practicing it or not. The ranks implied that a respondent accepted or did the way but at different levels.

Results in Table 7 indicates the mean average of ranking the ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture. Generally, the results fell in two categories as per the ranking scale, likes somehow (4) and neutral (3). The mean average indicates readiness or involvement of the study subjects to engage in these

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

ways of practicing agriculture. Highest mean was observed for home gardening (4.36±0.752) indicating high preference whereas minimizing the use of industrial fertilizers through the use of farm yard manures in production of food crops had the least mean (4.00± 0.662). On the other hand, mean average indicating low preference (neutral preference) of the ways was observed for production of biofortified food crop varieties (3.66±0.724), watering techniques in production of fruits and vegetables (3.56±0.774) and fish farming (3.20±0.840).

Table 7: Distribution of interviewed respondents showing the average ranking on the studied ways of Nutrition - sensitive Agriculture

Way of nutrition sensitive agriculture	Mean ± SD
Home gardening	4.36 ± 0.752
Production of biofortified food crop varieties	3.66 ± 0.724
Livestock keeping (including small livestock)	4.05 ± 0.560
Improved food crop varieties	4.03 ± 0.561
Watering techniques in production of fruits and vegetables	3.56 ± 0.774
Sustaining production of nutrient dense crops through applying soil fertility conserving techniques	4.20 ± 0.610
Minimizing the use of industrial fertilizers through the use of farm yard manures in production of food crops	4.00 ± 0.662
Fish farming	3.20 ± 0.840

Figure 2 shows ranking of studied ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture. Results indicates that majority of the study subjects either liked the studied ways, showing readiness and their engagement to practice them. Home gardening was liked the most by majority of the respondents (52%) followed by sustaining production of nutrient dense crops through applying soil fertility conserving techniques (30.4%) and to a lesser extent minimizing the use of industrial fertilizers through the use of farm yard manures in production of food crops (21.7%), livestock keeping

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

(18.3%), use of improved food crop varieties (16.5%), production of biofortified food crops (10%), watering techniques in production of fruits and vegetables (7%) and fish farming (0.9%).

To a lesser extent other individual indicated neutral or dislike preference on the studied ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture as shown in figure 2. And this was indication of either low engagement or readiness to practice the studied ways.



Figure 2: Percentage on ranking different ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture

Awareness on the benefits of Nutrition – sensitive Agriculture

Seven aspects were used to assess household head awareness through which agriculture can benefit nutrition. The seven aspects were the following:

- Enabling income gain therefore making easy to purchase food
- Source of employment

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

- Source of food for household consumption
- It allows for flexibility of women to care for their children in the household
- Allows for gender equity in the household
- Improving dietary diversity in the household/consumption of various food groups
- Makes easy to access nutrient dense foods in the household
- Ensuring food security

These aspects were categorized into two groups, the first group included aspects that were the basic reasons for them to engage in agriculture (income, food and employment source) while the second group included all other aspects that generate nutrition benefits either directly or indirectly to the household members. Results of the assessment are summarized in Table 8. Accordingly more than 90% of the interviewed respondents were aware that agriculture can benefit nutrition by being a source of employment, enables income gain thus making easier to purchase food and allows for gender equity in the household. To a lesser extent they were also aware that nutrition sensitive agriculture allows for flexibility of women to care for their children in the household (89%), improve dietary diversity in the household/consumption of various food groups (78%), ensures food security (75%) and that it makes easy to access nutrient dense foods in the household (71%)

These results indicate that majority of the household heads were aware of the benefits of nutrition agriculture through indirect pathways, which were source of employment and enabling income gain. To a lesser extent they were aware that agriculture could directly help to improve their nutrition by supplying nutrient dense foods, ensuring food security and improving dietary diversity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 8: Distribution of the interviewed respondents on awareness test about various benefits of Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture

Awareness of the benefit of Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture aspect	n	%
Source of employment	110	95.6
Enable income gain therefore making easier to purchase food	107	93
Source of food for household consumption	111	96.5
Allows for gender equity in the household	106	92.2
Makes easy to access nutrient dense foods in the household	82	71.3
Ensures food security	86	74.8
Improve dietary diversity in the household/consumption of various food groups	90	78.3
It allows for flexibility of women to care for their children in the household	102	88.7

Awareness of the importance of Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture was placed into three categories using scores on the 8 aspects which were used to measure awareness. 0 - 4 indicated low awareness, 5 – 6 indicates medium level awareness while 7 – 8 points indicates high awareness. Table 9 indicates that no respondents had low awareness, while a few of them, 30.4% had medium level awareness and majority of the interviewed respondents 70% had high awareness as per scores.

