

1 Socioeconomic inequality in the double burden of child malnutrition in the Eastern and
2 Southern African Region

3

4 Socioeconomic inequality in the double burden of child malnutrition

5

6 Rishi Caleyachetty¹, Niraj Kumar², Hana Bekele³, Semira Manaseki-Holland^{4*}

7

8 Warwick Centre for Global Health, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick,
9 Medical School Building, Coventry, UK.

10

11 University College London Medical School, University College London, London, UK

12

13 World Health Organization, Inter-Country Support Team, Zimbabwe WHO Country
14 Office, Harare, Zimbabwe

15

16 Institute for Applied Health Research, College of Medical and Dental Sciences,
17 University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

18

19

20 *Corresponding author: s.manasekiholland@bham.ac.uk

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 Abstract

28 Socioeconomic inequalities in the double burden of child malnutrition threatens global
 29 nutrition targets 2025, especially in Eastern and Southern Africa. We aimed to quantify
 30 these inequalities from nationally representative household surveys in 13 Eastern and
 31 Southern African countries between 2000 and 2018. 13 of the latest Demographic and
 32 Health Surveys including 72,231 children under five year olds were studied.
 33 Prevalence of stunting, wasting and overweight (including obesity) were disaggregated by
 34 wealth quintiles, maternal education categories and urban-rural residence for visual
 35 inspection of inequalities, and the slope index of inequality (SII) and the relative index of
 36 inequality (RII) were estimated for each country. Country-specific estimates were pooled
 37 using random-effects meta-analyses. Regional stunting and wasting prevalence was
 38 higher among children living in the poorest households, with mother's with the lowest
 39 educational level and in rural areas. In contrast, regional overweight (including obesity)
 40 prevalence was higher among children living in the richest households, with mother's
 41 with the highest educational level and urban areas. Tackling social inequalities in the
 42 distribution of the double burden of malnutrition among children in the Eastern and
 43 Southern African region will require strategies that address the reasons socially
 44 disadvantaged children become more exposed to stunting or wasting.

45

46

47

48

49 Introduction

50 The African region has the highest burden of childhood stunting and one of the highest

51 burdens of childhood overweight in Africa.¹ Importantly, the region is off track to achieve
 52 the UN Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 2 aim to end all forms of hunger and
 53 malnutrition by 2030.² The double burden of malnutrition, is considered a major global
 54 health challenge for African countries,³ particularly those in Eastern and Southern Africa.
 55 The prevalence of malnutrition is 34.5% in Eastern Africa for stunting and 10.2% in
 56 Southern Africa for overweight (including obesity), compared to 29.1% for stunting and
 57 4.7% for overweight (including obesity) in Africa.¹

58

59 Following on from the 2008 WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health and
 60 2011 Rio Political Declaration on Social Determinants of Health, another important goal
 61 for the African region is tackling social inequalities in health.⁴ Considering that the double
 62 burden of malnutrition is inextricably bound to socioeconomic conditions,⁵ monitoring
 63 and description of child malnutrition inequalities will be important to serve
 64 evidence-based program and policy decisions in the Eastern and Southern African
 65 region. Several measures of social inequality in health reflecting its different dimensions
 66 have been described.⁶ In the context of child malnutrition, absolute inequality measures
 67 reflects the magnitude of difference in malnutrition prevalence between two subgroups
 68 and relative inequality measures show proportional differences in child malnutrition
 69 prevalence among subgroups. The choice of measure is not value-neutral and
 70 influences our understanding of which populations may be actually experiencing a higher
 71 malnutrition burden. Therefore, both relative and absolute measures to monitor social
 72 inequalities are recommended.⁷

73 A recent study examined global inequalities in household-level double burden of
 74 malnutrition and found the probability of double burden of malnutrition higher among
 75 richer households in poorer low-income and middle-income countries.⁸ Their definition of

76 double burden of malnutrition was expressed as a stunted child with an overweight
 77 mother. The objective of reducing child malnutrition may not necessarily be compatible
 78 with the objective of reducing socioeconomic inequalities in child malnutrition. For
 79 example, Africa has observed spectacular gains in reducing stunting, however these
 80 gains may have not benefited every child equally.⁹ In the Eastern and Southern African
 81 region, there has not been to date a comprehensive large-scale assessment of
 82 socioeconomic inequalities in the population-level double burden of child malnutrition.
 83 Such an assessment would be valuable to support countries moving towards regional
 84 nutrition equity.

