

Supplemental Table 1. Amount of LNS provided (g/day) and nutrient value (per daily ration)

	Nutributter ¹	iLiNS Project formulation ^{2,3}	Revised iLiNS Project formulation ⁴	Plumpy'Doz (6-11 mo) ⁵	Plumpy'Doz (12-18 mo) ⁵	Rice-lentil LNS (6-11 mo) ⁵	Rice-lentil LNS (12-18 mo) ⁵	Chickpea LNS (6-11 mo) ⁵	Chickpea LNS (12-18 mo) ⁵
Ration (g/day)	20	20	20	23.2	46.4	25.7	51.4	23.6	47.2
Total energy (kcal)	108	118	118	123.4	246.8	133.9	267.8	128.6	257.2
Protein (g)	2.56	2.6	2.6	2.9	5.9	2.8	5.7	3.5	7.1
Fat (g)	7.08	9.6	9.6	7.9	15.8	6.9	13.9	6.6	13.2
Linoleic acid (g)	1.29	4.46	4.46						
α-Linolenic acid (g)	0.29	0.58	0.58						
Vitamin A (µg RE)	400	400	400	200	400	117.7	235.4	118.5	236.9
Vitamin C (mg)	30	30	30						
Vitamin B1 (mg)	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6
Vitamin B2 (mg)	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.5
Niacin (mg)	4	4	6	2.8	5.6	2.6	5.1	2.4	4.7
Folic acid (µg)	80	80	150	80	160.1	100	199.9	118.2	236.5
Pantothenic acid (mg)	1.8	1.8	2	1	2	1.1	2.2	1	2
Vitamin B6 (mg)	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6
Vitamin B12 (µg)	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.9
Vitamin D (IU) 1 IU = 0.025 ug	0	200	200			226.2	452.3	226.6	453.1
Vitamin E (mg)	0	6	6	3	6	4.9	9.8	4.7	9.4
Vitamin K (µg)	0	30	30			11.3	22.6	11.3	22.7
Iron (mg)	9	6	9	4.5	9	3.3	6.7	3.5	7.1
Zinc (mg)	4	8	8	2	4	2.4	4.8	2.5	5.1
Copper (mg)	0.2	0.34	0.34	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.5
Calcium (mg)	100	280	280	193.5	387	208.2	416.3	219.5	439
Phosphorus (mg)	82	190	190	137.6	275.2	61.7	123.4	72.9	145.8
Potassium (mg)	152	200	200	155	310	206.6	413.3	220.7	441.3
Magnesium (mg)	16	40	40	29.9	59.9	41.6	83.3	47.7	95.3
Selenium (µg)	10	20	20	8.6	17.2	7.5	14.9	7.6	15.1
Iodine (µg)	90	90	90	27.6	55.2	33.7	67.3	33.7	67.5
Manganese (mg)	0.08	1.2	1.2	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.9

¹Provided by Adu-Afarwuah 2007 (39), Iannotti 2014 (41)

²Provided by Hess 2015 (37), Becquey 2019 (38), Adu-Afarwuah 2016 (40), Galasso 2019 (43), Ashorn 2015 (44), Maleta 2015 (45), Huybregts 2019 (46), Humphrey 2019 (47), Prendergast 2019 (48). iLiNS (International Lipid-based Nutrient Supplements) Project formulation described in Arimond et al. 2013 (16).

³Hess 2015 (37) provided 0-10 mg zinc/d in the SQ-LNS product, plus a 5 mg/d zinc supplement in one intervention arm. Maleta 2015 provided 10-40 g/d of LNS, with and without milk powder, varying by intervention arm (the 40 g arms were not included in this IPD analysis); the micronutrient composition of the LNS was identical across intervention arms, but there were differences in total kcal, protein, fat, linoleic acid and α-linolenic acid.

⁴Provided by Dewey 2017 (35), Luby 2018 (36), Null 2018 (42).

⁵Provided by Christian 2015 (34). Product and quantities differed by intervention arm and age.

Supplemental Table 2: Descriptive information on potential study-level effect modifiers, by trial