Table 9: Distribution of the interviewed respondents showing their awareness level on the importance of nutrition sensitive agriculture.

Scores (points)	Awareness category	n	%
5 – 6	Medium	35	30.4
7 – 8	High	80	69.6
Total		**115**	**100**

Interviews with key informants revealed that awareness among their people and actual practices of agriculture to improve nutrition is low, for example the district nutrition officer insisted that *"majority of the people in the study are engaged in production of perennial food crops such as banana, oranges and coconut for business purpose to earn money for spending on other needs."*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

The officer went further to state that "*these people are mostly en gaged in production of maize and paddy that is why there is low production of other biofortified foods like yellow maize or Orange Fleshed Sweet Potatoes, they only produce if they are sure that the market will be available for sell*". This is an indication that there is low awareness of the importance of Nutrition-sensitive agricultural practices among the people in the study area probably due to low knowledge on how agriculture can be positioned to improve their nutrition

One community development officer also proved that majority of the people in the households are not aware and therefore do not practice nutrition-sensitive agriculture because even the production groups available have goals in enhancing the beneficiaries financially and not nutritionally.

On the other hand, key informants/technical personnel in agriculture and nutrition were aware of the importance of agriculture to nutrition as they participated in various activities that focused on emphasizing consumption of their agricultural produce. Low knowledge was observed among the local government leaders such as ward and village executive officer. One village executive officer reported that "*I only understand that foods like vegetables and fruits are important for our health but we normally have a specific person in the Ward Development Committee invited to explain in detail, but if they do not show up, nutrition issues will not be talked about*". One ward executive officer reported that "*I'm only know about nutrition issues as one of the agendas that must be included in every meeting but on linking nutrition and agriculture that is the role of the agriculture extension officers"*

Consumption nutrient dense foods in the household

Table 10 presents frequency of consumption of nutrient dense foods in a period of seven days (one week) before the survey. Vegetables had the highest consumption rate (5 – 6 times per week)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

whereby about 90% consumed them followed by fruits (74.8%). On the other hand, medium consumption rates (2-4 times per week) was more common for legumes (77%) followed by fruits (75%). Milk/milk products, flesh meat and eggs had the lowest consumption rate (once per week) or not consumed at all, where by 66%, 50% and 32% consumed milk/milk products, eggs and flesh meat respectively once per week while 24%, 42% and 53% respectively never consumed milk/milk product, eggs and flesh meat over the reference period.

Table 10: Distribution of respondents showing frequency of consumption of nutrient dense foods in households.

Nutrient dense food	Frequency of consumption of nutrient dense foods (%)			
	5-6/week	2-4/week	Once per week	Never
	High	Medium	Low	Never
Fruits	18.3	74.8	6.1	0.9
Vegetables	89.6	6.1	3.5	0.9
Milk/milk products	4.3	5.2	66.1	24.3
Legumes	3.5	76.5	20	0
Flesh meat (beef, goat and poultry meat)	1.7	13	32.2	53
Eggs	0.9	7	50.4	41.7

Awareness on the importance of consuming nutrient dense foods

Figure 3 presents the proportion of respondents in the sampled households who received nutrition education on the importance of consuming nutrient dense crops. More than two third of the respondents (71.3%) did not receive nutrition education while only 28.7% claimed to have

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

received nutrition education from experts such as nutrition officer, livestock and agriculture extension officers.