85

86 We use nationally representative household surveys across 13 Eastern and Southern
 87 African countries between 2003-2018 to quantify socioeconomic inequalities in the
 88 double burden of malnutrition among children under five years old.

89

91 **Methods**

92 We searched for data from the most recent Demographic and Health Survey (DHS)¹⁰
 93 within countries in the Eastern and Southern African region with data available on
 94 length/height and weight. In all countries, these surveys followed the same standardised
 95 procedures. Complete descriptions of country DHS sampling, questionnaire validation,
 96 data collection methods, and data validation procedures are published elsewhere.¹⁰ Our
 97 analytical sample included alive children under age five years with valid weight and
 98 height measurement, and living with their mother. The datasets used for this project are
 99 available at the DHS Program website
 100 (<https://www.dhsprogram.com/data/available-datasets.cfm>).

101

102 **Ethics statement**

103 The DHS was approved centrally by ICF International (Calverton, MD, USA) institutional
 104 review board and by individual review boards within every participating country. Informed
 105 verbal consent was obtained from all participants during surveys and data were released
 106 in deidentified form. A parent or guardian provided verbal consent prior to participation
 107 by a child.

108

109 **Anthropometric measurements**

110 DHS include data about each child's age (in months and years) and measured
 111 height/weight. Trained survey staff weighed and measured the length/height of each
 112 child. Height-for age and BMI-for-age z-scores were calculated using the 'zscore06'
 113 STATA command, which uses WHO 2006 growth standards. Stunting was defined as z
 114 scores for height-for-age (HAZ) of <-2SD. Wasting was defined as z scores for
 115 weight-for-height (WHZ) <-2 SD. Overweight was defined as z scores for WHZ >2 SD

116 and ≤ 3 SD of the median and obese was defined as z scores for WHZ > 3 SD.

117

118 Socioeconomic characteristics

119 The economic status of households was based on asset indices. Household
120 questionnaires collect information on household assets (such as televisions,
121 refrigerators, and other appliances), dwelling characteristics (materials used for the
122 walls, floor and roof, presence of electricity, water supply and sanitary facilities) and
123 other variables associated with wealth (such as ownership of the house, of land
124 or livestock). A wealth index is constructed using household asset data via principle
125 component analysis, which can be split into quintiles, where the first quintile (Q1)
126 represents the approximately 20% poorest households in the survey sample and the fifth
127 quintile (Q5) represents the richest. Maternal education was self-reported and
128 categorised in three groups: none (no formal education); primary (any primary education,
129 including completed primary education); and secondary or higher (any secondary
130 education, including complete secondary). Urban or rural location were defined defined
131 by the national census or statistical bureau in each country at the time the survey was
132 conducted.

133

134

135 Statistical analysis

136 Regional prevalence estimates and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for stunting, wasting,
137 overweight (including obesity), concurrent stunting and wasting, and concurrent stunting
138 and overweight (including obesity) in children <5 years were calculated. First, we
139 calculated country-specific malnutrition estimates. The DHS used complex sample
140 designs therefore we accounted for stratification and clustering. Meta-analysis of

country-specific estimates were performed to calculate the regional prevalence estimates and 95% CIs. Variances of the raw proportions were stabilized with a double arcsine transformation and then pooled on the basis of a random-effects model.