Country	First author, year	Region	Stunting prevalence at 18 mo (control) (%)	Malaria Prevalence (%)	Water quality (% improved)	Sanitation (% improved)	Duration of supplementation	Intensity of visitation	Average SQ-LNS compliance (%)	Compliance definition (in the SQ-LNS group)
Bangladesh	Christian, 2015 (34)	SEAR	44.2 ^b	0.2 ^a	100.0 ^a	77.0 ^a	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	93.0 ^a	% of total intended SQ-LNS consumed (quantity * day)
Bangladesh	Dewey, 2017 (35)	SEAR	35.2 ^b	0.2 ^a	100.0 ^a	71.1 ^a	> 12 mo	Monthly	97.4 ^a	% reporting "high adherence" (≥ 4 days/week)
Bangladesh	Luby, 2018 (36)	SEAR	43.4 ^b	0.1 ^a	88.5 ^a	94.7 ^a	> 12 mo	Weekly	93.0 ^a	Number of sachets consumed in 14 days prior to annual survey/14
Burkina Faso	Hess, 2015 (37)	AFR	39.4 ^b	59.1 ^b	26.7 ^b	2.3 ^b	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	96.8 ^a	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed
Burkina Faso	Becquey, 2019 (38) ¹	AFR	30.5 ^a	42.9 ^b	50.6 ^b	53.4 ^a	≤ 12 mo	Monthly	37.0 ^b	caregiver reported receiving SQ-LNS in the previous month
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah, 2007 (39)	AFR	7.3 ^a	37.4 ^b	91.9 ^a	91.5 ^a	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	88.2 ^a	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah, 2016 (40)	AFR	13.0 ^a	36.8 ^b	98.4 ^a	97.3 ^a	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	73.5 ^b	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed
Haiti	Iannotti, 2014 (41)	AMR	13.4 ^a	0.9 ^a	98.7 ^a	94.0 ^a	≤ 12 mo	Monthly	97.0 ^a	Reported consuming all of the monthly supply of the SQ-LNS during the supplementation period
Kenya	Null, 2018 (42)	AFR	32.2 ^a	8.5 ^a	68.0 ^b	15.8 ^b	> 12 mo	Monthly	115.0 ^a	Number of sachets consumed in 14 days prior to annual survey/14
Madagascar	Galasso, 2019 (43)	AFR	63.0 ^b	5.5 ^a	26.9 ^b	0.0 ^b	≤ 12 mo	Monthly	-	Data unavailable.
Malawi	Ashorn, 2015 (44)	AFR	34.7 ^a	26.8 ^b	91.7 ^a	9.2 ^b	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	77.1 ^b	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed
Malawi	Maleta, 2015 (45)	AFR	46.5 ^b	30.3 ^b	91.6 ^a	2.9 ^b	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	71.6 ^b	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed (considering missed delivery visits)
Mali	Huybregts, 2019 (46) ¹	AFR	36.4 ^b	39.1 ^b	50.8 ^a	75.3 ^a	> 12 mo	Monthly	47.0 ^b	caregiver reported receiving SQ-LNS in the previous month
Zimbabwe	Humphrey, 2019 (47); Prendergast, 2019 (48) ²	AFR	37.2 ^b	9.0 ^a	63.6 ^b	34.0 ^b	≤ 12 mo	Monthly	73.5 ^b	received > 11 (80% of expected) deliveries * consumed SQ-LNS in past 24 h (at 12 month visit)

¹Study-level effect modifier categorization based on longitudinal cohort

²Study-level effect modifier categorization was the same for both HIV exposed and HIV un-exposed children

Superscripts a and b designate the two categories, as described in Notes below.

Abbreviations: SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements

Notes:

Geographic region based on WHO regions

Stunting was defined as length-for-age Z score < -2 SD. Stunting prevalence was based on study-specific data at 18 months (when available) in the control arms. Stunting was assessed at 12 months for Adu-Afarwuah 2007 (39) and Iannotti 2014 (41), and at ~25 months of age for Null 2018 (42). These 3 studies were then categorized based on expected changes in stunting prevalence with age. Trials were categorized as (a) low/moderate burden when stunting was < 35% and (b) high burden when stunting was ≥35%.

Malaria prevalence: Data extracted from Annex, Data table F: Population at risk and reestimated malaria cases and deaths, 2010-2017 (wmr2018-annex-table-f.xls); Point estimate (presumed and confirmed malaria cases), divided by population at risk, per 100 persons. Trials were categorized as (a) low burden when malaria was < 10% and (b) high burden when malaria was ≥10%.

Water quality: Data based on sample prevalences of improved source water quality. Study-level water quality was considered improved if the main source of drinking water for ≥ 75% of participants was improved; study-level water quality was considered unimproved if the main source of drinking water for < 75% of participants was improved. "Improved water sources are those that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, and include: piped water, boreholes or tubewells, protected dug wells, protected springs, rainwater and packaged or delivered water". Unimproved water sources include: water from an unprotected dug well or unprotected spring, or surface water (e.g., river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal or irrigation canal). (washdata.org/monitoring/drinking-water).

Sanitation: Data based on sample prevalences of improved sanitation. Study-level sanitation was considered improved if sanitation services for ≥ 50% of participants were improved; study-level sanitation was considered unimproved if sanitation services for < 50% of participants were improved. "Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include: flush/pour flush to piped sewer system, septic tanks or pit latrines; ventilated improved pit latrines, composting toilets or pit latrines with slabs". Unimproved sanitation services include: use of pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines or bucket latrines, or open defecation. (<https://washdata.org/monitoring/sanitation>)

Compliance: Data extracted from publication; study-specific definitions of compliance are noted in the table. Trials were categorized as (a) high compliance when compliance was ≥ 80% or (b) low compliance when compliance was < 80% compliance.