Figure 3: Distribution of respondents showing the proportion of individuals who received the nutrition education and those who did not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

Ways Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture is implemented in the study area

Nutrition sensitive agriculture is one of the food-based approach that can be used in improving nutrition depending on the stage in the food chain, including production, post-harvest handling, processing, retailing and consumption (Ecker *et al.* 2011). The ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture covered in this study include: home gardening, livestock keeping for obtaining foods of animal origin, biofortified food crop varieties, improved food crop varieties, watering in production of fruits and vegetables, fish farming, sustaining production of nutrient dense crops through applying soil fertility conserving techniques and minimizing the use of industrial fertilizers through the use of farm yard manures in production of food crops

Home gardening

One of the most convenient way of ensuring food availability and access in the household is through home gardening (Mustafa *et al*., 2021). This method can reduce the cost to purchase fruits and vegetables from the markets and the money can be redirected to obtain other food varieties which diversify the household diet. Majority of the households practiced this technique and this was supported by their consumption of vegetables and fruits supplied by these gardens as shown in table 10. A study by Weinberger (2013) also found similar results that home gardens contributed to more diversified diets and to higher consumption of nutritionally-rich foods including fruits and vegetables. The study also found that home gardening was practiced as their common activity around their homes, however the gardens were not well organized such that some vegetables were randomly grown nearby waste areas in the household. This implies that, among all other reasons, there might be low contribution of agricultural extension officers and other experts in enhancing awareness among the people on the importance and proper management of gardens in the study

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

area. The study by Nordhagen, *et al.* (2019) suggests that with appropriate technical support to the farmers, it is possible to maximize production, improve income and increase men ownership of home gardening, all of which were low in the study area.

Livestock keeping

According to FAO (2017), keeping of livestock around home enables availability of protein and micronutrient rich food sources which are important for health of household members especially the growing children. This study found that chicken were the main livestock kept in households. Similar findings were reported by Bruyn *et al.* (2018), Bundala *et al.* (2019) and Bellows *et al.* (2020). In most cases chicken were left to move around freely in search for food. This method of keeping these poultry birds was convenient for many poor rural households who may not be able to afford the costs of feeding them in the house. Matthiesen *et al*. (2011) also supported this by stating that convenience in keeping the animals while providing other benefits drives the owner to keep certain species of livestock.

As one of the social cultural factors influencing agricultural production habits of the people, ethnicity of the study subjects was observed to be associated with the type of livestock the household kept (Hetherington *et al.*, 2017). It was observed that individuals who migrated into the study area, mainly Maasai and Sukuma among all others were involved in keeping large livestock such as cattle and goats as compared to the natives who mainly kept small livestock especially poultry such as chicken and ducks (URT, 2016). This is because keeping of these livestock types is their lifestyle and main economic activity. Bundala *et al.* (2019) also found similar patterns of livestock keeping in rural parts of Tanzania. On the other side, one ward livestock officer reported that, some natives abstain from keeping cattle and other large animals because they fear stealing behavior from other owners who migrated into the area.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Biofortified food crops

In order to increase the levels of micronutrient intakes, biofortification can be used to achieve this goal especially when the biofortified food crops is a staple food in the target group diet (FAO, 2017). But this approach alone cannot be relied to treat the severe cases of micronutrients deficiencies especially among women and children who have higher demands but it can serve to provide daily dose of micronutrients to help prevent the deficiencies throughout their lives (Ruel *et al.*, 2013). As one of the plant breeding techniques that can enhance micronutrients nutrition status, biofortification has been reported to be cost effective providing high yielding nutrient dense staples with high retention of the minerals after processing and cooking (Stein *et al.*, 2007; Mustafa *et al*., 2021).

Very few households reported to be involved in production of biofortified food crops (yellow maize and orange fleshed sweet potatoes - OFSP) in the study area. One strong reason for this could be lack of assured market for these crops as it was reported by Waized *et al.* (2015) that farmers prefer to produce crops that can be used for both selling and consumption. Uncertainty of the market of the produce discourages the farmers from risking their scarce resources to engage in production (Bouis *et al.* 2013). Other reasons could be low awareness about these crops including their health benefits. However, costs of their seeds can also be a stumbling block, as majority of the rural farmers are small holder farmers with limited resources (Thierfelder *et al.*, 2013). One ward agriculture extension officer remarked that: "*few people that are aware of their benefits fail to grow them because they are required purchase the seeds which are relatively expensive due to low economic level"*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Watering techniques in production of fruits and vegetables

Watering/irrigation interventions in production of nutrient dense foods like fruits and vegetables can play significant role in transforming nutrition situation of individuals especially in those at risk of malnutrition. But this holds only when a reliable water source is available, watering interventions can be accessed, adopted and used by the targeted group (Domènech and Ringler, 2013). On the other hand, use of unsafe water for irrigation poses health risks to the end users of the food produced (Domènech, 2015).