Social inequalities in the population-level double burden of child malnutrition were first visualized using equiplots. Equiplots allow comparison of absolute social inequality indicating both the prevalence of malnutrition in each group and the distance between groups, which represents the absolute social inequality. We then estimated using absolute and relative differences between poorest and richest households, lowest and highest maternal education and urban and rural residence. Wealth and education inequalities in the double burden of malnutrition were measured for each country by regression-based inequality measures, the relative index of inequality (RII) and the slope index of inequality (SII), respectively.¹¹ A logistic regression model was used to assess the association between malnutrition and wealth or maternal education and to generate the SII and RII values and 95% CIs. Social inequalities on both scales were reported because conclusions can be skewed when only one or the other is used.¹² Both these measures take into account the size of the population across wealth and education groups. The SII can be interpreted as the defined as the absolute difference in the malnutrition prevalence between the poorest and richest or mothers with the lowest education and mothers with the highest education level (across the entire socioeconomic or maternal education distribution). SII can range from -1 to 1. If there is no inequality, SII takes the value zero. Positive SII values indicate that the child malnutrition indicator is concentrated in the most socially advantaged group (i.e. richest or mothers with the highest education). The RII is defined as the ratio of the estimated prevalence of malnutrition between the poorest and the richest or mothers with the lowest education and mothers with the highest education (across the entire socioeconomic or maternal

167 education distribution). If there is no inequality, RII takes the value one. An RII value
 168 great than 1 indicates the child malnutrition indicator is concentrated among the most
 169 socially advantaged group. We used random-effects meta-analysis to average inequality
 170 estimates across countries in the Eastern and Southern African region. All of the
 171 statistical analyses were performed with the use of STATA version 16.1 (StataCorp). We
 172 used the svy command to account for complex survey sampling designs and the
 173 sampling weights for all countries' surveys.

174

175

176

177

178

179

181 Results

182 Demographic Health Survey datasets from 2003-2018 were available for 17 Eastern and
183 Southern African countries. 15 out of 17 had available anthropometric data however
184 access to two DHS datasets were restricted. In total, 13 out of 17 (77.0%) countries and
185 116,747 children living with their mother were eligible for inclusion in our study. Of the
186 children aged 0-5 years and living with their mother (n=75,894), 4.0% (n=3037) with
187 implausible HAZ and 0.8% (n=626) implausible WHZ. 72,231 children (95.2%) were
188 included in our final analytical sample.

189

190 Table 1 shows the country-level characteristics of participants. The mean age of children
191 was 28.4 months (range: 26.0-29.8 months). The proportion of children with mothers
192 who had no formal education ranged from 1.0% (Lesotho) to 48.0% (Comoros), and the
193 proportion of children who lived households in the lowest household wealth quintile
194 ranged from 21.6% (Lesotho) to 25.8% (Comoros). The proportion of children living in
195 urban areas ranged from 13.0% (Malawi) to 56.9% (South Africa).

Table 1. Characteristics of most recent Demographic Health Surveys in Eastern and Southern African region

Country	Year	Children < 5 years (n)	Analytic sample (n)	Response Rate (%)	Age (months)	Living in urban area (%)	Lowest household wealth quintile (%)	No maternal education (%)
Comoros	2012	2,882	2,432	84.4	28.6	26.6	25.8	48.0
Eswatini	2006	2,220	2,042	92.0	27.7	18.7	22.0	9.2
Kenya	2015	19,255	18,648	96.8	29.1	34.3	24.2	11.9
Lesotho	2014	1,367	1,303	95.3	27.0	27.3	21.6	1.0
Malawi	2015	5,357	5,116	95.5	29.6	13.1	23.8	13.0
Mozambique	2011	9,772	9,363	95.8	27.8	26.9	23.8	37.7
Namibia	2013	1,945	1,800	92.5	26.0	42.6	25.2	6.9
Rwanda	2014	3,615	3,544	98.0	28.4	16.5	24.8	14.3
South Africa	2016	1,451	1,070	73.7	29.8	56.9	24.1	19.8
Tanzania	2015	9,196	8,940	97.2	28.0	25.9	24.7	21.4
Uganda	2016	4,506	4,382	97.2	28.8	20.4	22.7	11.1
Zambia	2018	9,094	8,694	95.6	28.8	35.0	25.1	10.1
Zimbabwe	2015	5,234	4,897	93.6	29.4	29.6	24.4	1.2