References

World Malaria Report 2018. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018. Available at: <https://www.who.int/malaria/publications/world-malaria-report-2018/report/en/> Accessed on: 26 August 2019

Supplemental Table 3: Descriptive information on potential individual-level effect modifiers, by trial

Country	First author, year	Maternal height < 150.1 cm (%)	Maternal BMI < 20 kg/m ² (%)	Maternal age < 25 y (%)	Maternal education, completed primary (%)	Maternal depression, below 75th (%)	Child sex, male (%)	Child birth order, first born (%)	Child baseline LAZ < -1 (%)	Child baseline WLZ < 0 (%)	Child baseline MUACZ < 0 (%)	Child baseline WAZ < -1 (%)	Child baseline HCZ < -1 (%)	Moderate to severe food insecurity (%)	SES index, below median (%)	Improved source water quality (%)	Improved sanitation access (%)	Home environment, below median (%)	Season at endline, dry (%)
Bangladesh	Christian, 2015 (34)			56.8	63.5		50.2	79.0*	62.9	65.2	76.2	57.2	50.8	29.6 ^f	49.4	100.0	77.2		53.7
Bangladesh	Dewey, 2017 (35)	45.7	55.5	72.8	74.0	65.8 ^a	50.2	40.2	60.3	63.5	56.7	52.6	67.8	37.4 ^b	49.9	100.0	70.8	28.2 ^b	44.3
Bangladesh	Luby, 2018 (36)	45.5	54.2	56.2	71.2	75.1 ^d	49.7	34.1						22.1 ^b	49.8	89.0	94.7	48.8 ^b	55.8
Burkina Faso	Hess, 2015 (37)	1.9	38.7	41.2	3.8		50.7	22.1	56.8	82.7	81.8	63.7	72.1	48.9 ^b	41.4	26.6	2.3	39.9 ^a	71.5
Burkina Faso	Becquey, 2019 (cross-sectional) (38)	2.3	40.5	54.7	8.4		52.5	16.5							50.5	63.1	39.3		47.6
Burkina Faso	Becquey, 2019 (longitudinal) (38)	2.8	25.2	43.2	7.0	71.1 ^b	51.9	17.2	36.3	56.2		37.1		40.8 ^b	49.9	50.6	53.5		49.6
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah, 2007 (39)	4.3	9.2	29.0	88.3		52.1	40.0							46.3	91.9	91.5		57.7
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah, 2016 (40)	5.1	15.2	38.8	78.5	70.9 ^a	48.0	33.1	38.9	51.7	54.5	32.8	40.6	31.0 ^b	50.6	98.5	97.2	37.1 ^a	58.8
Haiti	Iannotti, 2014 (41)			30.9	85.3		43.7	37.0*	29.8	49.0		25.2			49.3	99.0	94.2		
Kenya	Null, 2018 (42)	4.0	21.6	44.2	47.6	74.0 ^c	48.2	21.4						10.3 ^b	43.1	67.9	15.8	43.2 ^b	22.7
Madagascar	Galasso, 2019 (43)	36.2		45.4	23.1	72.2 ^f	49.1	26.4						28.5 ^b	49.7	26.8	0.0	46.2 ^c	99.9
Malawi	Ashorn, 2015 (44)	13.3	40.3	50.0	15.8	74.2 ^a	47.3	20.5	58.4	35.3	45.4	33.1	23.9	70.7 ^b	46.5	91.5	9.4	34.8 ^a	71.1
Malawi	Maleta, 2015 (45)	16.7	26.1	45.1	23.9		50.6	23.7	63.9	42.2	42.5	40.4	44.9	73.5 ^b	49.1	91.6	2.9	41.3 ^a	58.9
Mali	Huybregts, 2019 (cross-sectional) (46)	3.1	27.4	47.5	10.6		52.2	14.4							49.7	59.7	74.9		
Mali	Huybregts, 2019 (longitudinal) (46)	2.8	25.3	30.3	7.7	74.7 ^a	52.3	12.1	44.4	68.0	66.3	47.8		33.4 ^b	49.6	50.8	75.3		
Zimbabwe	Humphrey, 2019 (HIV-unexposed) (47)	3.8	15.5	48.9	96.3	70.0 ^c	50.1	27.9*	46.3	41.8	48.4	29.6	19.5	18.7 ^c	49.8	63.7	34.1		92.7
Zimbabwe	Prendergast, 2019 (HIV-exposed) (48)	4.6	18.5	24.1	93.8	70.4 ^c	49.6	20.0*	58.5	47.0	56.3	41.4	27.2	25.4 ^c	49.8	60.8	30.1		93.7

Abbreviations: BMI, body-mass index; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference z-score; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; HCZ, head circumference z-score; SES, socio-economic status.

Notes:

Maternal depression scales used: a) Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) at 6 mo postpartum; b) EPDS at 2 mo postpartum; c) EPDS during pregnancy at enrollment; d) Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression (CESD) Scale at 12 mo postpartum; e) Patient Health Questionnaire (modified) at 24 mo postpartum; f) CESD Scale during pregnancy at baseline anthropometry is measured at enrollment into the study or start of supplementation if supplementation did not begin at enrollment.