Results show that very few respondents practiced watering in production of fruits or vegetables. A few were engaged in small scale production of vegetables along the water streams as revealed by the transect walks (fig. 1), and individual farmers reported that they use these water sources to irrigate their small plots. This observation could be due to issues concerning availability of reliable water supply systems and ease with which they have access to them as it was observed that there were poorly watering schemes. The Tanzania agriculture policy highlighted this as one of the challenges facing the agriculture sector (URT, 2013). A study by Passarelli *et al.* (2018) reported that, small scale irrigation/watering schemes are viewed as less desirable and inefficient in many parts of Tanzania. They went further to state that most of these traditional and informal schemes are considered illegal given that farmers do not have formal water user rights. Drechsel et al. (2006) also highlighted that in most of the developing countries, informal watering systems receive little recognition but they are highly used by most of the small holder farmers. At certain points of the river streams, water sources mixed with sewage water channels from households, posing health risks to their users.

When watering schemes are developed and advanced, it is possible to improve agricultural productivity due to convenience as a study by Keraita and de Fraiture (2011) reported that, in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

Tanzania using buckets and watering cans takes more than 2500 hours per year to irrigate one hectare of vegetables whereas approximately 250 hours are spent for the same task using motorized pumps. For activities such as home gardening which are normally controlled by women, the use of mechanized irrigation can be an important entry point for women's empowerment, by saving time and a good source of household income (Malapit *et al.* 2013; Sraboni *et al.* 2014).

Fish farming

More than 30% of people in Africa consume fish as their major animal protein source (AUC-NEPAD, 2014). In Tanzania where malnutrition rates are high, fish presents an excellent source of protein, micronutrients and essential fatty acid which can address multiple forms of these problems (Obiero *et al.* 2019). Growth in fish farming over the past several years has contributed to more than 40% of fish consumed globally. Despite this increase, the practice in Sub Saharan countries like Tanzania is still at infancy stage, implemented in few places even though they have favorable soils and climate (Beveridge *et al.* 2013; De Graaf & Garibaldi, 2014).

The study found that fish farming was not practiced by majority of the study subjects. Mwima *et al.* (2012) reported similar finding in Tanzania, that fish farming is practiced at very low scales resulting to less contribution to the overall fish production, despite being one of the major animal food sources especially for poor households (FAO, 2018).

One reason for this observation could be low adoption and awareness on how to appropriately practice fish farming among the study subjects. The practice requires training to individuals on how it should be suitably done, while demanding nearby services from the experts as needs arise. Agricultural extension officer from an NGO operating in the study area and the district livestock officer remarked on adoption of the practice that: *"the adoption of fish farming among these people is low because most believe that it is difficult to keep fish"*. A study by Mwajiande and Lugendo

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

(2015) conducted in 8 regions of Tanzania including Morogoro found that a higher demand for extension services to help the people gain proper knowledge on fish farming management activities was a major barrier towards adoption and practicing fish farming..

Fish farming sectors in Africa progressively contribute to food and nutrition security, employment, and livelihood support services (De Graaf & Garibaldi, 2014), as a result it can significantly help to tackle the triple burden of malnutrition while acting as both the income and livelihood source to the household members.

Awareness about the Importance of Nutrition – sensitive Agriculture

Agriculture can play a significant role in enhancing the nutrition status of the household through various pathways including being source of food, employment, income, women empowerment and easy access to nutrients rich foods (FAO, 2014).

Awareness among household heads

The study found that majority of the household heads were aware of the importance of agriculture to nutrition, especially as an important source of employment and income. However, agricultural income does not necessarily translate into improved nutrition (Ruel and Alderman, 2013). Anderson and Corps (2012) reported that even when farmers grow nutritious food items, usually they tend to sell them and buy staple foods such as rice, beans and sugar which are definitely less nutrient dense. This was similar to situation in the study area as reported by district agriculture and nutrition officers as well as ward and village executive officers, that farmers sell their produce to earn income for securing other food items, which may not necessarily be nutritious foods.

