

1 ***Title: Comparing the accuracy of an ultrasound height***
2 ***measurement device with a wooden measurement board***
3 ***among children aged 2-5 years in rural Lao People's***
4 ***Democratic Republic: a methods-comparison study.***

5

6 Authors: Shan Huang*¹, Caroline S.E. Homer¹, Joel Conkle², Sengchanh Kounnavong³, Khampheng
7 Phongluxa³, Joshua P. Vogel¹

8

9 1 Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Program, Burnet Institute, Melbourne, Australia

10 2 Division of Data, Analytics, Planning and Monitoring, UNICEF, New York, USA

11 3 Lao Tropical and Public Health Institute, Ministry of Health, Lao PDR

12

13 *Corresponding author:

14 Email: shan.huang@burnet.edu.au (SH)

15

16 Abstract

17 **Background:** Height is a key component of nutrition assessments in children from limited-resource
18 settings. Traditional measurement boards are bulky and difficult to transport. We aimed to assess
19 whether a handheld digital ultrasound device provides comparable accuracy to the measurement
20 board for measuring children’s height.

21

22 **Methods:** We trained 12 health workers to measure the standing height of 222 children aged 2-5
23 years in rural Lao People’s Democratic Republic using the ultrasound device and measurement
24 board. The Bland-Altman method was used to depict limits of agreement and potential bias. We
25 reported the technical error of measurement (TEM) for precision, accuracy and assessed results
26 against the Standardized Monitoring and Assessment for Relief and Transition (SMART) Manual 2.0
27 and the WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study (MGRS).

28

29 **Results:** The average difference between the ultrasound and board measurements was 0.096 cm
30 (95% limits-of-agreement: 0.041cm, 0.61cm) with a systematic bias of 0.1cm (95% confidence
31 interval: 0.067,0.134), suggesting the ultrasound measurements measured slightly higher than those
32 from the board. The ultrasound and board TEMs for precision were 0.157cm and 0.113 respectively.
33 The accuracy TEM was 0.208cm. All TEMs were within SMART and WHO MGRS limits.

34

35 **Conclusion:** The ultrasound device is comparable to the measurement board among standing Lao
36 children aged 2-5 years for precision and accuracy TEMs but showed a bias of 0.1cm. Further studies
37 are required to assess whether calibration of device can minimise this bias and determine the
38 ultrasound’s accuracy on recumbent length for infants and younger children.

39

40

41 Introduction

42 Height and weight are basic anthropometric measurements that have long been used to create
43 indicators of childhood nutrition status [1-3]. These two common anthropometric measures are used
44 to monitor a child's growth and development, as well as calculate subnational, national and
45 international estimates of undernutrition and overnutrition. Estimation of the rates of stunting (low
46 height-for-age) and wasting (low weight-for-height) in children under five years at a population level
47 depends on accurate height and weight measurement [4]. These estimates are used by local and
48 national governments to allocate resources for programs and activities to improve outcomes for
49 childhood nutrition [5].

50

51 While digital scales are routinely used to measure a child's weight, height measurements use
52 measurement boards or stadiometers with readings done manually [6]. These boards are bulky,
53 difficult to transport, costly, and prone to measurement errors in reading and recording reliable
54 height measurements [7]. These measurement errors are attributable to their design and use, such
55 as, incorrect positioning of the child against the board, difficulty in seeing measurements etched
56 onto the board, the incorrect angle at which the measurement is read, and variability between
57 different measurers [7]. Additionally, children aged under five years are challenging to measure due
58 to their difficulty standing or lying still while measurements are taken [8].

59

60 Digital ultrasonic devices to measure length are used in the construction industry. Such devices are
61 small, handheld, and potentially simpler to use compared to the bulky measurement board,
62 however, their accuracy and precision in monitoring child growth have not been adequately
63 reviewed or investigated. For ultrasound devices available on the market, we found no evidence
64 regarding their use in children [9-11]. A few non-marketed devices have been formally tested in
65 research settings with varying success [12-15]. Digital height measurement devices that are
66 commercially available range from USD 25-50 per unit [9-11], making them significantly cheaper

67 than measurement boards (at USD 114-259 each) [16]. If digital height tools were shown to be valid
68 in clinical and survey settings, this could reduce costs of child height surveillance programs. Using
69 global UNICEF procurement figures from 2012-2016, potential cost savings could be up to USD 3-7
70 million annually [7].