Food security scales used: a) Food Access Survey Tool; b) Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFAIS); c) Coping Strategy Index

Water and sanitation references - as for study-level effect modifiers

Home environment assessed by the Family Care Indicators tool at: a) 18 mo of age; b) 24 mo of age; c) endline survey

Season is defined at time of outcome assessment as a dichotomous "Rainy" vs "Dry" category based on child-specific average rainfall during the month of measurement and 2 months prior.

*Data on birth order were not available for all children. Consequently, first-born vs later-born status was estimated based on the number of children under 5 years old in the household.

Supplemental Table 4: Growth outcomes at endline among control groups, by trial

Country	First author, year	LAZ	Stunted (%)	WLZ	Wasting (%)	MUACZ	Low MUAC (%)	Acute malnutrition		Underweight (%)	HCZ	Small head size (%)	WLZ > 1 (%) ¹
								(%)	WAZ				
Bangladesh	Christian, 2015 (34)	-1.9 ± 1.0	44.2	-1.2 ± 0.9	16.4	-1.1 ± 0.8	15.2	21.1	-1.8 ± 1.0	39.2	-1.4 ± 0.9	24.0	0.6
Bangladesh	Dewey, 2017 (35)	-1.8 ± 0.9	42.0	-1.1 ± 0.9	15.1	-0.7 ± 0.8	5.2	15.3	-1.7 ± 0.9	37.8	-1.9 ± 0.9	42.9	0.9
Bangladesh	Luby, 2018 (36)	-1.8 ± 1.0	41.9	-0.9 ± 1.0	11.2				-1.6 ± 1.0	32.4	-1.6 ± 0.9	32.8	2.6
Burkina Faso	Hess, 2015 (37)	-1.8 ± 1.2	39.4	-0.9 ± 1.0	13.5	-1.1 ± 1.0	18.3	19.2	-1.5 ± 1.1	30.9	-1.8 ± 0.9	41.0	2.7
Burkina Faso	Becquey, 2019 (38)	-1.4 ± 1.0	28.5	-0.8 ± 1.0	10.1	-0.8 ± 0.9	10.2	14.2	-1.2 ± 1.0	21.2			2.8
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah, 2007 (39)	-0.4 ± 1.1	7.3	-0.6 ± 1.2	9.4				-0.7 ± 1.1	11.5	-0.6 ± 0.9	6.3	6.3
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah, 2016 (40)	-0.9 ± 1.0	13.0	-0.6 ± 1.0	7.5	-0.5 ± 0.9	3.8	8.1	-0.9 ± 1.0	13.0	-1.1 ± 0.9	16.0	4.5
Haiti	Iannotti, 2014 (41)	-0.7 ± 1.2	13.4	0.0 ± 1.0	1.3				-0.4 ± 1.1	4.7			17.4
Kenya	Null, 2018 (42)	-1.6 ± 1.1	32.2	0.1 ± 0.9	1.5	-0.5 ± 1.0	5.5	3.2	-0.8 ± 1.0	10.0	-0.3 ± 1.0	4.3	16.2
Madagascar	Galasso, 2019 (43)	-2.2 ± 1.2	58.5	-0.4 ± 1.0	5.8	-0.7 ± 1.0	9.7	9.4	-1.4 ± 1.0	26.0			7.1
Malawi	Ashorn, 2015 (44)	-1.6 ± 1.1	34.7	-0.1 ± 1.0	3.4	0.1 ± 1.0	3.4	4.5	-0.9 ± 1.1	11.7	-0.8 ± 1.0	10.8	12.4
Malawi	Maleta, 2015 (45)	-1.9 ± 1.2	46.5	-0.2 ± 1.1	5.4	0.0 ± 1.0	2.1	5.8	-1.1 ± 1.1	19.9	-1.1 ± 1.0	21.8	10.8
Mali	Huybregts, 2019 (46)	-1.6 ± 1.1	34.6	-0.6 ± 1.0	7.3	-0.8 ± 0.9	9.2	9.6	-1.3 ± 1.0	20.4			4.1
Zimbabwe	Humphrey, 2019 (47)	-1.6 ± 1.1	34.8	0.0 ± 1.1	2.6	0.0 ± 0.9	1.5	3.4	-0.8 ± 1.0	10.6	-0.3 ± 1.1	5.8	16.5
Zimbabwe	Prendergast, 2019 (48)	-2.0 ± 1.2	50.0	0.0 ± 1.2	3.7	-0.2 ± 0.9	1.5	4.6	-0.9 ± 1.1	17.1	-0.6 ± 1.2	10.0	18.0

Abbreviations: LAZ, length-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference z-score; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; HCZ, head circumference z-score.

Notes:

Values are mean ± SD or prevalence

¹Not an outcome, made available for context.

