


Supplemental Figure 1: Summary risk of bias as a percentage of all included studies for the effects of SQ-LNS on growth outcomes




Supplemental figure 2: Sensitivity analyses of main effects of SQ-LNS on growth outcomes

Contents


Supplemental figure 2A: Mean differences for continuous outcomes	2
Supplemental figure 2B: Prevalence ratios for dichotomous outcomes	3
Supplemental figure 2C: Prevalence differences for dichotomous outcomes	4

These figures show the pooled estimates of intervention effects by different pooling methods and different sensitivity analyses. For continuous outcomes, the intervention effect is measured by the difference in mean of the LNS group minus control. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence ratios, the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group divided by the prevalence in the control group. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence differences, the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group minus the prevalence in the control group. The labels on the left y-axis indicate which outcome is assessed. The different columns correspond to sensitivity analyses in which intervention group categorization differs. All-trial analysis includes all trials; Child-LNS-only excludes trial arms that provided both maternal and child LNS; Multi-component analysis separates comparisons within trials that included multi-component interventions, so that the SQ-LNS vs. no SQ-LNS comparisons were conducted separately between pairs of arms that included the same non-nutrition components (e.g. SQ-LNS+WASH vs. WASH; SQ-LNS vs. Control); Passive arms excluded analysis excludes passive control arms; Milk-peanut LNS only analysis excludes arms with SQ-LNS formulations that were not milk and peanut based. LAZ, length-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; MUACZ, midupper arm circumference z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score.


Supplemental figure 2A: Mean differences for continuous outcomes



Supplemental figure 2B: Prevalence ratios for dichotomous outcomes



Supplemental figure 2C: Prevalence differences for dichotomous outcomes




Supplemental figure 3: Forest plots for all main effects of SQ-LNS on growth outcomes

Contents


Supplemental figure 3A: Mean difference in LAZ	2
Supplemental figure 3B: Stunting prevalence ratio	3
Supplemental figure 3C: Stunting prevalence difference	4
Supplemental figure 3D: Mean difference in WLZ	5
Supplemental figure 3E: Wasting prevalence ratio	6
Supplemental figure 3F: Wasting prevalence difference	7
Supplemental figure 3G: Mean difference in MUACZ	8
Supplemental figure 3H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio	9
Supplemental figure 3I: Low MUAC prevalence difference	10
Supplemental figure 3J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio	11
Supplemental figure 3K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference	12
Supplemental figure 3L: Mean difference in WAZ	13
Supplemental figure 3M: Underweight prevalence ratio	14
Supplemental figure 3N: Underweight prevalence difference	15
Supplemental figure 3O: Mean difference in HCZ	16
Supplemental figure 3P: Small head size prevalence ratio	17
Supplemental figure 3Q: Small head size prevalence difference	18

These figures are forest plots showing the study-level estimates of intervention effect with the pooled estimate in the bottom summary rows. For continuous outcomes the intervention effect is measured by the difference in mean of the LNS group minus control. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence ratios the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group divided by the prevalence in the control group. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence differences the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group minus the prevalence in the control group. The labels on the left y-axis correspond to trial level information. The values on the right indicate the study level effect estimate, confidence interval, and weighting for deriving the pooled estimate. LAZ, length-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score.


Supplemental figure 3A: Mean difference in LAZ




Supplemental figure 3B: Stunting prevalence ratio




Supplemental figure 3C: Stunting prevalence difference




Supplemental figure 3D: Mean difference in WLZ




Supplemental figure 3E: Wasting prevalence ratio




Supplemental figure 3F: Wasting prevalence difference




Supplemental figure 3G: Mean difference in MUACZ




Supplemental figure 3H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio




Supplemental figure 3I: Low MUAC prevalence difference




Supplemental figure 3J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio




Supplemental figure 3K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference




Supplemental figure 3L: Mean difference in WAZ




Supplemental figure 3M: Underweight prevalence ratio




Supplemental figure 3N: Underweight prevalence difference




Supplemental figure 3O: Mean difference in HCZ



Supplemental figure 3P: Small head size prevalence ratio



Supplemental figure 3Q: Small head size prevalence difference



Supplemental figure 4: Forest plots for effects of SQ-LNS on growth outcomes stratified by study-level effect modifiers

Contents

Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ	6
4A1: Stratified by Geographic region	6
4A2: Stratified by Stunting burden	7
4A3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	8
4A4: Stratified by Source water quality	9
4A5: Stratified by Sanitation	10
4A6: Stratified by Supplement duration	11
4A7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	12
4A8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	13
Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio	14
4B1: Stratified by Geographic region	14
4B2: Stratified by Stunting burden	15
4B3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	16
4B4: Stratified by Source water quality	17
4B5: Stratified by Sanitation	18
4B6: Stratified by Supplement duration	19
4B7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	20
4B8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	21
Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference	22
4C1: Stratified by Geographic region	22
4C2: Stratified by Stunting burden	23
4C3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	24
4C4: Stratified by Source water quality	25
4C5: Stratified by Sanitation	26
4C6: Stratified by Supplement duration	27
4C7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	28
4C8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	29

Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ	30
4D1: Stratified by Geographic region	30
4D2: Stratified by Stunting burden	31
4D3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	32
4D4: Stratified by Source water quality	33
4D5: Stratified by Sanitation	34
4D6: Stratified by Supplement duration	35
4D7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	36
4D8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	37
Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio	38
4E1: Stratified by Geographic region	38
4E2: Stratified by Stunting burden	39
4E3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	40
4E4: Stratified by Source water quality	41
4E5: Stratified by Sanitation	42
4E6: Stratified by Supplement duration	43
4E7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	44
4E8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	45
Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference	46
4F1: Stratified by Geographic region	46
4F2: Stratified by Stunting burden	47
4F3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	48
4F4: Stratified by Source water quality	49
4F5: Stratified by Sanitation	50
4F6: Stratified by Supplement duration	51
4F7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	52
4F8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	53
Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ	54
4G1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)	54
4G2: Stratified by Stunting burden	55
4G3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	56
4G4: Stratified by Source water quality	57
4G5: Stratified by Sanitation	58
4G6: Stratified by Supplement duration	59
4G7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	60
4G8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	61
Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio	62
4H1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)	62

4H2: Stratified by Stunting burden	63
4H3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	64
4H4: Stratified by Source water quality	65
4H5: Stratified by Sanitation	66
4H6: Stratified by Supplement duration	67
4H7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	68
4H8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	69
Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference	70
4I1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)	70
4I2: Stratified by Stunting burden	71
4I3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	72
4I4: Stratified by Source water quality	73
4I5: Stratified by Sanitation	74
4I6: Stratified by Supplement duration	75
4I7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	76
4I8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	77
Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio	78
4J1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)	78
4J2: Stratified by Stunting burden	79
4J3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	80
4J4: Stratified by Source water quality	81
4J5: Stratified by Sanitation	82
4J6: Stratified by Supplement duration	83
4J7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	84
4J8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	85
Supplemental figure 4K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference	86
4K1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)	86
4K2: Stratified by Stunting burden	87
4K3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	88
4K4: Stratified by Source water quality	89
4K5: Stratified by Sanitation	90
4K6: Stratified by Supplement duration	91
4K7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	92
4K8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	93
Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ	94
4L1: Stratified by Geographic region	94
4L2: Stratified by Stunting burden	95
4L3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	96

4L4: Stratified by Source water quality	97
4L5: Stratified by Sanitation	98
4L6: Stratified by Supplement duration	99
4L7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	100
4L8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	101
Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio	102
4M1: Stratified by Geographic region	102
4M2: Stratified by Stunting burden	103
4M3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	104
4M4: Stratified by Source water quality	105
4M5: Stratified by Sanitation	106
4M6: Stratified by Supplement duration	107
4M7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	108
4M8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	109
Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference	110
4N1: Stratified by Geographic region	110
4N2: Stratified by Stunting burden	111
4N3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	112
4N4: Stratified by Source water quality	113
4N5: Stratified by Sanitation	114
4N6: Stratified by Supplement duration	115
4N7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	116
4N8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	117
Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ	118
4O1: Stratified by Geographic region	118
4O2: Stratified by Stunting burden	119
4O3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	120
4O4: Stratified by Source water quality	121
4O5: Stratified by Sanitation	122
4O6: Stratified by Supplement duration	123
4O7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	124
4O8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	125
Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio	126
4P1: Stratified by Geographic region	126
4P2: Stratified by Stunting burden	127
4P3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	128
4P4: Stratified by Source water quality	129
4P5: Stratified by Sanitation	130

4P6: Stratified by Supplement duration	131
4P7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	132
4P8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	133
Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference	134
4Q1: Stratified by Geographic region	134
4Q2: Stratified by Stunting burden	135
4Q3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence	136
4Q4: Stratified by Source water quality	137
4Q5: Stratified by Sanitation	138
4Q6: Stratified by Supplement duration	139
4Q7: Stratified by Frequency of contact	140
4Q8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance	141

These figures are forest plots showing the study-level effect modification of intervention effects. Each figure shows the study-level estimates along with the corresponding pooled estimate grouped by study-level effect modifier category. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence ratios, the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group divided by the prevalence in the control group. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence differences, the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group minus the prevalence in the control group. The labels on the left y-axis correspond to trial level information. The values on the right indicate the study level effect estimate, confidence interval, and weighting for deriving the pooled estimates. LAZ, length-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score.

Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ

4A1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region

(p -diff = 0.636)

Geographic region – SEAR


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431
		5659	5490

$I^2 = 0.78$, $\tau^2 = 0.00$

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330
		11440	13908

$I^2 = 0.60$, $\tau^2 = 0.01$



Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ


4A2: Stratified by Stunting burden

Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.309)


Stunting burden – Less than 35%

Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
I² = 0.53, Tau² = 0.01		3564	7871



Stunting burden – More than 35%

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330
I² = 0.72, Tau² = 0.01		13684	11676



Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ

4A3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence
(p-diff = 0.508)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330
		11184	14582

I² = 0.62, Tau² = 0.00

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
		6064	4965

I² = 0.68, Tau² = 0.01



Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ

4A4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality
(p-diff = 0.313)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	0.09 (0.03, 0.14)	0.19
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.08 (-0.01, 0.16)	0.16
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	567	1104	0.26 (0.16, 0.36)	0.14
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.28 (-0.02, 0.58)	0.04
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.20 (0.07, 0.33)	0.12
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149	-0.01 (-0.14, 0.13)	0.11
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.08 (-0.25, 0.10)	0.09
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	0.06 (-0.04, 0.17)	0.14
I² = 0.65, Tau² = 0.01		6578 4785		0.10 (0.02, 0.18)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	0.31 (0.22, 0.39)	0.16
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	0.15 (0.02, 0.27)	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	0.04 (-0.14, 0.22)	0.09
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	695	2253	0.11 (0.00, 0.21)	0.14
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682	0.03 (-0.11, 0.17)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	0.16 (0.01, 0.31)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	0.22 (0.05, 0.39)	0.09
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	892	880	0.11 (0.00, 0.21)	0.14
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.27 (-0.01, 0.55)	0.05
I² = 0.59, Tau² = 0.00		8139 8453		0.15 (0.09, 0.22)	



Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ

4A5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.694)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	567	1104
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
I² = 0.50, Tau² = 0.00		8413	6928

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	695	2253
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	892	880
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146
I² = 0.78, Tau² = 0.01		6304	6310



Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ

4A6: Stratified by Supplement duration

Supplement duration
(p-diff = 0.461)

Supplement duration – 12m or less


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330
		11512	8689

I² = 0.71, Tau² = 0.01

Supplement duration – > 12m

Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
		5736	10858

I² = 0.37, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ

4A7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.527)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.08 (-0.01, 0.16)	0.13
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	0.15 (0.02, 0.27)	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	0.04 (-0.14, 0.22)	0.07
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149	-0.01 (-0.14, 0.13)	0.09
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137	0.15 (0.09, 0.21)	0.15
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682	0.03 (-0.11, 0.17)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	0.16 (0.01, 0.31)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	0.22 (0.05, 0.39)	0.07
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794	0.16 (0.08, 0.23)	0.14
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330	0.25 (0.08, 0.43)	0.07
I² = 0.29, Tau² = 0.00		9939	12735	0.12 (0.08, 0.17)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	0.09 (0.03, 0.14)	0.21
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431	0.21 (0.14, 0.28)	0.19
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	0.31 (0.22, 0.39)	0.17
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.28 (-0.02, 0.58)	0.04
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.20 (0.07, 0.33)	0.13
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.08 (-0.25, 0.10)	0.10
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	0.06 (-0.04, 0.17)	0.16
I² = 0.81, Tau² = 0.01		7309	6812	0.15 (0.06, 0.25)	



Supplemental figure 4A: Mean difference in LAZ

4A8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance
(p-diff = 0.724)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low


Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330
		6231	6329

I² = 0.37, Tau² = 0.00

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137
		9315	11536

I² = 0.80, Tau² = 0.01



Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio

4B1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region


(p-diff = 0.646)

Geographic region – SEAR

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	0.92 (0.84, 1.01)	0.32
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.92 (0.85, 1.00)	0.34
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431	0.84 (0.77, 0.91)	0.34
I² = 0.36, Tau² = 0.00		5659	5490	0.89 (0.84, 0.95)	

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	0.75 (0.65, 0.87)	0.09
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	0.82 (0.67, 1.00)	0.07
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	0.87 (0.63, 1.19)	0.03
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.70 (0.23, 2.13)	0.00
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.66 (0.45, 0.98)	0.02
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137	0.86 (0.78, 0.94)	0.14
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682	0.98 (0.90, 1.07)	0.14
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	1.10 (0.89, 1.36)	0.06
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	1.00 (0.87, 1.15)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	0.92 (0.76, 1.10)	0.07
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	0.78 (0.65, 0.95)	0.07
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794	0.79 (0.72, 0.87)	0.13
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330	0.81 (0.68, 0.96)	0.08
I² = 0.57, Tau² = 0.01		11440	13908	0.87 (0.81, 0.93)	



Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio

4B2: Stratified by Stunting burden

Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.912)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%


Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
I² = 0.21, Tau² = 0.00		3564	7871

PR

(95% CI)	W
0.82 (0.67, 1.00)	0.20
0.87 (0.63, 1.19)	0.10
0.70 (0.23, 2.13)	0.01
0.66 (0.45, 0.98)	0.06
1.04 (0.60, 1.81)	0.03
0.86 (0.78, 0.94)	0.42
1.10 (0.89, 1.36)	0.18
0.88 (0.79, 0.97)	