Fig 1 shows the regional prevalence estimates for child malnutrition. Overall, stunting prevalence was 30.5% (95% CI 27.7,33.4), with prevalence ranging from 22.3% (Namibia) to 39.3% (Mozambique) (S1 Table); wasting prevalence was 4.6% (95% CI: 3.7-5.6), with prevalence ranging from 2.3% (Rwanda) to 12.3% (Comoros) (S2 Table); and overweight (including obesity) prevalence was 6.5% (95% CI 5.2,7.9), with prevalence ranging from 3.6% (Tanzania) to 12.9% (South Africa) (S3 Table). The pooled prevalence of concurrent stunting and wasting was 1.1% (95% CI 0.8,1.4), with prevalence ranging from 0.4% (South Africa) to 2.1% (Comoros) (S4 Table). The pooled prevalence of concurrent stunting and overweight (including obesity) was 2.6% (95% CI 1.9, 3.5), with the prevalence varying across countries, ranging from 1.1% (Kenya) to 5.1% (Comoros) (S5 Table).

Fig 2 shows the prevalence of adolescent overweight (including obesity) by stunting or wasting prevalence, with each country in the region represented by one square. The vertical and horizontal lines separate four quadrants. The plot identifies 23% (3 of 13) of

218 Eastern and Southern African countries had prevalences of overweight (including
219 obesity) and stunting or wasting greater than the overall pooled prevalence estimates for
220 overweight (including obesity) and stunting or wasting, respectively.

221

222 Fig 3 presents equiplots of regional stunting prevalence by wealth quintiles, categories of
223 formal maternal education, and urban-rural residence. Higher stunting prevalence was
224 found among children belonging to the poorest households, mother's with the lowest
225 educational level and rural residence. Lesotho represents an extreme example with the
226 widest gaps in stunting prevalence by wealth (30.5% points; $p < 0.001$) and maternal
227 education (54.6% points; $p < 0.001$) (S6-S7 Tables). Malawi showed the widest gap in
228 stunting prevalence by urban-rural residence gap (13.7% points; $p < 0.001$) (S8 Table).

229

230 Fig 4 presents equiplots of regional wasting prevalence by wealth quintiles, categories of
231 formal maternal education categories, and urban-rural residence for the region. Higher
232 wasting prevalence was found among children belonging to the poorest households,
233 mother's with the lowest educational level, and rural residence. Mozambique and
234 Namibia represents extreme examples with the widest gaps in wealth (7.1% points;
235 $p < 0.001$) and maternal education gaps (16.2% points; $p < 0.001$) (S9-S10 Tables).
236 Mozambique showed the widest gap in wasting prevalence by urban-rural residence
237 (3.0%; $p < 0.001$) (S11 Table).

238

239 Fig 5 presents equiplots of overweight (including obesity) prevalence by wealth quintiles,
240 categories of formal maternal education categories, and urban-rural residence for the
241 region. Higher overweight (including obesity) prevalence was found among children
242 belonging to the richest households, mother's with the highest educational level and
243 urban residence. Eswatini represents an extreme example, with the the widest gaps in

244 overweight (including obesity) prevalence by wealth (6.1% points; $p=0.058$), maternal
245 education (12.2% points; $p<0.001$) and urban-rural residence (6.8% points; $p=0.002$)
246 (S12-14 Tables).