Supplemental Table 5: Risk of bias assessment in each trial

Country	Author	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding participants	Outcome assessment¹	Incomplete outcome	Selective reporting	Other
Bangladesh	Christian 2015 (34)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Bangladesh	Dewey 2017 (35)	low	low	high	low	low	low	low
Bangladesh	Luby 2018 (36)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Burkina Faso	Hess 2015 (37)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Burkina Faso	Becquey 2019 (38)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2007 (39)	low	low	high	low	low	low	low
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2016 (40)	low	low	high	low	low	low	low
Haiti	Iannotti 2014 (41)	unclear	low	high	high	low	low	low
Kenya	Null 2018 (42)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Madagascar	Galasso 2019 (43)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Malawi	Ashorn 2015 (44)	low	low	high	low	low	low	low
Malawi	Maleta 2015 (45)	low	low	high	low	low	low	low
Mali	Huybregts 2019 (46)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Zimbabwe	Humphrey 2019 (47)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Zimbabwe	Prendergast 2019 (48)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low

1. Due to the nature of the intervention, blinding of participants was not possible. We considered anthropometric outcome assessment to be at low risk of bias only when it was clearly specified that data collectors who performed the anthropometric measurements were not aware of group allocation, and it would be unlikely that they could easily become aware of group allocation (i.e. observation of interventions materials in study communities, non-intervention passive control arms, etc.)

Adu-Afarwuah 2007 (39)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "we randomly selected ~75% of the total number of eligible infants to enter the intervention trial. This was done on a weekly basis, when infants were 5 mo of age, by entering the identification numbers of the eligible infants in a dataset, and using an SAS data step (ranuni [1] le 0.75) to select those for the intervention...the NI infants were randomly selected from the pool of initially eligible infants" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "the infants were randomly assigned (with the use of opaque envelopes with group designation) to receive SP, NT, or NB until 12 mo of age" Comment: adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "NT was provided to the mothers in plastic bags, and the NB (20 g/d) was provided in foil packs with screw caps" Comment: not adequate
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Personal communication with investigator (SAA): "All anthropometric measurements were carried out by dedicated anthropometrists separate from the field workers who delivered the supplements in the homes, and the anthropometrists had no knowledge of the group assignments. At both 6 and 12 months of age, all children were brought to the laboratory where the anthropometric measurements were conducted; in this case, it was neither possible for the anthropometrists to determine group assignments within the intervention groups, nor was it likely that the anthropometrists could remember or know which children belonged to the intervention versus non-intervention groups." Comment: adequately done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: SP group = 98/105; NT group = 102/105; NB group = 98/103; Control group = 96/97 Comment: Minimal attrition and reasons given for loss to follow-up
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT00379158); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Supported by the Nestlé Foundation with additional support from USAID's MGL Research Program through ILSI.		

Adu-Afarwuah 2016 (40)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "The study statistician at University of California, Davis developed group allocations with the use of a computer generated (SAS version 9.3; SAS Institute) randomization scheme in blocks of 9" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "At each enrollment, the study nurse offered sealed, opaque envelopes bearing group allocations, 9 envelopes at a time, and the woman picked one to reveal the allocation" Comment: adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "It was not possible to blind study workers and participants to the capsules (IFA and MMN supplements) compared with the LNS supplements because of their different appearances"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "It was not possible to blind study workers and participants to the capsules (IFA and MMN supplements) compared with the LNS supplements because of their apparent differences, but laboratory staff, anthropometrists, and data analysts had no knowledge of group assignment until all preliminary analyses had been completed" Comment: adequately done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: IFA group = 393/408; MMN group = 401/411; LNS group = 391/409 Comment: Minimal attrition and reasons given for loss to follow-up
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT00970866); SAP available online; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Funded by a grant to the University of California, Davis, from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.		

Ashorn 2015 (44)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Researcher not involved with the trial created individual randomisation slips (in blocks of 9)" Comment: Additional details on randomization provided in Ashorn <i>et al.</i> AJCN 2015.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "...packed them in sealed, numbered, opaque randomization envelopes that were stored in numerical order...Eligible pregnant women were requested to choose 1 of the top 6 envelopes in the stack, and the contents of the envelope indicated her participant number and group allocation"" Comment: adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "The IFA and MMN interventions were provided with double-masked procedures...For the LNS group, we used single-masked procedures; that is field workers who delivered the supplements knew which mothers were receiving LNS, and the participants were advised not to disclose information about their supplements to anyone other than an iLiNS team member" Comment: not done
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "The data collectors who performed the anthropometric measurements or assessed other outcomes were not aware of group allocation. Researchers responsible for the data cleaning remained blind to the trial code, until the database was considered fully cleaned" Comment: adequately done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: IFA group = 220/223; MMN group = 222/233; LNS group = 214/222 Comment: Minimal attrition and reasons given for loss to follow-up
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT01239693); SAP available online; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Supported in part by a grant to the University of California, Davis, from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, with additional funding from the Office of Health, Infectious Diseases, and Nutrition, Bureau for Global Health, US Agency for International Development (USAID) under terms of cooperative agreement AID-OAAA-1200005, through the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA), managed by FHI 360. For data management and statistical analysis, the team received additional support from the Academy of Finland grant 252075 and the Medical Research Fund of Tampere University Hospital grant 9M004. YBC was supported by the Singapore Ministry of Health's National Medical Council under its Clinician Scientist Award.		