Stunting burden – More than 35%

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330
I² = 0.63, Tau² = 0.01		13684	11676



Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio

4B3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence

(p-diff = 0.862)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330
		11184	14582

I² = 0.55, Tau² = 0.00

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
		6064	4965

I² = 0.51, Tau² = 0.01




Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio

4B4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality

(p-diff = 0.267)

Source water quality – Improved



Source water quality – Unimproved



Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio

4B5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.328)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	0.92 (0.84, 1.01)	0.22
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.92 (0.85, 1.00)	0.24
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	567	1104	0.80 (0.70, 0.92)	0.15
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	0.82 (0.67, 1.00)	0.09
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	0.87 (0.63, 1.19)	0.04
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.70 (0.23, 2.13)	0.00
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.66 (0.45, 0.98)	0.03
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149	1.04 (0.60, 1.81)	0.02
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	0.92 (0.76, 1.10)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	0.78 (0.65, 0.95)	0.10
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		8413	6928	0.88 (0.84, 0.93)	

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	0.75 (0.65, 0.87)	0.15
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	695	2253	0.92 (0.79, 1.08)	0.13
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682	0.98 (0.90, 1.07)	0.24
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	1.10 (0.89, 1.36)	0.09
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	1.00 (0.87, 1.15)	0.16
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	892	880	0.85 (0.74, 0.97)	0.17
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.79 (0.61, 1.04)	0.06
I² = 0.63, Tau² = 0.01		6304	6310	0.91 (0.83, 1.00)	




Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio

4B6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.742)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m



Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio

4B7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p -diff = 0.734)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.92 (0.85, 1.00)	0.17
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	0.82 (0.67, 1.00)	0.07
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	0.87 (0.63, 1.19)	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149	1.04 (0.60, 1.81)	0.01
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137	0.86 (0.78, 0.94)	0.15
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682	0.98 (0.90, 1.07)	0.16
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	0.92 (0.76, 1.10)	0.08
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	0.78 (0.65, 0.95)	0.08
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794	0.79 (0.72, 0.87)	0.15
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330	0.81 (0.68, 0.96)	0.09
$I^2 = 0.41, \text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$		9939	12735	0.87 (0.83, 0.92)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	0.92 (0.84, 1.01)	0.25
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431	0.84 (0.77, 0.91)	0.27
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	0.75 (0.65, 0.87)	0.16
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.70 (0.23, 2.13)	0.01
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.66 (0.45, 0.98)	0.04
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	1.10 (0.89, 1.36)	0.10
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	1.00 (0.87, 1.15)	0.17
$I^2 = 0.63, \text{Tau}^2 = 0.01$		7309	6812	0.88 (0.79, 0.99)	




Supplemental figure 4B: Stunting prevalence ratio


4B8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance
(p-diff = 0.974)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low



Average SQ-LNS compliance – High



Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference

4C1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region

(p -diff = 0.874)

Geographic region – SEAR


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431
		5659	5490

$I^2 = 0.26$, $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330
		11440	13908

$I^2 = 0.60$, $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$




Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference

4C2: Stratified by Stunting burden


Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.181)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%



Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference

4C3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence
(p-diff = 0.848)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.01)	0.16
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	0.12
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.14
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149	-0.02 (-0.08, 0.04)	0.07
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137	-0.05 (-0.07, -0.02)	0.16
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.14
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.15
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330	-0.10 (-0.17, -0.02)	0.05
		11184	14582	-0.05 (-0.06, -0.03)	

I² = 0.45, Tau² = 0.00

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	-0.11 (-0.14, -0.08)	0.17
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	-0.05 (-0.10, -0.01)	0.13
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	-0.03 (-0.09, 0.02)	0.10
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.02 (-0.09, 0.05)	0.07
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	0.14
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.03 (-0.04, 0.11)	0.06
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.04)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.01)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.03)	0.13
		6064	4965	-0.05 (-0.07, -0.02)	

I² = 0.61, Tau² = 0.00




Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference

4C4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality

(p-diff = 0.234)

Source water quality – Improved



Source water quality – Unimproved



-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
 Difference
 Favors LNS Favors Control

Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference

4C5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.839)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.01)	0.16
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	0.11
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	567	1104	-0.08 (-0.13, -0.03)	0.09
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	-0.05 (-0.10, -0.01)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	-0.03 (-0.09, 0.02)	0.08
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.02 (-0.09, 0.05)	0.06
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	0.12
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149	-0.02 (-0.08, 0.04)	0.07
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.01)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.03)	0.11
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		8413	6928	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.03)	

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	-0.11 (-0.14, -0.08)	0.22
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	695	2253	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.18
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.21
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.03 (-0.04, 0.11)	0.08
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.04)	0.12
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	892	880	-0.05 (-0.09, -0.01)	0.16
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	-0.11 (-0.22, 0.01)	0.04
I² = 0.77, Tau² = 0.00		6304	6310	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	




Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference

4C6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.654)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m



Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference

4C7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.910)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	-0.05 (-0.10, -0.01)	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	-0.03 (-0.09, 0.02)	0.08
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149	-0.02 (-0.08, 0.04)	0.07
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137	-0.05 (-0.07, -0.02)	0.15
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1682	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.13
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.01)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.03)	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.14
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330	-0.10 (-0.17, -0.02)	0.05
I² = 0.28, Tau² = 0.00		9939	12735	-0.05 (-0.06, -0.03)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.01)	0.21
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.19
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	-0.11 (-0.14, -0.08)	0.19
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.02 (-0.09, 0.05)	0.08
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	0.16
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.03 (-0.04, 0.11)	0.07
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.04)	0.10
I² = 0.72, Tau² = 0.00		7309	6812	-0.04 (-0.08, -0.01)	



Supplemental figure 4C: Stunting prevalence difference

4C8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance

(p-diff = 0.803)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low


Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	863	914	-0.05 (-0.10, -0.01)	0.13
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	439	-0.03 (-0.09, 0.02)	0.09
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	0.14
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.03 (-0.04, 0.11)	0.06
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.04)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS (46)	506	506	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.01)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	952	969	-0.07 (-0.11, -0.03)	0.14
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1880	1794	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.18
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	330	-0.10 (-0.17, -0.02)	0.06
		6231	6329	-0.05 (-0.07, -0.03)	

I² = 0.30, Tau² = 0.00

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2838	1244	-0.04 (-0.06, -0.01)	0.19
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	0.13
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1158	3431	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.17
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	-0.11 (-0.14, -0.08)	0.17
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.02 (-0.09, 0.05)	0.07
Haiti	HAITI (41)	149	149	-0.02 (-0.08, 0.04)	0.08
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1457	5137	-0.05 (-0.07, -0.02)	0.19
		9315	11536	-0.05 (-0.08, -0.03)	

I² = 0.65, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ

4D1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region


(p -diff = 0.482)

Geographic region – SEAR

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217	0.08 (0.03, 0.13)	0.37
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	0.07 (0.00, 0.15)	0.30
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424	0.12 (0.05, 0.19)	0.32
		5600	5456	0.09 (0.06, 0.12)	

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	0.18 (0.11, 0.26)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907	0.10 (-0.03, 0.22)	0.07
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	-0.11 (-0.24, 0.02)	0.07
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.21 (-0.13, 0.54)	0.02
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.09 (-0.04, 0.22)	0.07
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118	0.06 (0.00, 0.13)	0.12
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682	0.00 (-0.11, 0.11)	0.08
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.05 (-0.21, 0.11)	0.06
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	0.01 (-0.12, 0.14)	0.07
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	0.10 (-0.02, 0.23)	0.08
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	0.16 (0.06, 0.26)	0.09
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784	0.08 (0.00, 0.15)	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	-0.14 (-0.32, 0.04)	0.05
		11402	13853	0.06 (0.00, 0.11)	



Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ

4D2: Stratified by Stunting burden

Stunting burden


(p-diff = 0.264)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%

Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
I² = 0.38, Tau² = 0.00		3554	7842

Stunting burden – More than 35%

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
I² = 0.55, Tau² = 0.00		13596	11616



Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ

4D3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence

(p-diff = 0.629)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		11108	14517

I² = 0.27, Tau² = 0.00

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
		6042	4941

I² = 0.64, Tau² = 0.01




Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ


4D4: Stratified by Source water quality

Source water quality
(p-diff = 0.707)

Source water quality – Improved



Source water quality – Unimproved




Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ


4D5: Stratified by Sanitation

Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.211)

Sanitation – Improved



Sanitation – Unimproved



Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ

4D6: Stratified by Supplement duration

Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.207)

Supplement duration – 12m or less


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		11435	8640

I² = 0.61, Tau² = 0.01

Supplement duration – > 12m

Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
		5715	10818

I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ

4D7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.251)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
I² = 0.49, Tau² = 0.00		9898	12680

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
I² = 0.50, Tau² = 0.00		7252	6778



Supplemental figure 4D: Mean difference in WLZ

4D8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance

(p-diff = 0.101)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low


Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		6197	6293

I² = 0.57, Tau² = 0.01

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
		9253	11483

I² = 0.28, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio

4E1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region


(p-diff = 0.973)

Geographic region – SEAR

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217	0.91 (0.78, 1.05)	0.49
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	0.87 (0.70, 1.07)	0.23
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424	0.79 (0.65, 0.96)	0.28
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		5600	5456	0.86 (0.78, 0.96)	

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	0.69 (0.54, 0.87)	0.24
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907	0.86 (0.59, 1.27)	0.09
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	1.03 (0.72, 1.49)	0.10
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.87 (0.35, 2.16)	0.02
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.84 (0.52, 1.37)	0.06
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118	0.88 (0.53, 1.45)	0.05
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682	0.96 (0.67, 1.38)	0.10
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.94 (0.39, 2.28)	0.02
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	1.37 (0.78, 2.40)	0.04
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	0.61 (0.15, 2.42)	0.01
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	0.83 (0.63, 1.10)	0.17
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784	0.89 (0.60, 1.34)	0.08
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	1.38 (0.65, 2.96)	0.02
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		11402	13853	0.86 (0.77, 0.97)	




Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio

4E2: Stratified by Stunting burden


Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.532)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%




Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio

4E3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence


Malaria prevalence

(p -diff = 0.533)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%



Malaria prevalence – At least 10%




Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio

4E4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality

(p-diff = 0.371)

Source water quality – Improved



Source water quality – Unimproved




Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio


4E5: Stratified by Sanitation

Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.532)

Sanitation – Improved



Sanitation – Unimproved



0.25 0.50 1.0 2.0 4.0
Ratio
Favors LNS Favors Control


Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio

4E6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.368)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m




Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio


4E7: Stratified by Frequency of contact

Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.399)

Frequency of contact – Monthly



Frequency of contact – Weekly



0.25 0.50 1.0 2.0 4.0
Ratio
Favors LNS Favors Control

Supplemental figure 4E: Wasting prevalence ratio

4E8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance
(p-diff = 0.231)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low


Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		6197	6293

I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
		9253	11483

I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference

4F1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region

(p-diff = 0.025)

Geographic region – SEAR


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
		5600	5456

I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		11402	13853

I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference

4F2: Stratified by Stunting burden

Stunting burden


(p -diff = 0.203)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%

Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
$I^2 = 0.00$, $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$		3554	7842

Stunting burden – More than 35%

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
$I^2 = 0.37$, $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$		13596	11616



Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference

4F3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence

(p-diff = 0.216)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		11108	14517

I² = 0.11, Tau² = 0.00

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
		6042	4941

I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference

4F4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality
(p-diff = 0.560)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.22
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.13
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	566	1101	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.13
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.01 (-0.09, 0.07)	0.02
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.11
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.16
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.14
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)	0.10
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		6519	4755	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.01)	0.05
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.05
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.00 (-0.04, 0.05)	0.02
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	694	2244	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.38
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682	0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.13
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.17
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.05
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	876	0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.14
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.00 (-0.05, 0.05)	0.02
I² = 0.11, Tau² = 0.00		8109	8416	-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	



Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference

4F5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.251)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	566	1101
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		8332	6874

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	694	2244
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	876
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146
I² = 0.27, Tau² = 0.00		6296	6297



Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference

4F6: Stratified by Supplement duration

Supplement duration


(p-diff = 0.696)

Supplement duration – 12m or less

Country	Trial	N	N		PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217		-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.08
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664		-0.04 (-0.07, -0.01)	0.06
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907		-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.06
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436		0.00 (-0.04, 0.05)	0.02
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96		-0.01 (-0.09, 0.07)	0.01
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692		-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149		0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.06
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682		0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.16
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444		0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.05
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241		0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)	0.04
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784		0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.40
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328		0.01 (-0.02, 0.05)	0.04
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		11435	8640		-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	

Supplement duration – > 12m

Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815		-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.04
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424		-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	0.08
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118		0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)	0.68
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502		-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.16
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959		-0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.04
I² = 0.37, Tau² = 0.00		5715	10818		-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	



Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference

4F7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.017)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.02
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	856	907	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.03
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.00 (-0.04, 0.05)	0.01
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	149	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.03
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1455	5118	0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)	0.46
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1700	1682	0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.08
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.03
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1784	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.21
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	0.01 (-0.02, 0.05)	0.02
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		9898	12680	0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1217	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.21
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1156	3424	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	0.28
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1952	664	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.01)	0.15
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.01 (-0.09, 0.07)	0.02
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.10
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.13
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	241	0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)	0.10
I² = 0.13, Tau² = 0.00		7252	6778	-0.02 (-0.03, -0.01)	




Supplemental figure 4F: Wasting prevalence difference

4F8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance


Average SQ-LNS compliance

(p-diff = 0.204)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low



Average SQ-LNS compliance – High



Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ

4G1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)

Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ

4G2: Stratified by Stunting burden

Stunting burden


(p-diff = 0.433)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912	0.09 (-0.03, 0.21)	0.20
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436	-0.06 (-0.22, 0.10)	0.15
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.09 (-0.03, 0.20)	0.21
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5185	0.12 (0.05, 0.18)	0.29
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.04 (-0.20, 0.12)	0.15
I² = 0.35, Tau² = 0.00		3306	7670	0.06 (0.00, 0.13)	

Stunting burden – More than 35%

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271	0.08 (0.03, 0.13)	0.15
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.04 (-0.04, 0.12)	0.13
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666	0.30 (0.20, 0.39)	0.12
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658	-0.03 (-0.16, 0.09)	0.09
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240	0.06 (-0.05, 0.18)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505	0.19 (0.05, 0.32)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970	0.13 (0.01, 0.25)	0.10
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1872	1780	0.06 (0.00, 0.12)	0.14
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	328	0.04 (-0.10, 0.17)	0.09
I² = 0.72, Tau² = 0.01		12565	8233	0.10 (0.03, 0.16)	



Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ

4G3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence

(p-diff = 0.248)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)		
Haiti	HAITI (41)		
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5185
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1872	1780
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	328
		9910	11037

I² = 0.11, Tau² = 0.00

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)		
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970
		5961	4866

I² = 0.71, Tau² = 0.01




Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ


4G4: Stratified by Source water quality

Source water quality
(p-diff = 0.438)

Source water quality – Improved



Source water quality – Unimproved



Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ

4G5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.887)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)		
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)		
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Haiti	HAITI (41)		
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970
I² = 0.17, Tau² = 0.00		7646	5602

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2270
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	889	871
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146
I² = 0.78, Tau² = 0.01		6288	6295




Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ

4G6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.427)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m



Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ

4G7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.388)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.04 (-0.04, 0.12)	0.14
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912	0.09 (-0.03, 0.21)	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436	-0.06 (-0.22, 0.10)	0.08
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5185	0.12 (0.05, 0.18)	0.15
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658	-0.03 (-0.16, 0.09)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505	0.19 (0.05, 0.32)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970	0.13 (0.01, 0.25)	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1872	1780	0.06 (0.00, 0.12)	0.15
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	328	0.04 (-0.10, 0.17)	0.09
I² = 0.34, Tau² = 0.00		9752	12589	0.07 (0.03, 0.11)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271	0.08 (0.03, 0.13)	0.28
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666	0.30 (0.20, 0.39)	0.21
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.09 (-0.03, 0.20)	0.18
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.04 (-0.20, 0.12)	0.13
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240	0.06 (-0.05, 0.18)	0.19
I² = 0.81, Tau² = 0.01		6119	3314	0.10 (0.00, 0.21)	




Supplemental figure 4G: Mean difference in MUACZ


4G8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance
(p-diff = 0.228)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low



Average SQ-LNS compliance – High



Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

4H1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)


Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

4H2: Stratified by Stunting burden


Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.925)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%



Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

4H3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence

(p-diff = 0.684)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271	0.85 (0.70, 1.03)	0.36
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	1.02 (0.69, 1.49)	0.12
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5185	0.71 (0.54, 0.94)	0.21
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658	0.97 (0.76, 1.26)	0.24
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1872	1780	0.51 (0.27, 0.97)	0.05
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	328	0.97 (0.29, 3.28)	0.01
		9910	11037	0.84 (0.73, 0.98)	

I² = 0.17, Tau² = 0.01

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666	0.64 (0.51, 0.79)	0.34
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912	0.94 (0.63, 1.40)	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436	0.92 (0.66, 1.28)	0.17
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.77 (0.37, 1.57)	0.04
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.94 (0.39, 2.28)	0.03
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240	1.35 (0.54, 3.36)	0.03
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505	0.58 (0.31, 1.07)	0.05
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970	0.90 (0.68, 1.19)	0.22
		5961	4866	0.79 (0.68, 0.92)	

I² = 0.19, Tau² = 0.01



Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

4H4: Stratified by Source water quality

Source water quality


(p-diff = 0.367)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271	0.85 (0.70, 1.03)	0.69
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	1.02 (0.69, 1.49)	0.19
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.77 (0.37, 1.57)	0.05
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.94 (0.39, 2.28)	0.03
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240	1.35 (0.54, 3.36)	0.03
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		5823	3463	0.89 (0.76, 1.05)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666	0.64 (0.51, 0.79)	0.29
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912	0.94 (0.63, 1.40)	0.09
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436	0.92 (0.66, 1.28)	0.13
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2270	0.67 (0.41, 1.10)	0.06
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658	0.97 (0.76, 1.26)	0.21
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505	0.58 (0.31, 1.07)	0.04
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970	0.90 (0.68, 1.19)	0.17
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	889	871	0.65 (0.25, 1.68)	0.02
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.50 (0.05, 5.43)	0.00
I² = 0.24, Tau² = 0.01		8111	8434	0.80 (0.70, 0.92)	



Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

4H5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.291)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271	0.85 (0.70, 1.03)	0.40
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	1.02 (0.69, 1.49)	0.11
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912	0.94 (0.63, 1.40)	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436	0.92 (0.66, 1.28)	0.14
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.77 (0.37, 1.57)	0.03
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505	0.58 (0.31, 1.07)	0.04
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970	0.90 (0.68, 1.19)	0.19
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		7646	5602	0.88 (0.78, 0.99)	

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666	0.64 (0.51, 0.79)	0.47
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2270	0.67 (0.41, 1.10)	0.09
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658	0.97 (0.76, 1.26)	0.35
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.94 (0.39, 2.28)	0.03
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240	1.35 (0.54, 3.36)	0.03
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	889	871	0.65 (0.25, 1.68)	0.03
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.50 (0.05, 5.43)	0.00
I² = 0.30, Tau² = 0.01		6288	6295	0.77 (0.65, 0.93)	




Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio


4H6: Stratified by Supplement duration

Supplement duration
(p-diff = 0.928)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m




Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

4H7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact

(p-diff = 0.354)

Frequency of contact – Monthly



Frequency of contact – Weekly



0.25 0.50 1.0 2.0 4.0
Ratio
Favors LNS Favors Control

Supplemental figure 4H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

4H8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance


Average SQ-LNS compliance
(p-diff = 0.377)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912	0.94 (0.63, 1.40)	0.16
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436	0.92 (0.66, 1.28)	0.24
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.77 (0.37, 1.57)	0.05
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.94 (0.39, 2.28)	0.04
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240	1.35 (0.54, 3.36)	0.03
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505	0.58 (0.31, 1.07)	0.07
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970	0.90 (0.68, 1.19)	0.32
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1872	1780	0.51 (0.27, 0.97)	0.07
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	328	0.97 (0.29, 3.28)	0.02
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		6211	6308	0.86 (0.73, 1.01)	

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271	0.85 (0.70, 1.03)	0.37
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	1.02 (0.69, 1.49)	0.11
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666	0.64 (0.51, 0.79)	0.31
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5185	0.71 (0.54, 0.94)	0.20
I² = 0.53, Tau² = 0.02		7980	7937	0.77 (0.64, 0.93)	



Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

4I1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)


Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

4I2: Stratified by Stunting burden


Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.829)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%



-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
Difference
Favors LNS Favors Control

Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

4I3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence


(p-diff = 0.447)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%

Country	Trial	N	N		PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271		-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	0.14
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.15
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)					
Haiti	HAITI (41)					
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5185		-0.02 (-0.03, 0.00)	0.19
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.15
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1872	1780		-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	0.22
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	328		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.15
I² = 0.06, Tau² = 0.00		9910	11037		-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666		-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912		-0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)	0.14
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436		-0.01 (-0.06, 0.03)	0.06
Ghana	GHANA (39)					
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693		-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.15
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444		0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.12
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240		0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.16
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505		-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.14
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970		-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.12
I² = 0.64, Tau² = 0.00		5961	4866		-0.02 (-0.03, 0.00)	



Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

4I4: Stratified by Source water quality

Source water quality


(p-diff = 0.262)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N		PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271		-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	0.22
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.23
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)					
Ghana	GHANA (39)					
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693		-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.20
Haiti	HAITI (41)					
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444		0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.15
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240		0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.20
I² = 0.05, Tau² = 0.00		5823	3463		-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666		-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.08
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912		-0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436		-0.01 (-0.06, 0.03)	0.04
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2270		-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	0.15
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658		0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.13
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505		-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970		-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.09
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	889	871		0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	0.19
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146		-0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)	0.11
I² = 0.60, Tau² = 0.00		8111	8434		-0.02 (-0.03, 0.00)	



Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

4I5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.982)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)		
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)		
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Haiti	HAITI (41)		
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		7646	5602

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2270
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	889	871
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146
I² = 0.72, Tau² = 0.00		6288	6295




Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

4I6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.842)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m



Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

4I7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.331)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436	-0.01 (-0.06, 0.03)	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5185	-0.02 (-0.03, 0.00)	0.15
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1680	1658	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.12
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.09
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1872	1780	-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	0.17
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	328	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.12
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		9752	12589	-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	0.23
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.17
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.21
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.17
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240	0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.22
I² = 0.79, Tau² = 0.00		6119	3314	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)	



Supplemental figure 4I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

4I8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance


(p-diff = 0.094)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	854	912	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	436	-0.01 (-0.06, 0.03)	0.05
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.12
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.09
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	696	240	0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)	0.12
Mali	PROMIS (46)	507	505	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	954	970	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.10
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1872	1780	-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	0.18
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	328	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.13
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		6211	6308	-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2897	1271	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	0.24
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.26
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1959	666	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.18
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5185	-0.02 (-0.03, 0.00)	0.32
I² = 0.81, Tau² = 0.00		7980	7937	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	



Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

4J1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)


Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

4J2: Stratified by Stunting burden


Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.835)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%



Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

4J3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence

(p-diff = 0.526)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1216
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)		
Haiti	HAITI (41)		
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1454	5117
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1675	1655
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1867	1777
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	327
		9776	10907

I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1951	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	846	901
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	434
Ghana	GHANA (39)		
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	690	240
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
		5921	4836

I² = 0.22, Tau² = 0.01



Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

4J4: Stratified by Source water quality

Source water quality


(p-diff = 0.378)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1216	0.89 (0.78, 1.01)	0.65
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	0.86 (0.70, 1.05)	0.25
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.85 (0.54, 1.35)	0.05
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.81 (0.36, 1.80)	0.02
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	690	240	1.42 (0.83, 2.43)	0.04
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		5701	3407	0.89 (0.81, 0.99)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1951	664	0.67 (0.54, 0.85)	0.23
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	846	901	0.83 (0.60, 1.14)	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	434	0.95 (0.73, 1.23)	0.18
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	694	2244	0.76 (0.43, 1.34)	0.04
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1675	1655	0.98 (0.75, 1.29)	0.16
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	0.59 (0.23, 1.47)	0.01
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	0.89 (0.70, 1.13)	0.21
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	886	871	0.82 (0.49, 1.37)	0.05
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.87 (0.27, 2.79)	0.01
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		8066	8376	0.84 (0.75, 0.93)	



Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

4J5: Stratified by Sanitation

Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.450)

Sanitation – Improved


Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1216	0.89 (0.78, 1.01)	0.46
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	0.86 (0.70, 1.05)	0.18
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	846	901	0.83 (0.60, 1.14)	0.07
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	434	0.95 (0.73, 1.23)	0.11
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.85 (0.54, 1.35)	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	0.59 (0.23, 1.47)	0.01
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	0.89 (0.70, 1.13)	0.13
		7504	5519	0.88 (0.81, 0.96)	

I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1951	664	0.67 (0.54, 0.85)	0.43
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	694	2244	0.76 (0.43, 1.34)	0.07
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1675	1655	0.98 (0.75, 1.29)	0.29
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.81 (0.36, 1.80)	0.03
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	690	240	1.42 (0.83, 2.43)	0.08
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	886	871	0.82 (0.49, 1.37)	0.08
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.87 (0.27, 2.79)	0.02
		6263	6264	0.85 (0.70, 1.02)	

I² = 0.31, Tau² = 0.01




Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

4J6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.607)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m




Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio


4J7: Stratified by Frequency of contact

Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.706)

Frequency of contact – Monthly



Frequency of contact – Weekly



Supplemental figure 4J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

4J8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance


Average SQ-LNS compliance
(p-diff = 0.269)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	846	901	0.83 (0.60, 1.14)	0.16
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	434	0.95 (0.73, 1.23)	0.24
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.85 (0.54, 1.35)	0.08
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.81 (0.36, 1.80)	0.02
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	690	240	1.42 (0.83, 2.43)	0.06
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	0.59 (0.23, 1.47)	0.02
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	0.89 (0.70, 1.13)	0.28
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1867	1777	0.79 (0.55, 1.14)	0.12
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	327	1.23 (0.61, 2.48)	0.03
		6173	6276	0.90 (0.79, 1.02)	

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1216	0.89 (0.78, 1.01)	0.55
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	0.86 (0.70, 1.05)	0.21
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1951	664	0.67 (0.54, 0.85)	0.17
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1454	5117	0.71 (0.49, 1.02)	0.07
		7849	7812	0.81 (0.71, 0.92)	



Supplemental figure 4K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

4K1: Stratified by Geographic region (insufficient comparisons)


Supplemental figure 4K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

4K2: Stratified by Stunting burden



Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.872)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%



Supplemental figure 4K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

4K3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence


(p-diff = 0.181)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1216	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.12
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.09
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1454	5117	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	0.30
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1675	1655	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.16
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1867	1777	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	0.26
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	327	0.01 (-0.02, 0.04)	0.07
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		9776	10907	-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1951	664	-0.06 (-0.09, -0.03)	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	846	901	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.13
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	434	-0.01 (-0.06, 0.04)	0.05
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.02)	0.11
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.12
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	690	240	0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.23
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.13
I² = 0.35, Tau² = 0.00		5921	4836	-0.02 (-0.03, 0.00)	




Supplemental figure 4K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

4K4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality

(p-diff = 0.852)

Source water quality – Improved



Source water quality – Unimproved



-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
Difference
Favors LNS Favors Control

Supplemental figure 4K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

4K6: Stratified by Supplement duration

Supplement duration


(p-diff = 0.887)

Supplement duration – 12m or less

Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1216
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1951	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	846	901
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	434
Ghana	GHANA (39)		
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)		
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1675	1655
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	690	240
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1867	1777
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	327
I² = 0.43, Tau² = 0.00		11139	8350

Supplement duration – > 12m

Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)		
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1454	5117
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		4558	7393



Supplemental figure 4K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

4K7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.113)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1661	815	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.07
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	846	901	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	0.07
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	424	434	-0.01 (-0.06, 0.04)	0.03
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1454	5117	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	0.23
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1675	1655	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	0.12
Mali	PROMIS (46)	499	502	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.13
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	944	959	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.07
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1867	1777	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	0.21
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	327	0.01 (-0.02, 0.04)	0.06
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		9706	12487	-0.01 (-0.01, 0.00)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2783	1216	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	0.28
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)				
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1951	664	-0.06 (-0.09, -0.03)	0.20
Ghana	GHANA (39)				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.02)	0.17
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)	0.19
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	690	240	0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)	0.16
I² = 0.62, Tau² = 0.00		5991	3256	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)	