247

248 Fig 6-9 show the mean values of stunting, wasting and overweight (including obesity)
249 prevalence respectively, and summary inequality measures (that take the whole
250 socioeconomic distribution into account). Significant levels of relative and absolute
251 inequalities in favour of the poorest households and least educated mothers were
252 observed for child stunting and wasting. In the absolute scale, the largest wealth
253 inequality in stunting prevalence was in Rwanda (SII= -0.36; 95% CI 0.41,-0.31) and in
254 the relative scale, the largest wealth inequality was in Namibia (RII= 0.36, 95% CI 0.25,
255 0.47). The largest maternal education inequality in stunting prevalence was in Rwanda
256 on the absolute scale (SII=-0.33, 95% CI -0.39, -0.26) and in relative scale Namibia on
257 the (RII=0.33, 95% CI 0.22, 0.43). Kenya had the largest inequalities in child wasting
258 prevalence by household wealth quintile (SII: -0.10, 95% CI -0.12, -0.09; RII: 0.17, 95%
259 CI 0.13, 0.21) and maternal education (SII: -0.13, 95% CI -0.15, -0.11; RII: 0.10 95% CI
260 0.08, 0.13). In contrast, there were inequalities in the other direction for overweight
261 (including obesity), that is, overweight (including obesity) was concentrated towards the
262 richest wealth quintiles children and higher maternal education. In the absolute scale,
263 the largest wealth inequality in overweight (including obese) prevalence was in Comoros
264 (SII: 0.09, 95% CI 0.04, 0.13) and in the relative scale, Kenya (RII: 4.46, 95% CI 3.24,
265 4.67). The largest maternal education inequality in overweight (including obese)
266 prevalence on the absolute scale was in Eswatini (SII: 0.11, 95% CI 0.05, 0.16) and
267 Kenya on the relative scale (RII: 4.35, 95% CI 3.09, 5.60).

268

269

271 Discussion

272

273 To our knowledge, this study is the first to systematically identify the magnitude of social
 274 inequalities in the double burden of malnutrition among children under five years across
 275 the Eastern and Southern African region. We documented important levels of
 276 socioeconomic inequalities both on the relative and absolute scales in stunting, wasting
 277 and overweight (including obesity), as well as urban-rural inequalities. The magnitude of
 278 these inequalities varied across countries and malnutrition indicators. Regionally,
 279 stunting and wasting prevalence were concentrated in the lowest wealth quintile and
 280 maternal education level, and rural areas. These inequalities were in the other direction
 281 for overweight (including obesity).

282

283 A study of 55 low-income and middle-income countries (LMICs) between 1992-2018
 284 examining inequalities in double burden of malnutrition found a higher probability of the
 285 double burden of malnutrition among richer households in poorer LMICs and poorer
 286 households in richer LMICs.⁸ The authors defined the double burden of malnutrition at
 287 the household level, expressed as a stunted child with an overweight mother. However,
 288 there is strong evidence that stunted child/overweight mother pairs represents a
 289 statistical artefact and not a distinct entity.¹³ Our study assessed socioeconomic
 290 inequalities in the double burden of child malnutrition at the population level, which is a
 291 common double burden of malnutrition operational definition.¹⁴ A systematic review
 292 examining socioeconomic status and overweight or obesity among older children (5-19
 293 years) in Sub-Saharan Africa used the RII to assess socioeconomic inequalities. The
 294 school-age children from higher socioeconomic households tended to be overweight and
 295 obese.¹⁵ We found similar wealth and education inequalities using both simple and
 296 complex absolute and relative measures in the Eastern and Southern African region for

297 children under five year olds. In highly developed countries, a higher prevalence of child
 298 overweight and obesity children is typically found in lower socioeconomic groups.¹⁶
 299 Eastern and Southern African households of lower socioeconomic status, may have
 300 financial constraints that prevent purchasing of high-energy density foods with a
 301 consequence that the overweight and obesity prevalence levels are kept to a minimum
 302 in these households. Additionally, parent's socio-cultural beliefs may influence their
 303 child's body shape ideals. In some sub-Saharan African countries, overweight and
 304 obesity have been historically been considered to be a sign of wealth.¹⁵