The study also revealed that some respondents were not aware of important aspects of nutrition sensitive agriculture such as enabling dietary diversity, source of nutrient dense foods or ensuring food security in the household which are critical for improving nutrition. One reason for this might

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

be low nutrition knowledge, as more than half of the respondents did not receive any nutrition education or training. Robinson *et al.* (2014) reported that most of the rural individuals who are normally poor farmers have low nutrition awareness especially on nutrient content of foods they produce or those available in their areas. FAO (2017) stressed on the importance of nutrition education to the farmers because many causes of poor nutrition are engrained in attitudes and practices such as negative attitudes towards fruit and vegetables, agricultural production decisions, food distribution in the household and ideas about child feeding, that can be influenced by education.

Also, majority of them were not practicing other important ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture apart from home gardening and small livestock keeping. The latter was being carried out not with a primary goal to enhance nutritious household diet but income gain which indicates low awareness of how agriculture could benefit them in nutrition term. A study by Bundala *et al.* (2019) in Morogoro and Dodoma regions reported similar findings that producing animals for household consumption was not usually prioritized due to other desires, with income earning being a top priority. Other reason for this observation might include lack of adequate extension services for both agriculture and nutrition to provide awareness and knowledge to the farmers. This was emphasized by the District nutrition officer who claimed that, the availability of only one nutrition specialist in the district does not correspond to the needs of the people in the area.

On the other hand, the study revealed high use female farm labor where by women spend most of their time in the fields. This may contribute to poor maternal and child nutrition because women lack adequate time to care for themselves and their children. A study by Farnworth *et al*., (2016) revealed that, increasing the amount of time spent on farm activities can impact on the welfare of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

other household members, especially children who may be unintentionally neglected at home if women spend more time in the field

Awareness among other stakeholders (government and non-government stakeholders)

As one of the key sectors to improved nutrition, agriculture is a primary driver to food and nutrition security in developing countries since it can enable families to increase the access to and the consumption of a diversified diet rich in micronutrients (Shetty, 2011; FAO, 2014). For agriculture to deliver nutrition sensitive outcomes, Shetty (2018) highlighted that stakeholders in governments, international donors and development organizations must be aware of nutrition-sensitive agriculture interventions and strategies to enable realizing community food and nutrition security.

Interviews with key stakeholders revealed that, majority of the stakeholders including agriculture, livestock and fishery, community development and nutrition officers from the government at district level were aware about nutrition sensitive agriculture and the practices related to it. This was similar to those at ward level and others from Non-governmental organizations. One of the major reason for this observation was that, agricultural related activities are part of their daily activities and also their offices are high level as such it is easier for them to obtain information on shaping agriculture to bring about improved nutrition outcome. This situation can be related to high level support for the nutrition agenda in the Tanzanian central government (DPG Nutrition 2013; Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, 2011). On the other hand, some stakeholders at ward and village levels such as ward and village executive officers, grain millers, agriculture input sellers were not competent with the concept and practices of nutrition sensitive agriculture. This could be related to availability and access to information that can put them in a position to facilitate spread of practices of nutrition sensitive agriculture among the community members they serve.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