Supplemental figure 4K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

4K8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance


Average SQ-LNS compliance

(p-diff = 0.129)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low



Average SQ-LNS compliance – High



Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ

4L1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region

(p -diff = 0.791)

Geographic region – SEAR


Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.10 (0.07, 0.14)	0.38
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.09 (0.01, 0.18)	0.30
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461	0.20 (0.13, 0.26)	0.33
		5640	5508	0.13 (0.07, 0.19)	

$I^2 = 0.68$, $\tau^2 = 0.00$

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.28 (0.21, 0.35)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.15 (0.03, 0.27)	0.08
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	-0.05 (-0.19, 0.09)	0.07
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.28 (-0.05, 0.61)	0.02
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.16 (0.03, 0.29)	0.07
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165	0.13 (0.07, 0.20)	0.11
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	0.01 (-0.10, 0.13)	0.08
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.07 (-0.23, 0.10)	0.06
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	0.05 (-0.05, 0.16)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.16 (0.05, 0.28)	0.08
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.23 (0.11, 0.36)	0.08
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786	0.13 (0.07, 0.20)	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	0.01 (-0.16, 0.18)	0.06
		11428	13913	0.12 (0.06, 0.17)	

$I^2 = 0.70$, $\tau^2 = 0.01$



Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ

4L2: Stratified by Stunting burden

Stunting burden


(p-diff = 0.292)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%

Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
I² = 0.50, Tau² = 0.01		3561	7895

Stunting burden – More than 35%

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
I² = 0.74, Tau² = 0.01		13655	11676



Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ

4L3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence
(p-diff = 0.490)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		11156	14622

I² = 0.42, Tau² = 0.00

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960
		6060	4949

I² = 0.75, Tau² = 0.01



Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ

4L4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality
(p-diff = 0.814)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.10 (0.07, 0.14)	0.20
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.09 (0.01, 0.18)	0.16
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	572	1119	0.25 (0.14, 0.37)	0.13
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.28 (-0.05, 0.61)	0.04
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.16 (0.03, 0.29)	0.12
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.06 (-0.06, 0.19)	0.12
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.07 (-0.23, 0.10)	0.09
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	0.05 (-0.05, 0.16)	0.14
I² = 0.49, Tau² = 0.00				0.11 (0.04, 0.17)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.28 (0.21, 0.35)	0.15
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.15 (0.03, 0.27)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	-0.05 (-0.19, 0.09)	0.10
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2261	0.09 (-0.01, 0.18)	0.13
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	0.01 (-0.10, 0.13)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.16 (0.05, 0.28)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.23 (0.11, 0.36)	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	876	0.07 (-0.02, 0.16)	0.13
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.03 (-0.21, 0.26)	0.05
I² = 0.75, Tau² = 0.01				0.12 (0.05, 0.19)	



Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ

4L5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.301)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.10 (0.07, 0.14)	0.16
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.09 (0.01, 0.18)	0.13
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	572	1119	0.25 (0.14, 0.37)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.15 (0.03, 0.27)	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	-0.05 (-0.19, 0.09)	0.09
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.28 (-0.05, 0.61)	0.03
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.16 (0.03, 0.29)	0.09
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.06 (-0.06, 0.19)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.16 (0.05, 0.28)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.23 (0.11, 0.36)	0.10
I² = 0.49, Tau² = 0.00		8375 6914		0.13 (0.08, 0.19)	

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.28 (0.21, 0.35)	0.19
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2261	0.09 (-0.01, 0.18)	0.17
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	0.01 (-0.10, 0.13)	0.15
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.07 (-0.23, 0.10)	0.10
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	0.05 (-0.05, 0.16)	0.16
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	876	0.07 (-0.02, 0.16)	0.17
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.03 (-0.21, 0.26)	0.07
I² = 0.81, Tau² = 0.01		6315 6319		0.08 (0.00, 0.16)	



Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ

4L6: Stratified by Supplement duration

Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.165)

Supplement duration – 12m or less


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		11483	8668

I² = 0.72, Tau² = 0.01

Supplement duration – > 12m

Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960
		5733	10903

I² = 0.24, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ

4L7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.339)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.09 (0.01, 0.18)	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.15 (0.03, 0.27)	0.09
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	-0.05 (-0.19, 0.09)	0.08
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.06 (-0.06, 0.19)	0.09
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165	0.13 (0.07, 0.20)	0.13
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	0.01 (-0.10, 0.13)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.16 (0.05, 0.28)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.23 (0.11, 0.36)	0.09
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786	0.13 (0.07, 0.20)	0.13
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	0.01 (-0.16, 0.18)	0.07
I² = 0.41, Tau² = 0.00		9912	12738	0.10 (0.06, 0.15)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.10 (0.07, 0.14)	0.22
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461	0.20 (0.13, 0.26)	0.19
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.28 (0.21, 0.35)	0.19
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.28 (-0.05, 0.61)	0.04
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.16 (0.03, 0.29)	0.12
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.07 (-0.23, 0.10)	0.10
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	0.05 (-0.05, 0.16)	0.15
I² = 0.81, Tau² = 0.01		7304	6833	0.14 (0.06, 0.23)	



Supplemental figure 4L: Mean difference in WAZ

4L8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance

(p-diff = 0.210)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low


Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		6207	6301

I² = 0.53, Tau² = 0.01

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165
		9307	11585

I² = 0.76, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio

4M1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region

(p-diff = 0.909)

Geographic region – SEAR


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461
I² = 0.57, Tau² = 0.00		5640	5508

PR

(95% CI)	W
0.91 (0.83, 1.01)	0.35
0.92 (0.83, 1.02)	0.34
0.79 (0.70, 0.89)	0.31
0.87 (0.79, 0.96)	

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
I² = 0.47, Tau² = 0.01		11428	13913



Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio

4M2: Stratified by Stunting burden

Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.979)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%


Country	Trial	N	N
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		3561	7895

PR

(95% CI)	W
0.86 (0.71, 1.05)	0.28
0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.21
0.71 (0.30, 1.69)	0.02
0.82 (0.57, 1.18)	0.11
0.71 (0.28, 1.78)	0.02
0.76 (0.62, 0.93)	0.27
1.13 (0.74, 1.72)	0.09
0.86 (0.77, 0.96)	

Stunting burden – More than 35%

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
I² = 0.61, Tau² = 0.01		13655	11676



Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio

4M3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence

(p-diff = 0.998)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		11156	14622

I² = 0.56, Tau² = 0.01

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960
		6060	4949

I² = 0.29, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio

4M4: Stratified by Source water quality

Source water quality


(p-diff = 0.601)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.91 (0.83, 1.01)	0.36
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.92 (0.83, 1.02)	0.33
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	572	1119	0.85 (0.73, 1.00)	0.17
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.71 (0.30, 1.69)	0.01
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.82 (0.57, 1.18)	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.71 (0.28, 1.78)	0.01
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	1.13 (0.74, 1.72)	0.03
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	1.01 (0.78, 1.31)	0.07
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		6564	4790	0.91 (0.86, 0.97)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.70 (0.59, 0.82)	0.21
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.86 (0.71, 1.05)	0.14
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.10
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2261	0.89 (0.65, 1.23)	0.06
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	1.04 (0.89, 1.21)	0.22
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.85 (0.62, 1.18)	0.06
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.88 (0.71, 1.10)	0.12
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	876	0.86 (0.64, 1.14)	0.07
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	1.03 (0.64, 1.69)	0.03
I² = 0.43, Tau² = 0.01		8126	8443	0.88 (0.80, 0.96)	



Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio

4M5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.873)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.91 (0.83, 1.01)	0.30
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.92 (0.83, 1.02)	0.27
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	572	1119	0.85 (0.73, 1.00)	0.14
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.86 (0.71, 1.05)	0.09
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.06
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.71 (0.30, 1.69)	0.01
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.82 (0.57, 1.18)	0.03
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.71 (0.28, 1.78)	0.00
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.85 (0.62, 1.18)	0.04
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.88 (0.71, 1.10)	0.08
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		8375	6914	0.90 (0.85, 0.95)	

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.70 (0.59, 0.82)	0.30
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2261	0.89 (0.65, 1.23)	0.08
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	1.04 (0.89, 1.21)	0.31
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	1.13 (0.74, 1.72)	0.05
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	1.01 (0.78, 1.31)	0.12
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	876	0.86 (0.64, 1.14)	0.10
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	1.03 (0.64, 1.69)	0.04
I² = 0.61, Tau² = 0.01		6315	6319	0.91 (0.80, 1.04)	



Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio

4M6: Stratified by Supplement duration

Supplement duration


(p-diff = 0.519)

Supplement duration – 12m or less

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.91 (0.83, 1.01)	0.21
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.70 (0.59, 0.82)	0.14
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.86 (0.71, 1.05)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.08
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.71 (0.30, 1.69)	0.01
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.82 (0.57, 1.18)	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.71 (0.28, 1.78)	0.01
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	1.04 (0.89, 1.21)	0.14
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	1.13 (0.74, 1.72)	0.03
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	1.01 (0.78, 1.31)	0.08
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786	0.71 (0.57, 0.87)	0.10
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	1.01 (0.73, 1.40)	0.05
I² = 0.49, Tau² = 0.01		11483	8668	0.88 (0.81, 0.97)	

Supplement duration – > 12m

Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.92 (0.83, 1.02)	0.31
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461	0.79 (0.70, 0.89)	0.29
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165	0.76 (0.62, 0.93)	0.16
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.85 (0.62, 1.18)	0.08
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.88 (0.71, 1.10)	0.15
I² = 0.23, Tau² = 0.00		5733	10903	0.85 (0.78, 0.91)	



Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio

4M7: Stratified by Frequency of contact

Frequency of contact


(p-diff = 0.516)

Frequency of contact – Monthly

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.92 (0.83, 1.02)	0.21
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.86 (0.71, 1.05)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.09
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.71 (0.28, 1.78)	0.01
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165	0.76 (0.62, 0.93)	0.11
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	1.04 (0.89, 1.21)	0.15
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.85 (0.62, 1.18)	0.06
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.88 (0.71, 1.10)	0.10
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786	0.71 (0.57, 0.87)	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	1.01 (0.73, 1.40)	0.05
I² = 0.29, Tau² = 0.00		9912	12738	0.89 (0.82, 0.96)	

Frequency of contact – Weekly

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.91 (0.83, 1.01)	0.30
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461	0.79 (0.70, 0.89)	0.27
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.70 (0.59, 0.82)	0.20
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.71 (0.30, 1.69)	0.01
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.82 (0.57, 1.18)	0.06
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	1.13 (0.74, 1.72)	0.05
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	1.01 (0.78, 1.31)	0.11
I² = 0.55, Tau² = 0.01		7304	6833	0.84 (0.75, 0.94)	



Supplemental figure 4M: Underweight prevalence ratio

4M8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance


Average SQ-LNS compliance
(p-diff = 0.272)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	0.86 (0.71, 1.05)	0.17
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.13
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	0.82 (0.57, 1.18)	0.07
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	1.13 (0.74, 1.72)	0.05
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	1.01 (0.78, 1.31)	0.12
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	0.85 (0.62, 1.18)	0.08
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	0.88 (0.71, 1.10)	0.15
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786	0.71 (0.57, 0.87)	0.16
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	1.01 (0.73, 1.40)	0.08
		6207	6301	0.88 (0.81, 0.97)	

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	0.91 (0.83, 1.01)	0.26
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.92 (0.83, 1.02)	0.24
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461	0.79 (0.70, 0.89)	0.22
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	0.70 (0.59, 0.82)	0.15
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.71 (0.30, 1.69)	0.01
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.71 (0.28, 1.78)	0.01
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165	0.76 (0.62, 0.93)	0.11
		9307	11585	0.82 (0.76, 0.90)	



Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference

4N1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region

(p -diff = 0.198)

Geographic region – SEAR


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461
		5640	5508

$I^2 = 0.31$, $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328
		11428	13913

$I^2 = 0.61$, $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$




Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference

4N2: Stratified by Stunting burden



Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.149)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%



Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference

4N3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence


(p-diff = 0.671)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.02)	0.14
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	0.10
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.13
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.09
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165	-0.02 (-0.04, -0.01)	0.17
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	0.01 (-0.02, 0.04)	0.13
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786	-0.03 (-0.05, -0.01)	0.16
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	0.00 (-0.06, 0.06)	0.07
I² = 0.59, Tau² = 0.00		11156	14622	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.01)	

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	-0.10 (-0.13, -0.07)	0.15
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.14
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.00 (-0.06, 0.05)	0.08
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.03 (-0.12, 0.05)	0.05
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)	0.12
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.01 (-0.04, 0.07)	0.09
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.03)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	0.13
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.14
I² = 0.62, Tau² = 0.00		6060	4949	-0.03 (-0.05, -0.01)	



Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference

4N4: Stratified by Source water quality

Source water quality


(p-diff = 0.966)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.02)	0.22
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	0.14
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	572	1119	-0.05 (-0.09, 0.00)	0.12
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.03 (-0.12, 0.05)	0.05
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)	0.14
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.13
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.01 (-0.04, 0.07)	0.10
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.03)	0.11
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		6564	4790	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.01)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	-0.10 (-0.13, -0.07)	0.13
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.00 (-0.06, 0.05)	0.06
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2261	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.16
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	0.01 (-0.02, 0.04)	0.14
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	0.10
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	876	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.15
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.01 (-0.08, 0.09)	0.03
I² = 0.73, Tau² = 0.00		8126	8443	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	



Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference

4N5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.573)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.02)	0.16
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	0.10
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	572	1119	-0.05 (-0.09, 0.00)	0.09
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.00 (-0.06, 0.05)	0.07
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.03 (-0.12, 0.05)	0.04
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)	0.10
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	0.11
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.12
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		8375	6914	-0.03 (-0.04, -0.02)	

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	-0.10 (-0.13, -0.07)	0.17
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	697	2261	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)	0.21
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	1702	1685	0.01 (-0.02, 0.04)	0.18
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.01 (-0.04, 0.07)	0.09
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.03)	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	876	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	0.20
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.01 (-0.08, 0.09)	0.04
I² = 0.80, Tau² = 0.00		6315	6319	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)	




Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference

4N6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.415)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m




Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference

4N7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact

(p-diff = 0.032)