305
 306 Our study found the Eastern and Southern African region is burdened by multiple forms
 307 of malnutrition. The prevalence of stunting among children was 30.4%, the prevalence of
 308 wasting was 4.6%, whereas 6.5% were overweight (including obesity). A much smaller
 309 proportion of children also had concurrent stunting and wasting (1.1%) and concurrent
 310 stunting and overweight (2.6%). The presence of a double burden of malnutrition at a
 311 population level, is likely to reflect the region's ongoing challenges with poverty, food
 312 insecurity, infectious diseases, droughts, floods and conflict as well as the presence of
 313 the obesogenic environment driven by globalization and rapid urbanization. Households
 314 of lower socioeconomic households may not have access to resources (money,
 315 knowledge, prestige, power and beneficial connections) that could better able them to
 316 avoid undernutrition and therefore unable to avoid child undernutrition.

317
 318 Several limitations, however, should be considered when interpreting our findings. The
 319 Eastern and Southern African region encompasses 24 countries, however our findings
 320 are for 13 countries of 17 in the Eastern and Southern African region where DHS is
 321 available. A direct indicator of household income is not collected in the DHS and the
 322 asset-based household wealth index was used. While this is an imperfect measure

323 financial resources, it is frequently used and judged to be superior to income in lower
 324 income countries.¹⁷ Between country comparisons may be affected by the period of data
 325 collection for each national household survey (from 2003 to 2018). Social reform and
 326 safety net programmes in the region have increased over this study period and may
 327 have reduced inequalities over time.¹⁸ Despite these limitations, our study has several
 328 strengths. Our analysis of socioeconomic inequalities and urban/rural inequalities in child
 329 malnutrition in Eastern and Southern African region are based on a relatively large and
 330 diverse sample of children from 13 nationally representative household surveys with
 331 uniformity of information based on the same questions and procedures in all countries.
 332 We used both simple and complex measures to show inequality. Simple measures only
 333 compare two subgroups. For example, we used equiplots to compare the richest and
 334 poorest. However, simple measures cannot describe how all groups change. We also
 335 used complex measures (including SII and RII) which indicated inequality across the
 336 whole population between the most and the least disadvantaged.

337

338 Addressing social inequalities in the distribution of the double burden of malnutrition
 339 among children in the Eastern and Southern African region requires strategies that
 340 address the reasons certain subpopulations became more exposed to these nutrition
 341 problems, while also avoiding strategies that solve one nutrition problem while
 342 worsening another one.⁵ Any attempt to analyse and act on inequalities in the double
 343 burden of child malnutrition in the Eastern and Southern African region, however
 344 requires the initial acknowledgement that tackling overweight (including obesity) among
 345 socially advantaged children, is not part of the "health inequalities" agenda, which
 346 focuses on the improving the health of socially disadvantaged.¹⁹ Most countries also do
 347 not have a robust routine data collection systems for child malnutrition,²⁰ and therefore
 348 cannot adequately and frequently monitor socioeconomic gradients in child malnutrition.

349 Countries may therefore not have programmes and policies that are also tailored to the
350 desired population.

351

352 Given the recent coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, this is likely to be a
353 time of worsening socioeconomic conditions.²¹ Therefore, it is important that there be an
354 ongoing conversation about measuring and acting on the socioeconomic inequalities of
355 the double burden of child malnutrition in the Eastern and Southern African region, as
356 there much to debate and resolve.