The disconnect of awareness about nutrition sensitive agriculture between district, ward, village and community levels stakeholders can be the major reason to agriculture contributing less to improved community nutrition outcome. As Herforth, (2013) and Robinson *et al.*, (2014) highlighted the importance of joining forces among different stakeholders in order to achieve optimal nutrition outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The study assessed practices and awareness about nutrition sensitive agriculture among the key stakeholders of nutrition in Morogoro rural district. Considering the stakeholders levels of working in the agriculture sector, district and to some extent ward level respondents practiced and were aware about nutrition sensitive agriculture. Majority of the households practiced home gardening while a number of them kept livestock and these were reported to be conducted as normal practices in their community rather than being influenced by experts such as agriculture, livestock and nutrition officers. A very few households practiced other ways of nutrition sensitive agriculture such as watering in production of fruits and vegetables, fish farming, sustaining production of nutrient dense foods through the use of soil fertility conserving techniques, and minimize the use of industrial fertilizer through the use of farm yard manure. Economic hardship among most of the rural poor farmers can be one of the reasons that have led to the observed low practices of other methods of nutrition sensitive agriculture especially those involving costs such as purchasing seeds and for other operations. Other reason could be unreliable agriculture and livestock extension services as most of the farmers complained on the availability of experts.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, P. and Corps, M. (2012). Linking Agriculture and Nutrition. USAID and TOPS
2. AU-IBAR, Chimatiro, S., Nouala, S., Seisay, M. AUC, NEPAD. (2014). The Policy Framework and Reform Strategy for Fisheries and Aquaculture in Africa; NEPAD: Johannesburg, South Africa.
3. Bellows, A., Canavan, C., Blakstad, M., Mosha, D., Noor, R., Webb, P., Kinabo, J., Masanja, H., and Fawzi, W. (2020). The Relationship between Dietary Diversity among Women of Reproductive Age and Agricultural Diversity in Rural Tanzania. Food and Nutrition Bulletin 2020, Vol. 41(1) 50-60
4. Beveridge, M. C., Thilsted, S. H., Phillips, M. J., Metian, M., Troell, M., & Hall, S. J. (2013). Meeting the food and nutrition needs of the poor: the role of fish and the opportunities and challenges emerging from the rise of aquaculturea. *Journal of fish biology*, *83*(4), 1067-1084.
5. Bouis, H., Low, J., McEwan, M., & Tanumihardjo, S. (2013). Biofortification: evidence and lessons learned linking agriculture and nutrition. *The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO)*. 18pp
6. Bundala, N., Kinabo, J., Jumbe, T., Rybak, C., & Sieber, S. (2020). Does homestead livestock production and ownership contribute to consumption of animal source foods? A pre-intervention assessment of rural farming communities in Tanzania. *Scientific African*, *7*
7. Chipili, G. and Msuya, J. (2016). Implementation of Nutrition-sensitive Agriculture in the Central Province of Zambia. *Journal of Nutrition and Health Sciences.* 3(2): 207
8. De Graaf, G., & Garibaldi, L. (2015). The value of African fisheries. *FAO fisheries and aquaculture circular*, Rome (C1093)
9. Development Partners Group - Nutrition (2013). Considerations for Including Nutrition into Agriculture Sector Programs and Projects in Tanzania.
10. Domènech, L. & Ringler, C. (2013). The impact of irrigation on nutrition, health, and gender: A review paper with insights for Africa south of the Sahara. International food policy research institute (IFPRI). Discussion Paper 01259. 13pp
11. Domènech, L. (2015). Is reliable water access the solution to undernutrition? A review of the potential of irrigation to solve nutrition and gender gaps in Africa South of the Sahara. International food policy research institute (IFPRI) Discussion Paper 01428. 27pp
12. Drechsel, P., Graefe, S., Sonou, M., & Cofie, O. O. (2006). Informal irrigation in urban West Africa: An overview. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute (IWMI) 34p. (IWMI Research Report 102). 34pp
13. Ecker, O., Mabiso, A., Kennedy, A., and Diao, X. (2011). Making Agriculture Pro - Nutrition: Opportunities in Tanzania. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01124. 60pp
14. FAO. (2014). Second International Conference on Nutrition. Rome: Food & Agriculture Organization.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