Frequency of contact – Monthly



Frequency of contact – Weekly



Supplemental figure 4N: Underweight prevalence difference

4N8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance


(p-diff = 0.062)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	857	911	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.13
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	430	436	0.00 (-0.06, 0.05)	0.07
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	693	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)	0.11
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.01 (-0.04, 0.07)	0.08
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	702	241	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.03)	0.09
Mali	PROMIS (46)	500	502	-0.04 (-0.08, 0.00)	0.12
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	946	960	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.01)	0.13
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1869	1786	-0.03 (-0.05, -0.01)	0.20
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	336	328	0.00 (-0.06, 0.06)	0.07
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		6207	6301	-0.02 (-0.04, -0.01)	

Average SQ-LNS compliance – High

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2814	1232	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.02)	0.18
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	0.12
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3461	-0.07 (-0.10, -0.04)	0.16
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1960	666	-0.10 (-0.13, -0.07)	0.15
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.03 (-0.12, 0.05)	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)	148	150	0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.11
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5165	-0.02 (-0.04, -0.01)	0.23
I² = 0.75, Tau² = 0.00		9307	11585	-0.04 (-0.07, -0.02)	



Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ

4O1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region

(p-diff = 0.840)

Geographic region – SEAR


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3463
		5711	5545

$I^2 = 0.28, \text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)		
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)		
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5176
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)		
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238
Mali	PROMIS (46)		
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)		
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1871	1783
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	329
		6972	9422

$I^2 = 0.56, \text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$




Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ

4O2: Stratified by Stunting burden


Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.053)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%



-0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4
Difference
Favors Control Favors LNS

Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ

4O3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence

(p -diff = 0.621)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3463
Haiti	HAITI (41)		
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5176
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)		
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1871	1783
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	329
		9380	12833

$I^2 = 0.00$, $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.00$

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)		
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)		
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238
Mali	PROMIS (46)		
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)		
		3303	2134

$I^2 = 0.68$, $\text{Tau}^2 = 0.01$



Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ

4O4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality
(p-diff = 0.875)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	MD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267	0.06 (0.01, 0.11)	0.26
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.10 (0.03, 0.17)	0.21
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	571	1121	0.16 (0.05, 0.27)	0.14
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.20 (-0.06, 0.46)	0.04
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.07 (-0.05, 0.18)	0.13
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.13 (-0.28, 0.03)	0.09
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238	0.11 (-0.02, 0.23)	0.12
I² = 0.43, Tau² = 0.00		6476 4673		0.08 (0.02, 0.14)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664	0.16 (0.10, 0.23)	0.39
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	696	2266	0.04 (-0.05, 0.13)	0.29
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)				
Mali	PROMIS (46)				
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)				
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	873	0.04 (-0.07, 0.14)	0.24
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	0.04 (-0.21, 0.28)	0.07
I² = 0.62, Tau² = 0.00		3676 3949		0.09 (0.01, 0.16)	




Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ


4O5: Stratified by Sanitation

Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.484)

Sanitation – Improved



Sanitation – Unimproved




Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ

4O6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.949)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m




Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ


4O7: Stratified by Frequency of contact

Frequency of contact
(p -diff = 0.687)

Frequency of contact – Monthly



Frequency of contact – Weekly



-0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4
Difference
Favors Control Favors LNS


Supplemental figure 4O: Mean difference in HCZ

4O8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance


Average SQ-LNS compliance

(p-diff = 0.336)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low



Average SQ-LNS compliance – High



Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio

4P1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region


(p-diff = 0.271)

Geographic region – SEAR

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267	1.03 (0.90, 1.18)	0.19
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.90 (0.82, 0.98)	0.47
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3463	0.90 (0.82, 1.00)	0.34
I² = 0.36, Tau² = 0.00		5711	5545	0.93 (0.86, 1.01)	

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664	0.89 (0.78, 1.01)	0.49
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)				
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.33 (0.07, 1.58)	0.00
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.88 (0.65, 1.20)	0.09
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5176	0.92 (0.67, 1.25)	0.09
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)				
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.88 (0.54, 1.44)	0.04
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238	0.79 (0.60, 1.03)	0.12
Mali	PROMIS (46)				
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)				
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1871	1783	0.81 (0.63, 1.05)	0.13
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	329	0.98 (0.61, 1.57)	0.04
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		6972	9422	0.87 (0.79, 0.95)	




Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio

4P2: Stratified by Stunting burden


Stunting burden

(p-diff = 0.780)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%



Stunting burden – More than 35%




Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio

4P3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence



Malaria prevalence

(p-diff = 0.351)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%



Malaria prevalence – At least 10%



Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio

4P4: Stratified by Source water quality


Source water quality
(p-diff = 0.958)

Source water quality – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N	PR (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267	1.03 (0.90, 1.18)	0.21
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	0.90 (0.82, 0.98)	0.54
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	571	1121	0.86 (0.73, 1.03)	0.13
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	0.33 (0.07, 1.58)	0.00
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	0.88 (0.65, 1.20)	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	0.88 (0.54, 1.44)	0.02
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238	0.79 (0.60, 1.03)	0.06
I² = 0.08, Tau² = 0.00		6476	4673	0.91 (0.85, 0.98)	

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664	0.89 (0.78, 1.01)	0.79
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	696	2266	0.73 (0.45, 1.17)	0.06
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)				
Mali	PROMIS (46)				
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)				
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	873	1.01 (0.73, 1.39)	0.13
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146	1.44 (0.68, 3.06)	0.02
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		3676	3949	0.90 (0.80, 1.01)	




Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio


4P5: Stratified by Sanitation

Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.549)

Sanitation – Improved



Sanitation – Unimproved




Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio

4P6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.749)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m




Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio


4P7: Stratified by Frequency of contact

Frequency of contact
(p-diff = 0.591)

Frequency of contact – Monthly



Frequency of contact – Weekly




0.25 0.50 1.0 2.0 4.0
Ratio
Favors LNS Favors Control

Supplemental figure 4P: Small head size prevalence ratio


4P8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance

Average SQ-LNS compliance
(p-diff = 0.264)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low



Average SQ-LNS compliance – High



Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference

4Q1: Stratified by Geographic region

Geographic region


(p-diff = 0.664)

Geographic region – SEAR

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267	0.00 (-0.03, 0.02)	0.48
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.00)	0.20
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3463	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.00)	0.32
I² = 0.50, Tau² = 0.00		5711	5545	-0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)	

Geographic region – AFR

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664	-0.04 (-0.08, -0.01)	0.11
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)				
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	0.04
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.03)	0.06
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5176	0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.34
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)				
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.01 (-0.06, 0.04)	0.06
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238	-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	0.05
Mali	PROMIS (46)				
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)				
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1871	1783	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.00)	0.29
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	329	0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.06
I² = 0.14, Tau² = 0.00		6972	9422	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.00)	



Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference

4Q2: Stratified by Stunting burden

Stunting burden


(p -diff = 0.345)

Stunting burden – Less than 35%

Country	Trial	N	N		PD (95% CI)	W
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)					
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)					
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96		-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	0.09
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692		-0.02 (-0.06, 0.03)	0.13
Haiti	HAITI (41)					
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5176		0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.67
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444		-0.01 (-0.06, 0.04)	0.11
$I^2 = 0.00$, $Tau^2 = 0.00$		2126	6408		-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	

Stunting burden – More than 35%

Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267		0.00 (-0.03, 0.02)	0.20
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815		-0.04 (-0.09, 0.00)	0.08
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3463		-0.03 (-0.06, 0.00)	0.14
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664		-0.04 (-0.08, -0.01)	0.12
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)					
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238		-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	0.05
Mali	PROMIS (46)					
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)					
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1871	1783		-0.01 (-0.03, 0.00)	0.33
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	329		0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.07
$I^2 = 0.30$, $Tau^2 = 0.00$		10557	8559		-0.02 (-0.03, -0.01)	



Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference

4Q3: Stratified by Malaria prevalence

Malaria prevalence


(p-diff = 0.025)

Malaria prevalence – Less than 10%

Country	Trial	N	N	PD (95% CI)	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267	0.00 (-0.03, 0.02)	0.17
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.00)	0.07
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	1163	3463	-0.03 (-0.06, 0.00)	0.11
Haiti	HAITI (41)				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	1461	5176	0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)	0.32
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)				
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1871	1783	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.00)	0.27
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	337	329	0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.06
I² = 0.19, Tau² = 0.00		9380	12833	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)	

Malaria prevalence – At least 10%

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664	-0.04 (-0.08, -0.01)	0.34
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)				
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96	-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	0.14
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.03)	0.20
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444	-0.01 (-0.06, 0.04)	0.18
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238	-0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)	0.15
Mali	PROMIS (46)				
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)				
I² = 0.00, Tau² = 0.00		3303	2134	-0.03 (-0.05, -0.01)	



Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference

4Q4: Stratified by Source water quality

Source water quality

(p-diff = 0.301)

Source water quality – Improved


Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	571	1121
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)		
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238
		6476	4673

I² = 0.02, Tau² = 0.00

Source water quality – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)		
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)		
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	696	2266
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)		
Mali	PROMIS (46)		
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)		
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	873
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146
		3676	3949

I² = 0.55, Tau² = 0.00



Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference

4Q5: Stratified by Sanitation


Sanitation
(p-diff = 0.442)

Sanitation – Improved

Country	Trial	N	N
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	2885	1267
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1663	815
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	571	1121
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)		
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)		
Ghana	GHANA (39)	98	96
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	347	692
Haiti	HAITI (41)		
Mali	PROMIS (46)		
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)		
I² = 0.24, Tau² = 0.00		5564	3991

Sanitation – Unimproved

Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1946	664
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	696	2266
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)		
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	220	444
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	692	238
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	887	873
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	147	146
I² = 0.38, Tau² = 0.00		4588	4631




Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference

4Q6: Stratified by Supplement duration


Supplement duration

(p-diff = 0.995)

Supplement duration – 12m or less



Supplement duration – > 12m



-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
Difference
Favors LNS Favors Control


Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference

4Q7: Stratified by Frequency of contact


Frequency of contact

(p-diff = 0.091)

Frequency of contact – Monthly



Frequency of contact – Weekly



-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
Difference
Favors LNS Favors Control


Supplemental figure 4Q: Small head size prevalence difference

4Q8: Stratified by Average SQ-LNS compliance


Average SQ-LNS compliance

(p -diff = 0.682)

Average SQ-LNS compliance – Low



Average SQ-LNS compliance – High



Supplemental figure 5: Pooled effect of SQ-LNS on prevalence ratios for low MUAC, acute malnutrition, underweight, and small head size stratified by study-level and individual-level characteristics


Contents

Supplemental figure 5A: Low MUAC prevalence ratio	2
5A1: Stratified by study-level characteristics	2
5A2: Stratified by individual-level maternal and child characteristics	3
5A3: Stratified by individual-level household characteristics	4
Supplemental figure 5B: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio	5
5B1: Stratified by study-level characteristics	5
5B2: Stratified by individual-level maternal and child characteristics	6
5B3: Stratified by individual-level household characteristics	7
Supplemental figure 5C: Underweight prevalence ratio	8
5C1: Stratified by study-level characteristics	8
5C2: Stratified by individual-level maternal and child characteristics	9
5C3: Stratified by individual-level household characteristics	10
Supplemental figure 5D: Small head size prevalence ratio	11
5D1: Stratified by study-level characteristics	11
5D2: Stratified by individual-level maternal and child characteristics	12
5D3: Stratified by individual-level household characteristics	13

These figures show pooled effects of SQ-LNS within study-level and individual-level characteristic subgroups along with the p-for-interaction. The labels on the left y-axis correspond to the characteristic subgroups and their sample sizes. The values on the right indicate the pooled prevalence ratio and confidence interval within that subgroup. MUAC, mid-upper arm circumference.


Supplemental figure 5A: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

5A1: Stratified by study-level characteristics




Supplemental figure 5A: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

5A2: Stratified by individual-level maternal and child characteristics




Supplemental figure 5A: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

5A3: Stratified by individual-level household characteristics




Supplemental figure 5B: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

5B1: Stratified by study-level characteristics




Supplemental figure 5B: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

5B3: Stratified by individual-level household characteristics




Supplemental figure 5C: Underweight prevalence ratio

5C1: Stratified by study-level characteristics




Supplemental figure 5C: Underweight prevalence ratio

5C2: Stratified by individual-level maternal and child characteristics




Supplemental figure 5C: Underweight prevalence ratio

5C3: Stratified by individual-level household characteristics




Supplemental figure 5D: Small head size prevalence ratio

5D1: Stratified by study-level characteristics




Supplemental figure 5D: Small head size prevalence ratio

5D2: Stratified by individual-level maternal and child characteristics



Supplemental figure 5D: Small head size prevalence ratio

5D3: Stratified by individual-level household characteristics



Supplemental figure 6: Forest plots for effects of SQ-LNS on growth outcomes stratified by individual-level maternal and child effect modifiers

Contents

Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ	5
6A1: Stratified by Maternal height	5
6A2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	6
6A3: Stratified by Maternal age	7
6A4: Stratified by Maternal education	8
6A5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	9
6A6: Stratified by Child sex	10
6A7: Stratified by Child birth order	11
6A8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	12
 Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio	 13
6B1: Stratified by Maternal height	13
6B2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	14
6B3: Stratified by Maternal age	15
6B4: Stratified by Maternal education	16
6B5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	17
6B6: Stratified by Child sex	18
6B7: Stratified by Child birth order	19
6B8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	20
 Supplemental figure 6C: Stunting prevalence difference	 21
6C1: Stratified by Maternal height	21
6C2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	22
6C3: Stratified by Maternal age	23
6C4: Stratified by Maternal education	24
6C5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	25
6C6: Stratified by Child sex	26
6C7: Stratified by Child birth order	27
6C8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	28
 Supplemental figure 6D: Mean difference in WLZ	 29
6D1: Stratified by Maternal height	29
6D2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	30
6D3: Stratified by Maternal age	31
6D4: Stratified by Maternal education	32
6D5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	33
6D6: Stratified by Child sex	34
6D7: Stratified by Child birth order	35
6D8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	36
 Supplemental figure 6E: Wasting prevalence ratio	 37