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

365 References

1. United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), World Health Organization, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank. Levels and trends in child malnutrition: key findings of the 2021 edition of the joint child malnutrition estimates. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
2. Atukunda P, Eide WB, Kardel KR, Iversen PO, Westerberg AC. Unlocking the potential for achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goal 2 - 'Zero Hunger' - in Africa: targets, strategies, synergies and challenges. Food Nutr Res. 2021;65
3. Onyango AW, Jean-Baptiste J, Samburu B, Mahlangu TLM. Regional Overview on the Double Burden of Malnutrition and Examples of Program and Policy Responses: African Region. Ann Nutr Metab. 2019;75:127-130.
4. Donkin A, Goldblatt P, Allen J, Nathanson V, Marmot M. Global action on the social determinants of health. BMJ Glob Health. 2018;3:e000603.
5. Perez-Escamilla R, Bermudez O, Buccini GS et al. Nutrition disparities and the global burden of malnutrition. BMJ. 2018;361:k2252.
6. Regidor E. Measures of health inequalities: part 2. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2004;58:900-903.
7. Kelly, MP, Morgan, A, Bonnefoy, J, Butt, J, Bergman, V. The social determinants of health: Developing an evidence base for political action. Final report of the Measurement and Evidence Knowledge Network to the World Health Organization Commission on the Social Determinants of Health. Geneva: WHO; 2007.
8. Seferidi P, Hone T, Duran AC, Bernabe-Ortiz A, Milet C. Global inequalities in the double burden of malnutrition and associations with globalisation: a multilevel analysis of Demographic and Healthy Surveys from 55 low-income and middle-income countries, 1992-2018. Lancet Glob Health. 2022 Apr;10(4):e482-e490.
9. 2021 Global Nutrition Report: The state of global nutrition. Bristol, UK: Development Initiatives.
10. ICF. The DHS Program. Demographic and Health Surveys. Rockville (MD): ICF; 2022 [cited 2022 March 24]. Available from: <https://dhsprogram.com/>.
11. Moreno-Betancur M, Latouche A, Menvielle G, Kunst AE, Rey G. Relative index of inequality and slope index of inequality: a structured regression framework for estimation. Epidemiology. 2015;26:518-527.
12. King NB, Harper S, Young ME. Use of relative and absolute effect measures in reporting health inequalities: structured review. BMJ. 2012;345:e5774..
13. Dieffenbach S, Stein AD. Stunted child/overweight mother pairs represent a statistical artifact, not a distinct entity. J Nutr. 2012;142:771-773.
14. Davis JN, Oaks BM, Engle-Stone R. The Double Burden of Malnutrition: A Systematic Review of Operational Definitions. Curr Dev Nutr. 2020;4:nzaa127.
15. Fruhstorfer BH MC, Uthman OA, Robertson W. Socio-economic status and overweight or obesity among school-age children in sub-Saharan Africa - a systematic review. Clin Obes. 2016;6:19-32.
16. Bammann K, Gwozdz W, Lanfer A, Barba G, De Henauw S, Eiben G, et al. Socioeconomic factors and childhood overweight in Europe: results from the multi-centre

IDEFICS study. *Pediatr Obes*. 2013;8:1-12.

17. Rutsein, Shea O. and Kiersten Johnson. The DHS Wealth Index. DHS Comparative Reports No. 6. Calverton, Maryland, USA: ORC Macro; 2004

18. Beegle K, Coudouel A, Monsalve E. Realizing the Full Potential of Social Safety Nets in Africa. Africa Development Forum series. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2018

19. Braveman PA, Kumanyika S, Fielding J et al. Health disparities and health equity: the issue is justice. *Am J Public Health*. 2011;101 Suppl 1:S149-55.

20. Friedman G. Review of National Nutrition Surveillance Systems. Washington, DC FHI 360/FANTA; 2014

21. Osendarp S, Akuoku JK, Black RE, Headey D, Ruel M, Scott N et al. The COVID-19 crisis will exacerbate maternal and child undernutrition and child mortality in low- and middle-income countries. *Nat Food*. 2021;2:476-484.




Fig 1. Pooled Eastern and Southern African region prevalence estimates




Fig 2. Scatterplot of overweight or obesity prevalence by stunting




Fig 3. Equiplot showing stunting prevalence by wealth quintiles, education, and urban/rural status.




Fig 4. Equiplot showing wasting prevalence by wealth quintiles, r




Fig 5. Equiplot showing overweight (including obesity) prevalence




Fig 6. Absolute (SII) inequalities in the double burden of malnutrition




Fig 7. Absolute (SII) inequalities in the double burden of malnutrition




Fig 8. Relative (RII) inequalities in the double burden of malnutrition




Fig 9. Relative (RII) inequalities in the double burden of malnutrition