Becquey 2019 (38)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "simple(i.e. non-stratified) random allocation was used"; "randomization took place at a community event...with local health authorities"; "32 identical pieces of paper with either 'control' or 'intervention' written on them were mixed in a bag for randomization" "In each health center catchment area, a census was conducted 1 month prior to the cross-sectional baseline and endline surveys to identify all pregnant women and eligible children. A random sample of children was drawn from the census list." Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "32 identical pieces of paper with either 'control' or 'intervention' written on them were mixed in a bag for randomization" Comment: adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "non-masked, community-based, trial" Comment: blinding of participants who received no intervention was not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "A two-arm, cluster-randomized, non-blinded, effectiveness trial" "All anthropometric measurements and checking of bilateral pitting edema were systematically performed by a trained and standardized anthropometrist with the help of a trained assistant." Comment: Non-blinded trial
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: 21.2% loss to follow-up (7.2% exited study one month early due to misunderstanding by study team, remained of attrition (14% of study sample) primarily due to moving, child death. Quote: "the proportion of enrolled children lost to follow-up was balanced across study groups" "We conducted multiple imputation of missing longitudinal outcome data using a 2-fold fully conditional specification algorithm, which imputes missing values under the missing at random assumption, respecting the temporal ordering of observations". Comment: reasons provided for loss to follow-up; missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention groups; multiple imputation procedures used
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: trial registered as NCT02245152 at ClinicalTrials.gov, published protocol (Huybregts BMC Public Health 2017); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section; data made available to IPD investigators.
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding The PROMIS studies were funded by Global Affairs Canada (GAC) (https://www.international.gc.ca/); grant 52308/5252/0200 and CGIAR Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH) program (http://a4nh.cgiar.org/) led by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), with no role by either funder in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.		

Christian 2015 (34)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "A random-number seed was selected by a statistician not involved in the study, using a random number generator, and a random number between 0 and 1 drawn from a uniform distribution was assigned to each sector" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Cluster-randomization of the 596 predefined communities in JiVitA, called 'sectors', was done by blocks of 19 (total 32 blocks, last block had 7 sectors). A random-number seed was selected by a statistician not involved in the study, using a random number generator, and a random number between 0 and 1 drawn from a uniform distribution was assigned to each sector. Additionally, a block number was assigned to each sector in groups of 19. For blocks 1–31, the first five sectors by sort order were assigned to treatment group 1, the next five to treatment group 2, and so on. For block 32, the two larger controls were assigned two sectors and the intervention groups 1 sector each. Comment: central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "Our trial was unblinded" Comment: not done
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "Our trial was unblinded"; "Anthropometry was done at this time using standard methods...Repeat infant anthropometry assessments were conducted during home visits every 3 months after the baseline at 9, 12, 15 and 18 months of age." Comment: not done; cluster-randomized trial
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: control group = 1312/1591; Plumpy'Doz group = 1395/1599; rice lentil group = 785/901; chickpea group = 786/920; WSB++ group = 789/928 Comments: reasons given for loss to follow-up; missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention groups
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: trial registered as NCT01562379 at ClinicalTrials.gov, outcomes described in the methodology section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding The JiVitA-4 study was funded by the US Department of Agriculture, NIFA under the FANEP [Award no. 2010-38418-21732]. In kind support in the form of micronutrient premix for the local food supplements was provided by DSM, Basel, Switzerland and Plumpy'doz was provided by Nutriset (Malaunay, France).		

Dewey 2017 (35)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "For the randomization, the study statistician at UCD first stratified all 64 clusters in the 11 unions by subdistrict and union and then randomly assigned each cluster to 1 of the 4 arms (each containing 16 clusters)" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "For the randomization, the study statistician at UCD first stratified all 64 clusters in the 11 unions by subdistrict and union and then randomly assigned each cluster to 1 of the 4 arms (each containing 16 clusters)" Comment: central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Comment: participant blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention (LNS, MNP, Control)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "The trial was a researcher-blind, longitudinal, cluster randomized effectiveness trial"; "SDU team members conducting anthropometric measurements were not aware of group assignment" Comment: adequately done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: LNS-LNS = 884/1047; IFA-LNS = 785/930; IFA-MNP = 895/1052; IFA-Control = 816/982 Comment: reasons given for loss to follow-up; missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention groups
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: The trial was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01715038); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Supported by the Office of Health, Infectious Diseases, and Nutrition, Bureau for Global Health, US Agency for International Development (USAID) under the terms of cooperative agreement AID-OAA-A-12-00005, through the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA), managed by FHI 360. Our research intervention was incorporated into the community health and development program of LAMB, which was supported by Plan-Bangladesh in 6 of the 11 study unions. Nutriset S.A.S. prepared the lipid-based nutrient supplements for this trial, and Hudson Pharmaceuticals Ltd. prepared the iron and folic acid tablets.		