6E1: Stratified by Maternal height	37
6E2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	38
6E3: Stratified by Maternal age	39
6E4: Stratified by Maternal education	40
6E5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	41
6E6: Stratified by Child sex	42
6E7: Stratified by Child birth order	43
6E8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	44
Supplemental figure 6F: Wasting prevalence difference	45
6F1: Stratified by Maternal height	45
6F2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	46
6F3: Stratified by Maternal age	47
6F4: Stratified by Maternal education	48
6F5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	49
6F6: Stratified by Child sex	50
6F7: Stratified by Child birth order	51
6F8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	52
Supplemental figure 6G: Mean difference in MUACZ	53
6G1: Stratified by Maternal height	53
6G2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	54
6G3: Stratified by Maternal age	55
6G4: Stratified by Maternal education	56
6G5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	57
6G6: Stratified by Child sex	58
6G7: Stratified by Child birth order	59
6G8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	60
Supplemental figure 6H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio	61
6H1: Stratified by Maternal height (insufficient comparisons)	61
6H2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	62
6H3: Stratified by Maternal age	63
6H4: Stratified by Maternal education	64
6H5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	65
6H6: Stratified by Child sex	66
6H7: Stratified by Child birth order	67
6H8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status (insufficient comparisons)	67
Supplemental figure 6I: Low MUAC prevalence difference	68
6I1: Stratified by Maternal height (insufficient comparisons)	68
6I2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	69
6I3: Stratified by Maternal age	70
6I4: Stratified by Maternal education	71
6I5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	72
6I6: Stratified by Child sex	73
6I7: Stratified by Child birth order	74
6I8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status (insufficient comparisons)	74
Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio	75
6J1: Stratified by Maternal height	75

6J2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	76
6J3: Stratified by Maternal age	77
6J4: Stratified by Maternal education	78
6J5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	79
6J6: Stratified by Child sex	80
6J7: Stratified by Child birth order	81
6J8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	82
Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference	83
6K1: Stratified by Maternal height	83
6K2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	84
6K3: Stratified by Maternal age	85
6K4: Stratified by Maternal education	86
6K5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	87
6K6: Stratified by Child sex	88
6K7: Stratified by Child birth order	89
6K8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	90
Supplemental figure 6L: Mean difference in WAZ	91
6L1: Stratified by Maternal height	91
6L2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	92
6L3: Stratified by Maternal age	93
6L4: Stratified by Maternal education	94
6L5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	95
6L6: Stratified by Child sex	96
6L7: Stratified by Child birth order	97
6L8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	98
Supplemental figure 6M: Underweight prevalence ratio	99
6M1: Stratified by Maternal height	99
6M2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	100
6M3: Stratified by Maternal age	101
6M4: Stratified by Maternal education	102
6M5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	103
6M6: Stratified by Child sex	104
6M7: Stratified by Child birth order	105
6M8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	106
Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference	107
6N1: Stratified by Maternal height	107
6N2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	108
6N3: Stratified by Maternal age	109
6N4: Stratified by Maternal education	110
6N5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	111
6N6: Stratified by Child sex	112
6N7: Stratified by Child birth order	113
6N8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	114
Supplemental figure 6O: Mean difference in HCZ	115
6O1: Stratified by Maternal height	115
6O2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	116

6O3: Stratified by Maternal age	117
6O4: Stratified by Maternal education	118
6O5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	119
6O6: Stratified by Child sex	120
6O7: Stratified by Child birth order	121
6O8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	122
Supplemental figure 6P: Small head size prevalence ratio	123
6P1: Stratified by Maternal height	123
6P2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	124
6P3: Stratified by Maternal age	125
6P4: Stratified by Maternal education	126
6P5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	127
6P6: Stratified by Child sex	128
6P7: Stratified by Child birth order	129
6P8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	130
Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference	131
6Q1: Stratified by Maternal height	131
6Q2: Stratified by Maternal BMI	132
6Q3: Stratified by Maternal age	133
6Q4: Stratified by Maternal education	134
6Q5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms	135
6Q6: Stratified by Child sex	136
6Q7: Stratified by Child birth order	137
6Q8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status	138


These figures are forest plots showing the individual-level effect modification of intervention effects. Each figure has the estimates of intervention effect stratified within study by individual-level effect modifier category. For continuous outcomes analyzed via mean differences, the effect estimate is the mean in the LNS group minus the mean in the control group. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence ratios, the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group divided by the prevalence in the control group. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence differences, the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group minus the prevalence in the control group. The labels on the far left correspond to trial level information. In the middle left and on the right the values indicate the study level effect estimate, confidence interval, and weighting for deriving the pooled estimates is shown by subgroup. LAZ, length-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score.

Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ

6A1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.215

Difference in MDs = -0.04 (-0.11, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ

6A2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.676

Difference in MDs = -0.01 (-0.06, 0.04)





Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ

6A3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.818

Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)

Country	Trial	LNS N	Control N	Control Mean	MD (95% CI)	Fixed W	Random W	At least 25 y	
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	1218	546	-1.94	0.10 (0.03, 0.16)	0.21	0.12		
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	453	221	-1.80	0.19 (0.03, 0.35)	0.04	0.05		
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	492	1512	-1.83	0.17 (0.09, 0.26)	0.12	0.10		
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1131	399	-1.72	0.33 (0.22, 0.45)	0.07	0.08		
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	485	526	-1.47	0.15 (-0.01, 0.32)	0.04	0.05		
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	202	192	-1.17	0.05 (-0.17, 0.27)	0.02	0.03		
Ghana	GHANA (39)	69	63	-0.30	0.28 (-0.08, 0.65)	0.01	0.01		
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	220	416	-0.84	0.11 (-0.05, 0.27)	0.04	0.05		
Haiti	HAITI (41)	101	103	-0.67	0.04 (-0.13, 0.21)	0.03	0.05		
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	844	2811	-1.50	0.13 (0.05, 0.21)	0.16	0.11		
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	896	949	-2.26	0.03 (-0.13, 0.18)	0.04	0.05		
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	106	226	-1.65	-0.04 (-0.30, 0.21)	0.02	0.03		
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	368	134	-1.88	0.00 (-0.14, 0.14)	0.05	0.06		
Mali	PROMIS (46)	346	359	-1.72	0.17 (0.02, 0.33)	0.04	0.05		
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	503	507	-1.47	0.16 (-0.04, 0.36)	0.02	0.04		
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	875	800	-1.55	0.20 (0.08, 0.31)	0.07	0.08		
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	244	231	-1.97	0.24 (0.04, 0.45)	0.02	0.04		
		8553	9995		I² = 0.38, Tau² = 0.00				
					0.14 (0.11, 0.17)				
					0.14 (0.10, 0.18)				





Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ

6A4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.699


Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.04, 0.06)

Country	Trial	LNS N	Control N	Control Mean	Primary or greater MD (95% CI)	Fixed W	Random W	Fixed		Random	
								W	W	W	W
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	1830	756	-1.78	0.08 (0.02, 0.14)	0.27	0.15				
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	1245	589	-1.77	0.10 (0.01, 0.19)	0.11	0.11				
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	813	2452	-1.72	0.24 (0.16, 0.32)	0.14	0.12				
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	82	16	-1.47	0.41 (0.11, 0.71)	0.01	0.02				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	70	54	-1.39	-0.08 (-0.38, 0.23)	0.01	0.02				
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	34	39	-1.26	0.00 (-0.49, 0.49)	0.00	0.01				
Ghana	GHANA (39)	91	75	-0.36	0.28 (-0.05, 0.62)	0.01	0.02				
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	267	548	-0.89	0.18 (0.03, 0.32)	0.04	0.07				
Haiti	HAITI (41)	130	126	-0.71	-0.04 (-0.19, 0.11)	0.04	0.07				
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	700	2434	-1.39	0.09 (0.00, 0.18)	0.11	0.11				
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	351	431	-2.17	0.03 (-0.17, 0.23)	0.02	0.04				
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	35	69	-1.37	-0.10 (-0.51, 0.32)	0.01	0.01				
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	162	56	-1.73	0.12 (-0.08, 0.32)	0.02	0.04				
Mali	PROMIS (46)	41	37	-1.25	0.10 (-0.29, 0.49)	0.01	0.01				
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	107	96	-1.42	0.29 (-0.04, 0.63)	0.01	0.02				
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	1717	1644	-1.59	0.15 (0.07, 0.23)	0.14	0.12				
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	301	293	-1.96	0.21 (0.03, 0.40)	0.03	0.05				
		7976	9715								
					I² = 0.40, Tau² = 0.00						
Fixed					0.12 (0.09, 0.15)						
Random					0.12 (0.08, 0.17)						



Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ

6A5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms




Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ

6A6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.170

Difference in MDs = 0.03 (-0.01, 0.07)




Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ

6A7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.134

Difference in MDs = -0.03 (-0.08, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6A: Mean difference in LAZ

6A8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.932


Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.06, 0.05)



Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio

6B1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.020
Ratio of PRs = 1.09 (1.01, 1.18)




Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio

6B2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.017


Ratio of PRs = 1.10 (1.02, 1.19)



Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio

6B3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.192
 Ratio of PRs = 1.04 (0.98, 1.10)




Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio

6B4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.042

Ratio of PRs = 1.07 (1.00, 1.15)




Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio

6B5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.003


Ratio of PRs = 0.89 (0.82, 0.96)



Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio

6B6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.002
 Ratio of PRs = 0.92 (0.87, 0.97)




Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio

6B7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.054

Ratio of PRs = 1.06 (1.00, 1.13)




Supplemental figure 6B: Stunting prevalence ratio

6B8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.006

Ratio of PRs = 1.25 (1.07, 1.46)




Supplemental figure 6C: Stunting prevalence difference

6C1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.339

Difference in PDs = 0.02 (-0.02, 0.05)




Supplemental figure 6C: Stunting prevalence difference

6C2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.306

Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.01, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 6C: Stunting prevalence difference

6C3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.541

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6C: Stunting prevalence difference

6C4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.233

Difference in PDs = 0.02 (-0.01, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 6C: Stunting prevalence difference

6C6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.187

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6C: Stunting prevalence difference

6C7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.858

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6C: Stunting prevalence difference

6C8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.004

Difference in PDs = -0.04 (-0.06, -0.01)




Supplemental figure 6D: Mean difference in WLZ

6D1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.630

Difference in MDs = -0.02 (-0.09, 0.05)




Supplemental figure 6D: Mean difference in WLZ

6D2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.849

Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 6D: Mean difference in WLZ

6D3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.354

Difference in MDs = -0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6D: Mean difference in WLZ

6D4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.629

Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.04, 0.06)




Supplemental figure 6D: Mean difference in WLZ

6D5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.863

Difference in MDs = -0.01 (-0.07, 0.05)




Supplemental figure 6D: Mean difference in WLZ

6D7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.250

Difference in MDs = -0.03 (-0.07, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6D: Mean difference in WLZ

6D8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.325


Difference in MDs = 0.03 (-0.03, 0.09)



Supplemental figure 6E: Wasting prevalence ratio

6E1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.883
Ratio of PRs = 1.02 (0.81, 1.28)




Supplemental figure 6E: Wasting prevalence ratio

6E3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.707

Ratio of PRs = 1.03 (0.88, 1.22)




Supplemental figure 6E: Wasting prevalence ratio

6E4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.890

Ratio of PRs = 1.01 (0.83, 1.23)




Supplemental figure 6E: Wasting prevalence ratio

6E5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.265

Ratio of PRs = 1.15 (0.90, 1.48)




Supplemental figure 6E: Wasting prevalence ratio

6E6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.074

Ratio of PRs = 0.87 (0.75, 1.01)




Supplemental figure 6E: Wasting prevalence ratio

6E7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.609

Ratio of PRs = 1.05 (0.88, 1.25)




Supplemental figure 6F: Wasting prevalence difference

6F1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.438


Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)



Supplemental figure 6F: Wasting prevalence difference

6F3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.171
 Difference in PDs = 0.01 (0.00, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6F: Wasting prevalence difference

6F4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.380

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6F: Wasting prevalence difference

6F5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

I^2 -for-interaction = 0.511

Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6F: Wasting prevalence difference

6F6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.876

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6F: Wasting prevalence difference

6F7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.549

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6F: Wasting prevalence difference

6F8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status


P-for-interaction = 0.062

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)



Supplemental figure 6G: Mean difference in MUACZ

6G1: Stratified by Maternal height




Supplemental figure 6G: Mean difference in MUACZ

6G2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.580

Difference in MDs = -0.01 (-0.07, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 6G: Mean difference in MUACZ

6G4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.688

Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.04, 0.06)




Supplemental figure 6G: Mean difference in MUACZ

6G5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.348

Difference in MDs = -0.03 (-0.09, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 6G: Mean difference in MUACZ

6G7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.004

Difference in MDs = -0.07 (-0.11, -0.02)




Supplemental figure 6G: Mean difference in MUACZ

6G8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.177

Difference in MDs = 0.04 (-0.02, 0.10)



Supplemental figure 6H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio


6H1: Stratified by Maternal height (insufficient comparisons)

Supplemental figure 6H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

6H2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.337

Ratio of PRs = 1.12 (0.89, 1.40)




Supplemental figure 6H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

6H3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.741

Ratio of PRs = 1.03 (0.87, 1.22)




Supplemental figure 6H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

6H4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.240

Ratio of PRs = 1.16 (0.91, 1.48)




Supplemental figure 6H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

6H5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.798

Ratio of PRs = 1.04 (0.77, 1.40)




Supplemental figure 6H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

6H6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.002

Ratio of PRs = 0.77 (0.66, 0.91)




Supplemental figure 6H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

6H7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.002

Ratio of PRs = 1.37 (1.12, 1.67)



6H8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status (insufficient comparisons)

Supplemental figure 6I: Low MUAC prevalence difference


6I1: Stratified by Maternal height (insufficient comparisons)

Supplemental figure 6I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

6I2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.260


Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)



Supplemental figure 6I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

6I3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.160
 Difference in PDs = 0.01 (0.00, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

6I4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.676


Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)



Supplemental figure 6I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

6I5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

I^2 -for-interaction = 0.946
 Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

6I6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.032


Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)



Supplemental figure 6I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

6I7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.032
 Difference in PDs = 0.02 (0.00, 0.03)




6I8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status (insufficient comparisons)

Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

6J1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.435

Ratio of PRs = 0.90 (0.68, 1.18)




Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

6J2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.490

Ratio of PRs = 1.07 (0.88, 1.30)




Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

6J3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.429

Ratio of PRs = 1.06 (0.91, 1.23)




Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

6J4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.659

Ratio of PRs = 1.04 (0.86, 1.26)




Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

6J5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.532


Ratio of PRs = 1.08 (0.84, 1.39)



Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

6J6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.307
 Ratio of PRs = 0.93 (0.81, 1.07)




Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

6J7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.124

Ratio of PRs = 1.14 (0.96, 1.35)




Supplemental figure 6J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

6J8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.490

Ratio of PRs = 0.85 (0.53, 1.36)




Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

6K1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.297

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.05, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

6K2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.580


Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)



Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

6K3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.115
 Difference in PDs = 0.01 (0.00, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

6K4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.659

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

6K5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

I^2 -for-interaction = 0.781

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

6K6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.708

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

6K7: Stratified by Child birth order


P-for-interaction = 0.221

Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)



Supplemental figure 6K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

6K8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status




Supplemental figure 6L: Mean difference in WAZ

6L1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.234

Difference in MDs = -0.04 (-0.11, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 6L: Mean difference in WAZ

6L3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.880

Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.04, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 6L: Mean difference in WAZ

6L4: Stratified by Maternal education


P-for-interaction = 0.600

Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.03, 0.06)



Supplemental figure 6L: Mean difference in WAZ

6L5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms




Supplemental figure 6L: Mean difference in WAZ

6L6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.292

Difference in MDs = 0.02 (-0.02, 0.06)




Supplemental figure 6L: Mean difference in WAZ

6L7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.021

Difference in MDs = -0.05 (-0.09, -0.01)




Supplemental figure 6L: Mean difference in WAZ

6L8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.078


Difference in MDs = 0.05 (-0.01, 0.10)



Supplemental figure 6M: Underweight prevalence ratio

6M1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.546
Ratio of PRs = 1.04 (0.92, 1.16)




Supplemental figure 6M: Underweight prevalence ratio

6M3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.245

Ratio of PRs = 1.05 (0.97, 1.15)




Supplemental figure 6M: Underweight prevalence ratio

6M4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.399

Ratio of PRs = 1.05 (0.94, 1.17)




Supplemental figure 6M: Underweight prevalence ratio

6M5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.490

Ratio of PRs = 0.96 (0.84, 1.09)




Supplemental figure 6M: Underweight prevalence ratio

6M7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.001

Ratio of PRs = 1.16 (1.06, 1.27)




Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference

6N1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.211

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference

6N2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.263

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference

6N3: Stratified by Maternal age

P-for-interaction = 0.628

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference

6N4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.136

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference

6N5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

I^2 -for-interaction = 0.717

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference

6N6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.231


Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)



Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference

6N7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.043
 Difference in PDs = 0.02 (0.00, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 6N: Underweight prevalence difference

6N8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.004


Difference in PDs = -0.04 (-0.07, -0.01)



Supplemental figure 6O: Mean difference in HCZ

6O1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.185
Difference in MDs = 0.05 (-0.03, 0.13)




Supplemental figure 6O: Mean difference in HCZ

6O4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.711

Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.04, 0.06)




Supplemental figure 6O: Mean difference in HCZ

6O5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.386

Difference in MDs = -0.03 (-0.10, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 6O: Mean difference in HCZ

6O7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.966

Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.04, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 6O: Mean difference in HCZ

6O8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.980


Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.05, 0.05)



Supplemental figure 6P: Small head size prevalence ratio

6P1: Stratified by Maternal height

P-for-interaction = 0.420
Ratio of PRs = 0.95 (0.85, 1.07)




Supplemental figure 6P: Small head size prevalence ratio

6P2: Stratified by Maternal BMI

P-for-interaction = 0.607

Ratio of PRs = 0.97 (0.88, 1.08)




Supplemental figure 6P: Small head size prevalence ratio

6P4: Stratified by Maternal education

P-for-interaction = 0.091

Ratio of PRs = 1.11 (0.98, 1.26)




Supplemental figure 6P: Small head size prevalence ratio

6P5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

P-for-interaction = 0.095


Ratio of PRs = 1.12 (0.98, 1.27)



Supplemental figure 6P: Small head size prevalence ratio

6P6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.020
 Ratio of PRs = 0.89 (0.81, 0.98)




Supplemental figure 6P: Small head size prevalence ratio

6P7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.696

Ratio of PRs = 1.02 (0.92, 1.14)




Supplemental figure 6P: Small head size prevalence ratio

6P8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.152

Ratio of PRs = 1.25 (0.92, 1.70)




Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference

6Q1: Stratified by Maternal height


P-for-interaction = 0.301

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)



Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference

6Q2: Stratified by Maternal BMI




Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference

6Q3: Stratified by Maternal age


P-for-interaction = 0.536

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)



Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference


6Q4: Stratified by Maternal education



Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference

6Q5: Stratified by Maternal depressive symptoms

I^2 -for-interaction = 0.134
 Difference in PDs = 0.01 (0.00, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference

6Q6: Stratified by Child sex

P-for-interaction = 0.624

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference

6Q7: Stratified by Child birth order

P-for-interaction = 0.402

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 6Q: Small head size prevalence difference

6Q8: Stratified by Child baseline anthropometric status

P-for-interaction = 0.069

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.05, 0.00)



Supplemental figure 7: Forest plots for effects of SQ-LNS on growth outcomes stratified by individual-level household effect modifiers

Contents

Supplemental figure 7A: Mean difference in LAZ	4
7A1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	4
7A2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	5
7A3: Stratified by Household source water quality	6
7A4: Stratified by Household sanitation	7
7A5: Stratified by Home environment	8
7A6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	9
 Supplemental figure 7B: Stunting prevalence ratio	 10
7B1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	10
7B2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	11
7B3: Stratified by Household source water quality	12
7B4: Stratified by Household sanitation	13
7B5: Stratified by Home environment	14
7B6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	15
 Supplemental figure 7C: Stunting prevalence difference	 16
7C1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	16
7C2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	17
7C3: Stratified by Household source water quality	18
7C4: Stratified by Household sanitation	19
7C5: Stratified by Home environment	20
7C6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	21
 Supplemental figure 7D: Mean difference in WLZ	 22
7D1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	22
7D2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	23
7D3: Stratified by Household source water quality	24
7D4: Stratified by Household sanitation	25
7D5: Stratified by Home environment	26
7D6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	27
 Supplemental figure 7E: Wasting prevalence ratio	 28
7E1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	28
7E2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	29
7E3: Stratified by Household source water quality	30
7E4: Stratified by Household sanitation	31
7E5: Stratified by Home environment	32
7E6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	33
 Supplemental figure 7F: Wasting prevalence difference	 34

7F1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	34
7F2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	35
7F3: Stratified by Household source water quality	36
7F4: Stratified by Household sanitation	37
7F5: Stratified by Home environment	38
7F6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	39
Supplemental figure 7G: Mean difference in MUACZ	40
7G1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	40
7G2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	41
7G3: Stratified by Household source water quality	42
7G4: Stratified by Household sanitation	43
7G5: Stratified by Home environment	44
7G6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	45
Supplemental figure 7H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio	46
7H1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	46
7H2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	47
7H3: Stratified by Household source water quality	48
7H4: Stratified by Household sanitation	49
7H5: Stratified by Home environment	50
7H6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	51
Supplemental figure 7I: Low MUAC prevalence difference	52
7I1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	52
7I2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	53
7I3: Stratified by Household source water quality	54
7I4: Stratified by Household sanitation	55
7I5: Stratified by Home environment	56
7I6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	57
Supplemental figure 7J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio	58
7J1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	58
7J2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	59
7J3: Stratified by Household source water quality	60
7J4: Stratified by Household sanitation	61
7J5: Stratified by Home environment	62
7J6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	63
Supplemental figure 7K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference	64
7K1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	64
7K2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	65
7K3: Stratified by Household source water quality	66
7K4: Stratified by Household sanitation	67
7K5: Stratified by Home environment	68
7K6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	69
Supplemental figure 7L: Mean difference in WAZ	70
7L1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	70
7L2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	71
7L3: Stratified by Household source water quality	72


7L4: Stratified by Household sanitation	73
7L5: Stratified by Home environment	74
7L6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	75
Supplemental figure 7M: Underweight prevalence ratio	76
7M1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	76
7M2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	77
7M3: Stratified by Household source water quality	78
7M4: Stratified by Household sanitation	79
7M5: Stratified by Home environment	80
7M6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	81
Supplemental figure 7N: Underweight prevalence difference	82
7N1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	82
7N2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	83
7N3: Stratified by Household source water quality	84
7N4: Stratified by Household sanitation	85
7N5: Stratified by Home environment	86
7N6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	87
Supplemental figure 7O: Mean difference in HCZ	88
7O1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	88
7O2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	89
7O3: Stratified by Household source water quality	90
7O4: Stratified by Household sanitation	91
7O5: Stratified by Home environment	92
7O6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	93
Supplemental figure 7P: Small head size prevalence ratio	94
7P1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	94
7P2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	95
7P3: Stratified by Household source water quality	96
7P4: Stratified by Household sanitation	97
7P5: Stratified by Home environment	98
7P6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	99
Supplemental figure 7Q: Small head size prevalence difference	100
7Q1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status	100
7Q2: Stratified by Household food insecurity	101
7Q3: Stratified by Household source water quality	102
7Q4: Stratified by Household sanitation	103
7Q5: Stratified by Home environment	104
7Q6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment	105

These figures are forest plots showing the individual-level effect modification of intervention effects. Each figure has the estimates of intervention effect stratified within study by individual-level effect modifier category. For continuous outcomes analyzed via mean differences, the effect estimate is the mean in the LNS group minus the mean in the control group. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence ratios, the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group divided by the prevalence in the control group. For dichotomous outcomes analyzed via prevalence differences, the effect estimate is the prevalence in the LNS group minus the prevalence in the control group. The labels on the far left correspond to trial level information. In the middle left and on the right the values indicate the study level effect estimate, confidence interval, and weighting for deriving the pooled estimates is shown by subgroup. LAZ, length-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score.

Supplemental figure 7A: Mean difference in LAZ

7A1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.805
 Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 7A: Mean difference in LAZ

7A2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.943

Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.04, 0.05)




Supplemental figure 7A: Mean difference in LAZ

7A4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.135

Difference in MDs = -0.04 (-0.10, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 7A: Mean difference in LAZ

7A5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.394

Difference in MDs = 0.03 (-0.04, 0.09)




Supplemental figure 7A: Mean difference in LAZ

7A6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.834


Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.04, 0.05)



Supplemental figure 7B: Stunting prevalence ratio

7B1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.476
Ratio of PRs = 1.02 (0.96, 1.08)




Supplemental figure 7B: Stunting prevalence ratio

7B2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.827

Ratio of PRs = 1.01 (0.94, 1.08)




Supplemental figure 7B: Stunting prevalence ratio

7B3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.782

Ratio of PRs = 1.01 (0.93, 1.10)

Country	Trial	LNS N	Control N	Control Prevalence	Improved PR (95% CI)	Fixed W	Random W	LNS N	Control N	Control Prevalence	Unimproved PR (95% CI)	Fixed W	Random W
Bangladesh	JiVita-4 (34)												
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)												
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	496	989	40.7	0.77 (0.67, 0.88)	0.18	0.15	70	114	43.0	1.00 (0.71, 1.40)	0.03	0.07
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	550	141	35.5	0.82 (0.68, 0.99)	0.10	0.10	1394	519	40.2	0.74 (0.63, 0.86)	0.15	0.14
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	355	379	31.1	0.92 (0.74, 1.15)	0.07	0.08	361	355	31.5	0.62 (0.42, 0.92)	0.03	0.06
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	280	268	25.4	0.77 (0.54, 1.11)	0.03	0.03	149	171	22.8	1.06 (0.71, 1.58)	0.02	0.05
Ghana	GHANA (39)												
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)												
Haiti	HAITI (41)												
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	447	1549	30.6	0.96 (0.80, 1.14)	0.11	0.11	248	697	33.1	0.85 (0.66, 1.09)	0.06	0.10
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	419	453	51.4	1.02 (0.86, 1.20)	0.13	0.12	1203	1180	61.2	0.96 (0.88, 1.05)	0.47	0.18
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)												
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	555	193	46.1	1.01 (0.86, 1.19)	0.13	0.12	52	17	47.1	1.33 (0.85, 2.07)	0.02	0.05
Mali	PROMIS (46)	249	258	36.4	0.80 (0.63, 1.01)	0.06	0.07	247	243	36.2	1.04 (0.82, 1.32)	0.07	0.10
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	549	566	31.4	0.81 (0.64, 1.02)	0.06	0.07	362	388	37.6	0.78 (0.62, 0.98)	0.07	0.11
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	521	489	35.2	0.77 (0.65, 0.93)	0.11	0.11	274	302	32.5	0.97 (0.74, 1.26)	0.05	0.09
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	85	87	49.4	0.76 (0.55, 1.05)	0.03	0.04	55	56	57.1	0.76 (0.50, 1.16)	0.02	0.05
		4506	5372		I² = 0.36, Tau² = 0.00			4415	4042		I² = 0.50, Tau² = 0.01		
Fixed					0.87 (0.82, 0.92)						0.90 (0.85, 0.96)		
Random					0.87 (0.81, 0.93)						0.89 (0.80, 0.99)		




Supplemental figure 7B: Stunting prevalence ratio

7B4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.200

Ratio of PRs = 1.06 (0.97, 1.17)




Supplemental figure 7B: Stunting prevalence ratio

7B5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.280


Ratio of PRs = 0.96 (0.89, 1.03)



Supplemental figure 7B: Stunting prevalence ratio

7B6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.389
 Ratio of PRs = 0.97 (0.90, 1.04)




Supplemental figure 7C: Stunting prevalence difference

7C1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.724

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 7C: Stunting prevalence difference

7C2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.663

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 7C: Stunting prevalence difference

7C3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.469

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.04, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 7C: Stunting prevalence difference

7C4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.310

Difference in PDs = 0.02 (-0.01, 0.05)




Supplemental figure 7C: Stunting prevalence difference

7C5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.228

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.05, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 7C: Stunting prevalence difference

7C6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.493

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)





Supplemental figure 7D: Mean difference in WLZ

7D1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.814
 Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.03, 0.04)