15. FAO. (2017). Nutrition-sensitive agriculture and food systems in practice: Options for intervention. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome. 86pp
16. Farnworth, C., Baudron, C., Andersson, J., Misiko, M., Badstue, L. & Stirlin, C. (2016). Gender and conservation agriculture in East and Southern Africa: towards a research agenda. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability. Vol 14*: no 2, 142 –165
17. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2018). World Aquaculture Performance Indicators (WAPI)—Fish Consumption Module (WAPI-FISHCSP v.2018.1); FAO: Rome, Italy.
18. Gillespie, S., Van den Bold, M., Herforth, A. and Hodge, J. (2015). Leveraging agriculture for nutrition in South Asia and East Africa: examining the enabling environment through stakeholder perceptions. *Food Security* 7:463 – 477
19. Herforth, A. (2013). Synthesis of guiding principles on agriculture programming for nutrition. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation.
20. Hetherington, J. Wiethoelter, A., Negin, J. & Mor, S. (2017). Livestock ownership, animal source foods and child nutritional outcomes in seven rural village clusters in Sub-Saharan Africa *Agriculture & Food Security* 6:9
21. Jaenicke, H. and Virchow, D. (2013). Entry points into a nutrition-sensitive agriculture. *Food Security* 5: 679–692
22. Keraita, B. and de Fraiture, C. (2011). Investment opportunities for water lifting and application technologies in smallholder irrigated agriculture in Tanzania. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute (IWMI). (AgWater Solutions Project Case Study Report).
23. Malapit, L., S. Kadiyala, R. Quisumbing, K. Cunningham, and Tyagi, P. (2013). Women's Empowerment in Agriculture, Production Diversity, and Nutrition: Evidence from Nepal. Discussion Paper 01313. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
24. Matthiesen, T., Nyamete, F., Msuya, J & Maass, B. (2011). Importance of Guinea Pig Husbandry for the Livelihood of Rural People in Tanzania: A Case Study in Iringa Region. Development on the margin
25. Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. (2011). National Nutrition Strategy 2012–2015, Dodoma: Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
26. Mwima, H., Monor, V.G., Mbilinyi, H.G., Rathacharen, S., Omanyi, P.B. and Katonda, I.K. (2012) .Regional Assessment of Fisheries Issues, Challenges and Opportunities for Eastern Africa Region; AU-IBAR: Nairobi, Kenya
27. Nordhagena, S., Nielsenb, J., Van Mourika, T., Smithc E. & Klemmd, R. (2019). Fostering CHANGE: Lessons from implementing a multi-country, multi-sector nutrition-sensitive agriculture project. *Evaluation and Program Planning 77*
28. Obiero, Kevin, Paul Meulenbroek, Silke Drexler, Adamneh Dagne, Peter Akoll, Robinson Odong, Boaz Kaunda-Arara, and Herwig Waidbacher. (2019). "The Contribution of Fish

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.29.22276899; this version posted July 2, 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-NC 4.0 International license .

to Food and Nutrition Security in Eastern Africa: Emerging Trends and Future Outlooks" *Sustainability* 11, no. 6: 1636.

29. Robinson, E., Akinyele, I. O., Humphrey, J., & Henson, S. (2014). *Policy options to enhance markets for nutrient-dense foods in Nigeria* (No. IDS Evidence Report; 66). IDS.
30. Ruel, M., Quisumbinga, A. and Balagamwalab, M. (2018). Nutrition-sensitive agriculture: What have we learned so far? *Global Food Security*
31. Ruel, T., and Alderman, H. (2013). Nutrition-sensitive interventions and programmes: how can they help to accelerate progress in improving maternal and child nutrition? Lancet; 382 (9891):536–51.
32. Shetty P. (2011). Addressing Micronutrient Malnutrition to Achieve Nutrition Security. In: Combating Micronutrient Deficiencies: Food-based Approaches (Ed: Thompson B, Amoroso L). Food & Agriculture Organization, Rome and CAB International, UK.
33. Shetty, P. (2018). Nutrition sensitive agriculture to achieve better nutritional outcomes. European *Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 72:1296–1299
34. Sraboni, E., H. J. Malapit, A. R. Quisumbing, and A. U. Ahmed. (2014). "Women's Empowerment in Agriculture: What Role for Food Security in Bangladesh?" World Development 61: 11–52.
35. Stein, A., Nestel, P., Meenakshi, J., Qaim, M., Sachdev, H., & Bhutta, Z. (2007). Plant breeding to control zinc deficiency in India: How cost-effective is biofortification? *Public Health Nutrition*, *10*(5), 492-501.
36. Thierfelder, C., Mombeyarara, T., Mango, N & Rusinamhodzi, L. (2013). Integration of conservation agriculture in smallholder farming systems of southern Africa: Identification of key entry points, International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 11:4, 317-330
37. United Republic of Tanzania (2012). Population and Housing Census: Population Distribution by Administrative Areas. NBS, Dare es Salaam and Office of Chief Government Statistician President's Office, Zanzibar.
38. United Republic of Tanzania (2016). Morogoro District Council. The Council Five Year Development Plan 2016/2017 – 2020/2021. Regional Administration and Local
39. United Republic of Tanzania. (2013). National agriculture policy. Dar Es Saalam, Tanzania.
40. United Republic of Tanzania. (2018). *Tanzania National Nutrition Survey using SMART Methodology (*TNNS*)*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
41. World Bank Tanzania Country Overview, 2013: [http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tanzania/overview] accessed on 5 May 2022