Hess 2015 (37)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "computer-generated an assignment within strata to participate in the intervention cohort ... The same statistician, who was blinded to the intervention, generated a random allocation sequence at the level of the concession for the enrollment of eligible infants in the intervention cohort" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "The same statistician, who was blinded to the intervention, generated a random allocation sequence at the level of the concession for the enrollment of eligible infants in the intervention cohort" Comment: central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "The trial was partially masked, as all participants, field staff and researchers remained blinded to the four intervention groups until data analyses were completed, but were aware which communities were assigned to intervention cohort and non-intervention cohort" Comment: intervention and non-intervention cohorts non-blinded
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "The trial was partially masked, as all participants, field staff and researchers remained blinded to the four intervention groups until data analyses were completed, but were aware which communities were assigned to intervention cohort and non-intervention cohort." Comment: IC and NIC non-blinded
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: LNS-Zn0 group = 489/602; LNS-Zn5 group = 499/613; LNS-Zn10 group = 491/603; LNS-TabZn5 group = 481/617; NIC group = 666/785 Comment: reasons for loss to follow-up mentioned
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: Protocol attached as a supplement in the study paper; registered at ClinicalTrials.gov as NCT 00944281; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding The project was funded by a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to the University of California, Davis. The funder had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.		

Humphrey 2019 and Prendergast 2019 (47, 48)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "clusters were allocated (1:1:1:1) to one of four treatment groups"; "the study's statistician used a constrained randomization technique to identify 500 allocation schemes...From these, 10 allocations were randomly selected. The final allocation was selected at a public randomization event attended by elected representatives" Comments: Additional details available in Supplementary Materials (Appendix) and at https://osf.io/w93hy and in (SHINE Trial Team, Clin Infect Dis, 2015).
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "the study's statistician used a constrained randomization technique to identify 500 allocation schemes...From these, 10 allocations were randomly selected. The final allocation was selected at a public randomization event attended by elected representatives" Comments: Additional details available at https://osf.io/w93hy and in (SHINE Trial Team, Clin Infect Dis, 2015).
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "masking of participants and fieldworkers was not possible because of the obvious visual differences between interventions" Comment: not done
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "masking of participants and fieldworkers was not possible because of the obvious visual differences between interventions, but investigators were blinded to treatment groups until the final analysis of each pre-specified outcome." Comment: not done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Comment: attrition similar across all seven arms with reasons given
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: trial registered as NCT01824940 at ClinicalTrials.gov, published protocol (SHINE Trial Team, Clin Infect Dis 2015), research and statistical analysis plan available at https://osf.io/w93hy ; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding The SHINE trial is funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (OPP1021542 to Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health and OPP1143707 to Zvitambo Institute for Maternal and Child Health Research), the UK Department for International Development, the Wellcome Trust (093768/Z/10/Z and 108065/Z/15/Z), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (8106727), UNICEF (PCA-2017-0002), and the US National Institutes of Health (R01 HD060338/HD/NICHD).		

Huybregts 2019 (46)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "we applied stratified random allocation of the HC catchment areas to control and intervention study groups"; "we first stratified the [health centers] by hierarchical clustering"; "random allocation to control or intervention groups was conducted within each stratum during a community ceremony...forty-eight identical pieces of paper with either 'control' or 'intervention' were mixed in a bag...each [health center] director drew one piece of paper" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"random allocation to control or intervention groups was conducted within each stratum during a community ceremony...forty-eight identical pieces of paper with either 'control' or 'intervention' were mixed in a bag...each [health center] director drew one piece of paper" Comment: adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "non-masked, community-based, trial" Comment: blinding of participants who received no intervention was not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "We used a two-arm, cluster-randomized, non-blinded effectiveness trial" Comment: not done, cluster randomized trial at level of HC
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: LNS group = 494/577; Control group = 488/577 Quote: "A total of 150 (13%) children were lost to follow-up with similar attrition patterns for the intervention and control group"; "we conducted multiple imputations of missing longitudinal continuous and binary outcome data using a 2-fold fully conditional specification (FCS) algorithm". Comment: reasons provided for loss to follow-up; missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention groups; multiple imputation procedures used
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: trial registered as NCT02323815 at ClinicalTrials.gov, published protocol (Huybregts BMC Public Health 2017); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section; data made available to IPD investigators.
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding The PROMIS studies were funded by: Global Affairs Canada (GAC) (https://www.international.gc.ca/); grant 52308/5252/0200, and CGIAR Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH) program (http://a4nh.cgiar.org/) led by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), with no role by either funder in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.		