Country	Trial	LNS N	Control N	Control Mean	At least median		Fixed W	Random W		Less than median		Fixed W	Random W		
					MD (95% CI)					MD (95% CI)					
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	1401	607	-1.10	0.10 (0.04, 0.16)	0.22	0.15			1381	610	-1.24	0.06 (-0.01, 0.12)	0.20	0.13
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	834	407	-1.01	0.04 (-0.07, 0.15)	0.07	0.08			827	408	-1.21	0.10 (0.01, 0.19)	0.10	0.10
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)	579	1714	-0.72	0.12 (0.02, 0.21)	0.09	0.09			577	1710	-1.02	0.13 (0.04, 0.22)	0.10	0.10
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1225	299	-0.90	0.19 (0.09, 0.29)	0.08	0.09			720	364	-0.97	0.16 (0.09, 0.23)	0.15	0.12
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	405	479	-0.66	0.05 (-0.07, 0.17)	0.06	0.06			451	428	-0.77	0.16 (-0.04, 0.35)	0.02	0.03
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	220	208	-0.91	-0.06 (-0.25, 0.13)	0.02	0.03			210	228	-0.86	-0.16 (-0.34, 0.02)	0.03	0.04
Ghana	GHANA (39)	57	44	-0.41	0.06 (-0.46, 0.57)	0.00	0.00			41	46	-0.84	0.30 (-0.15, 0.74)	0.00	0.01
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	157	356	-0.53	0.10 (-0.09, 0.29)	0.02	0.03			190	334	-0.65	0.10 (-0.08, 0.28)	0.03	0.04
Haiti	HAITI (41)	74	60	0.23	-0.04 (-0.28, 0.20)	0.01	0.02			61	72	-0.22	0.15 (-0.07, 0.37)	0.02	0.03
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	825	2914	0.13	0.07 (-0.01, 0.15)	0.13	0.11			628	2200	0.05	0.06 (-0.03, 0.15)	0.11	0.10
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	771	884	-0.31	0.01 (-0.12, 0.13)	0.05	0.06			876	755	-0.56	0.04 (-0.10, 0.19)	0.04	0.05
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	121	234	-0.12	-0.04 (-0.24, 0.17)	0.02	0.03			99	209	-0.14	-0.08 (-0.33, 0.18)	0.01	0.02
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	301	104	-0.13	-0.04 (-0.21, 0.13)	0.03	0.04			294	103	-0.38	0.11 (-0.10, 0.32)	0.02	0.03
Mali	PROMIS (46)	246	250	-0.32	0.13 (-0.01, 0.27)	0.04	0.05			245	246	-0.32	0.06 (-0.09, 0.22)	0.03	0.05
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	501	458	-0.77	0.17 (0.04, 0.30)	0.05	0.06			443	501	-0.77	0.15 (0.01, 0.29)	0.04	0.05
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	903	797	0.08	0.04 (-0.07, 0.14)	0.08	0.08			826	856	-0.06	0.15 (0.06, 0.25)	0.09	0.09
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	171	156	0.06	-0.16 (-0.42, 0.09)	0.01	0.02			157	166	-0.03	-0.11 (-0.38, 0.15)	0.01	0.02
		8791	9971							8026	9236				
				I² = 0.23, Tau² = 0.00								I² = 0.27, Tau² = 0.00			
Fixed				0.08 (0.05, 0.11)								0.10 (0.07, 0.12)			
Random				0.07 (0.03, 0.11)								0.09 (0.05, 0.13)			




Supplemental figure 7D: Mean difference in WLZ

7D2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.813

Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.04, 0.05)




Supplemental figure 7D: Mean difference in WLZ

7D3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.860

Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.05, 0.07)




Supplemental figure 7D: Mean difference in WLZ

7D4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.062


Difference in MDs = -0.05 (-0.11, 0.00)



Supplemental figure 7D: Mean difference in WLZ

7D5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.043
Difference in MDs = 0.06 (0.00, 0.11)




Supplemental figure 7D: Mean difference in WLZ

7D6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.197


Difference in MDs = -0.03 (-0.08, 0.02)



Supplemental figure 7E: Wasting prevalence ratio

7E1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.492
Ratio of PRs = 1.06 (0.90, 1.24)




Supplemental figure 7E: Wasting prevalence ratio

7E2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.729

Ratio of PRs = 0.97 (0.81, 1.16)




Supplemental figure 7E: Wasting prevalence ratio

7E3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.075

Ratio of PRs = 1.27 (0.98, 1.65)




Supplemental figure 7E: Wasting prevalence ratio

7E4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.080

Ratio of PRs = 1.20 (0.98, 1.48)




Supplemental figure 7E: Wasting prevalence ratio

7E5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.478

Ratio of PRs = 1.09 (0.86, 1.37)




Supplemental figure 7E: Wasting prevalence ratio

7E6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.088

Ratio of PRs = 1.16 (0.98, 1.39)




Supplemental figure 7F: Wasting prevalence difference

7F1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.223

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)




Supplemental figure 7F: Wasting prevalence difference

7F2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.433

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 7F: Wasting prevalence difference

7F3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.612

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 7F: Wasting prevalence difference

7F4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.134

Difference in PDs = 0.02 (-0.01, 0.05)





Supplemental figure 7G: Mean difference in MUACZ

7G1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.768

Difference in MDs = 0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)

Country	Trial	LNS N	Control N	Control Mean	At least median		Fixed W	Random W		Less than median		Fixed W	Random W		
					MD (95% CI)					MD (95% CI)					
Bangladesh	JiVitA-4 (34)	1463	641	-0.95	0.09 (0.03, 0.15)	0.29	0.12			1433	630	-1.18	0.07 (0.01, 0.13)	0.24	0.13
Bangladesh	RDNS (35)	834	407	-0.60	0.05 (-0.06, 0.15)	0.09	0.09			829	408	-0.80	0.03 (-0.07, 0.12)	0.11	0.10
Bangladesh	WASH-B (36)														
Burkina Faso	iLiNS-Zinc (37)	1232	300	-1.09	0.30 (0.18, 0.42)	0.06	0.08			720	365	-1.16	0.29 (0.20, 0.38)	0.11	0.10
Burkina Faso	PROMIS (38)	403	479	-0.71	0.08 (-0.09, 0.25)	0.03	0.05			451	433	-0.76	0.10 (-0.02, 0.22)	0.07	0.08
Burkina Faso	PROMIS CS (38)	219	207	-0.82	-0.06 (-0.26, 0.13)	0.02	0.05			205	229	-0.81	-0.06 (-0.27, 0.15)	0.02	0.04
Ghana	GHANA (39)														
Ghana	iLiNS-DYADG (40)	157	356	-0.40	0.07 (-0.10, 0.25)	0.03	0.05			190	335	-0.54	0.11 (-0.05, 0.27)	0.04	0.06
Haiti	HAITI (41)														
Kenya	WASH-B (42)	827	2949	-0.39	0.14 (0.06, 0.22)	0.15	0.11			632	2232	-0.55	0.09 (-0.01, 0.19)	0.10	0.10
Madagascar	MAHAY (43)	761	865	-0.61	-0.05 (-0.22, 0.12)	0.03	0.06			866	750	-0.87	0.02 (-0.12, 0.17)	0.05	0.07
Malawi	iLiNS-DYADM (44)	121	234	0.14	-0.06 (-0.26, 0.15)	0.02	0.04			99	209	0.00	-0.02 (-0.27, 0.23)	0.02	0.03
Malawi	iLiNS-DOSE (45)	303	104	0.18	0.05 (-0.11, 0.21)	0.03	0.06			292	102	-0.06	0.00 (-0.17, 0.18)	0.03	0.05
Mali	PROMIS (46)	248	250	-0.78	0.17 (0.02, 0.31)	0.04	0.07			246	246	-0.76	0.19 (0.01, 0.37)	0.03	0.05
Mali	PROMIS CS (46)	505	463	-0.86	0.16 (0.01, 0.31)	0.04	0.07			449	507	-0.80	0.10 (-0.04, 0.24)	0.05	0.06
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV-) (47)	905	797	0.11	0.00 (-0.09, 0.08)	0.13	0.10			827	852	-0.11	0.15 (0.06, 0.24)	0.12	0.10
Zimbabwe	SHINE (HIV+) (48)	171	156	-0.14	0.02 (-0.17, 0.21)	0.02	0.05			158	166	-0.23	0.04 (-0.17, 0.25)	0.02	0.04
		8149	8208							7397	7464				
Fixed				I² = 0.54, Tau² = 0.00								I² = 0.52, Tau² = 0.00			
Random				0.08 (0.05, 0.11)								0.10 (0.07, 0.13)			
				0.08 (0.03, 0.13)								0.10 (0.05, 0.14)			




Supplemental figure 7G: Mean difference in MUACZ

7G2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.595

Difference in MDs = -0.01 (-0.06, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 7G: Mean difference in MUACZ

7G4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.026


Difference in MDs = -0.06 (-0.12, -0.01)



Supplemental figure 7G: Mean difference in MUACZ

7G5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.048
 Difference in MDs = 0.07 (0.00, 0.13)




Supplemental figure 7G: Mean difference in MUACZ

7G6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.977

Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.05, 0.05)




Supplemental figure 7H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

7H1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.129

Ratio of PRs = 1.14 (0.96, 1.35)




Supplemental figure 7H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

7H2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.182

Ratio of PRs = 1.15 (0.93, 1.42)




Supplemental figure 7H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

7H3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.130

Ratio of PRs = 0.85 (0.69, 1.05)




Supplemental figure 7H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

7H4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.239

Ratio of PRs = 1.15 (0.91, 1.46)




Supplemental figure 7H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

7H5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.543

Ratio of PRs = 1.10 (0.81, 1.48)




Supplemental figure 7H: Low MUAC prevalence ratio

7H6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.301

Ratio of PRs = 0.89 (0.72, 1.11)




Supplemental figure 7I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

7I1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.735

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 7I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

7I2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.630

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 7I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

7I3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.039

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)




Supplemental figure 7I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

7I4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.165

Difference in PDs = 0.02 (-0.01, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 7I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

7I5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.688

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 7I: Low MUAC prevalence difference

7I6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.322


Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)



Supplemental figure 7J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

7J1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.312
 Ratio of PRs = 1.08 (0.93, 1.25)




Supplemental figure 7J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

7J3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.789

Ratio of PRs = 1.03 (0.82, 1.30)




Supplemental figure 7J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

7J4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.013

Ratio of PRs = 1.25 (1.05, 1.49)




Supplemental figure 7J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

7J5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.310

Ratio of PRs = 1.14 (0.89, 1.45)




Supplemental figure 7J: Acute malnutrition prevalence ratio

7J6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.172

Ratio of PRs = 1.12 (0.95, 1.32)




Supplemental figure 7K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

7K1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.197

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)




Supplemental figure 7K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

7K2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.074

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)




Supplemental figure 7K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

7K3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.574


Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.02)



Supplemental figure 7K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

7K4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.016
Difference in PDs = 0.03 (0.01, 0.05)




Supplemental figure 7K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

7K5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.318

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.02, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 7K: Acute malnutrition prevalence difference

7K6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.534


Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.01, 0.02)



Supplemental figure 7L: Mean difference in WAZ

7L1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.954
 Difference in MDs = 0.00 (-0.03, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 7L: Mean difference in WAZ

7L2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.751

Difference in MDs = -0.01 (-0.05, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 7L: Mean difference in WAZ

7L4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.035

Difference in MDs = -0.06 (-0.11, 0.00)




Supplemental figure 7L: Mean difference in WAZ

7L5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.076

Difference in MDs = 0.06 (-0.01, 0.12)




Supplemental figure 7L: Mean difference in WAZ

7L6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.212


Difference in MDs = -0.03 (-0.07, 0.02)



Supplemental figure 7M: Underweight prevalence ratio

7M1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.877
Ratio of PRs = 1.01 (0.93, 1.09)




Supplemental figure 7M: Underweight prevalence ratio

7M2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.661

Ratio of PRs = 0.98 (0.89, 1.08)




Supplemental figure 7M: Underweight prevalence ratio

7M3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.762

Ratio of PRs = 0.98 (0.86, 1.12)




Supplemental figure 7M: Underweight prevalence ratio

7M4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.840

Ratio of PRs = 1.01 (0.89, 1.15)




Supplemental figure 7M: Underweight prevalence ratio

7M5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.416


Ratio of PRs = 1.05 (0.94, 1.17)



Supplemental figure 7M: Underweight prevalence ratio

7M6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.102
 Ratio of PRs = 1.08 (0.98, 1.19)




Supplemental figure 7N: Underweight prevalence difference

7N1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.123

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.00)




Supplemental figure 7N: Underweight prevalence difference

7N2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.068

Difference in PDs = -0.02 (-0.04, 0.00)




Supplemental figure 7N: Underweight prevalence difference

7N3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.232

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)




Supplemental figure 7N: Underweight prevalence difference

7N4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.679

Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.02, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 7N: Underweight prevalence difference

7N5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.750

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.03, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 7N: Underweight prevalence difference

7N6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.254

Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 7O: Mean difference in HCZ

7O2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.603

Difference in MDs = -0.01 (-0.06, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 7O: Mean difference in HCZ

7O3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.341

Difference in MDs = 0.04 (-0.04, 0.12)




Supplemental figure 7O: Mean difference in HCZ

7O4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.339

Difference in MDs = -0.03 (-0.09, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 7O: Mean difference in HCZ

7O5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.416

Difference in MDs = 0.03 (-0.04, 0.09)




Supplemental figure 7O: Mean difference in HCZ

7O6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.477


Difference in MDs = -0.02 (-0.06, 0.03)



Supplemental figure 7P: Small head size prevalence ratio

7P1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.462
Ratio of PRs = 1.04 (0.94, 1.14)




Supplemental figure 7P: Small head size prevalence ratio

7P3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.505

Ratio of PRs = 0.93 (0.74, 1.16)




Supplemental figure 7P: Small head size prevalence ratio

7P4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.109

Ratio of PRs = 1.13 (0.97, 1.31)




Supplemental figure 7P: Small head size prevalence ratio

7P5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.826

Ratio of PRs = 0.99 (0.89, 1.10)




Supplemental figure 7P: Small head size prevalence ratio

7P6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.434

Ratio of PRs = 1.04 (0.94, 1.15)




Supplemental figure 7Q: Small head size prevalence difference

7Q1: Stratified by Household socio-economic status

P-for-interaction = 0.965

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)




Supplemental figure 7Q: Small head size prevalence difference

7Q2: Stratified by Household food insecurity

P-for-interaction = 0.396

Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 7Q: Small head size prevalence difference

7Q3: Stratified by Household source water quality

P-for-interaction = 0.976

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.02, 0.03)




Supplemental figure 7Q: Small head size prevalence difference

7Q4: Stratified by Household sanitation

P-for-interaction = 0.794

Difference in PDs = 0.00 (-0.03, 0.04)




Supplemental figure 7Q: Small head size prevalence difference

7Q5: Stratified by Home environment

P-for-interaction = 0.291

Difference in PDs = -0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)



Supplemental figure 7Q: Small head size prevalence difference

7Q6: Stratified by Season at the time of assessment

P-for-interaction = 0.258

Difference in PDs = 0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)