Iannotti 2014 (41)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "Random assignment was carried out through an allocation-concealment mechanism whereby sealed paper forms that masked group assignments were drawn from a container by mothers by using a simple random assignment ratio of 1:1:1 for group assignments" Comment: randomization procedure not specified
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Random assignment was carried out through an allocation-concealment mechanism whereby sealed paper forms that masked group assignments were drawn from a container by mothers by using a simple random assignment ratio of 1:1:1 for group assignments" Comment: adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Comment: participant blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention (LNS, Control)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "The study team was comprised of one study coordinator and 3 enumerators who participated in a 1-wk training session at the beginning of the trial and another refresher training midway through covering the protocol of anthropometric measures, survey administration, and ethics." Comment: same enumerators conducting anthropometric assessments as providing supplements
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: control group = 156/191; 6-month LNS group = 159/202 Comment: reasons for loss-to-follow-up mentioned
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: Trial registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01552512); outcomes described in the methodology section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to FHI 360 through the Alive & Thrive Small Grants Program managed by University of California Davis; The Inter-American Development Bank; The World Bank; and The United Nations World Food Program.		

Luby 2018 (36)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: Clusters were randomly allocated to treatment using a random number generator by a coinvestigator at University of California, Berkeley (BFA). Each of the eight geographically adjacent clusters was block randomized to the double-sized control arm or one of the six interventions...Geographical matching ensured that arms were balanced across locations and time of measurement." Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote "Clusters were randomly allocated to treatment using a random number generator by a coinvestigator at University of California, Berkeley (BFA)." Comment: central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Comment: Not done due to the nature of the intervention
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "Interventions included distinct visible components so neither participants nor data collectors were masked to intervention assignment, although the data collection and intervention teams were different individuals". "Outcome and adherence was assessed by a team of university graduates who were not involved in the delivery or promotion of interventions." Comment: passive control arm; blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Comment: attrition similar across all seven arms with reasons given
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT 01590095); SAP and trial protocol available, and published (Arnold BMJ Open 2013); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Supported by a global development grant (OPPGD759) from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to the University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA.		

Maleta 2015 (45)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "We used block randomization and a set of opaque envelopes to assign participants to the intervention groups. The randomization list and envelopes were prepared by a study statistician not involved in trial implementation" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "We used block randomization and a set of opaque envelopes to assign participants to the intervention groups." Comment: adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Comment: participant blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention (LNS, Control)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "...and the code was not disclosed to the researchers or to those assessing the outcomes until all data had been entered and verified in a database." "For the LNS group, we used single-masked procedures (i.e., fieldworkers who delivered the supplements knew which children were receiving LNSs, but those who performed the anthropometric measurements or assessed other outcomes were not aware of group allocation)." Comment: adequately done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Attrition: 40g/day milk-free LNS group = 239/324; 40g/day milk LNS group = 242/322; 20g/day milk-free LNS group = 247/323; 20g/day milk LNS group = 236/322; 10g/day milk LNS group = 221/321; control group = 242/320 Comment: similar levels of attrition across groups, reasons for dropout provided
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT00945698); SAP and trial protocol available online; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Funded by a grant to the University of California, Davis, from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.		

Null 2018 (42)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Clusters were randomly allocated to treatment at the University of California, Berkeley using a random number generator with reproducible seed" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Clusters were randomly allocated to treatment at the University of California, Berkeley using a random number generator with reproducible seed" Comment: central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "Masking participants was not possible" Comment: blinding of participants was not possible due to the nature of the intervention
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "The health promoters and staff who delivered the interventions were not involved in data collection, but the data collection team could have inferred treatment status if they saw intervention materials in study communities." Comment: blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Comment: attrition similar across all seven arms with reasons given
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Comment: Trial registered as NCT01704105 at ClinicalTrials.gov. SAP and trial protocol available online, and published (Arnold BMJ Open 2013); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Supported in part by Global Development grant OPPGD759 from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to the University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA, and grant AID-OAA-F-13-00040 from United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to Innovations for Poverty Action. This manuscript was made possible by the generous support of the American people through the USAID. The contents are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the US Government.		

Galasso 2019 (43)		
Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "a random generator was used to block-randomise five sites per intervention group per region" ... "An up-to-date registry of government-programme eligible women and children... was used as a sampling frame to select households eligible for enrolment in the trial. 30 households were randomly sampled per site, stratified by children's age at baseline" Comment: adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Comment: central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Quote: "Due to the nature of the interventions, masking of participants and community health workers was not possible." Comment: not done
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Quote: "Due to the nature of the interventions, masking of participants and community health workers was not possible. Data analysts were not blinded to intervention group assignment due to differences in survey information" Comment: not done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Mothers or children who died before the final assessment were not replaced. Children who had permanently moved outside the programme site catchment area before final assessment were replaced with a randomly drawn child from the site within the same age range. Children and their households who returned to the site between the baseline and final assessment were re-interviewed." Comment: similar levels of attrition across groups, reasons for dropout provided
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Quote: "This trial has been registered with the ISRCTN registry, number ISRCTN14393738." Comment: published protocol (Fernald BMC Public Health 2016); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	Comment: no other potential sources of bias reported
Funding Funded by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development, Strategic Impact Evaluation Fund, Early Learning Partnership Program, World Bank Innovation Grant, Grand Challenges Canada, World Bank Research Committee, Japan Nutrition Trust Fund, Power of Nutrition Trust Fund.		