71

72 This study aimed to investigate the feasibility of a digital ultrasound device called One Grows™, to
73 measure height in children aged two to five years old. We hypothesised that this device would be
74 easier to use, clearer to read and show acceptable accuracy and precision in a limited-resource
75 context when compared to the measurement board.

76

77 **Materials and Methods**

78 **Study setting and participants**

79 We conducted a method-comparison study in the district of Feung in Vientiane Province, Lao
80 People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR). We aimed to recruit 220 children aged 2-5 years, who could
81 stand independently without assistance. The intervention was to use the One Grows™ ultrasound
82 device to measure the children's height, and the control (comparison) was using a three-piece
83 wooden height measurement board, the standard practice in Lao PDR. Both tools were used to
84 measure children's standing height only, not recumbent length. Participating children were
85 identified and recruited from two kindergartens and three villages near the local health centre. We
86 chose kindergartens and local villages as they are locations where health teams routinely perform
87 community health outreach activities, including child height measurement in this age group [17].
88 Children were identified using convenience sampling, with written informed consent received from
89 the child's parent/caregiver prior to measurement.

90 **Study design and ethics**

91

92 In 2017, UNICEF released a Target Product Profile (TPP) with recommendations for novel height
93 measurement devices [7]. One criteria for new products was an accuracy of 0.3cm. We used this
94 level of precision as the maximum allowable variation between the ultrasound and the
95 measurement board. Applying this clinical delta of $\pm 0.3\text{cm}$, assuming a zero bias, 80% power, 95%
96 confidence interval and 10% attrition/missing data, we calculated a sample size of 220 children.
97 Using the Bland-Alman statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of
98 measurement [18], this sample size allowed us to provide statistical inference for an approximate
99 maximum standard deviation of the difference in measurements of 0.127cm and a 95% limit-of-
100 agreement between the two methods of 0.249cm. This study was approved by the Ethics Review
101 Board of the Alfred Hospital in Melbourne, Australia (ID: 142/22), and the National Ethics Committee
102 for Health Research from the Ministry of Health, Vientiane, Lao PDR (ID: 2022.15). No identifying
103 data from the participants were collected.

104

105 [Training on use of One Grows™ device and Standardization Exercise for measurement](#) 106 [board](#)

107 We trained 12 health centre staff from the Feung District and two study supervisors from the Lao
108 Tropical and Public Health Institute (TPHI) on how to use the One Grows™ device. In Lao PDR, health
109 centre staff have three years of tertiary level education and are trained as ‘Medical Assistants’. They
110 are responsible for local public health activities, including maternal and child health promotion and
111 community-based nutritional screening. As such, all those trained had previous experience using the
112 measurement board but no experience with the ultrasound device.

113

114 The chief investigator (a public health nutritionist and clinical dietitian) delivered a two-day training.

115 The training materials included a training manual on the application and maintenance of One

116 Grows™ and a simple instruction card for easy reference during data collection. Aspects such as

117 correct head and feet positioning (the same when using the measurement board) were key aspects
118 of the training and well-practiced using the One Grows™ device.

119

120 Given previous experience, no additional training on using the measurement board was provided to
121 the team. However, a standardisation test was administered to the 12 data collection team using the
122 measurement board to assess how accurately and precisely measurers are able to use the board [1].

123 According to standardisation protocols, those who showed a Technical Error of Measurement (TEM)
124 for both precision and accuracy under 0.6cm were considered to have passed this test [1]. Based on
125 these results, six staff passed and became the measurers/enumerators for data collection. The
126 remaining six staff became measurement recorders. In total, we had six measurement teams (one
127 measurer and one recorder in each).

128

129 [Data collection](#)

130 Data collection took place between 6-21 June 2022, immediately following the training. Written
131 consent from the parent/caregiver was provided to the study team before any measurements were
132 taken from the children. Children were selected in a random order to be measured. For each child, a
133 total of six measurements were taken by a single enumerator – three measurements using the
134 measurement board, and three using the One Grows™ device. The measurement process (Figure 2)
135 alternated between the devices for each child to reduce the potential for recall bias should the
136 measurer use the same device to measure the same child repeatedly one after another. The process
137 then alternated in order again with the next child; for example, if child one was measured with the
138 ultrasound device first, child two would be measured with the height board first and so on. Two
139 study supervisors provided full time supervision and ensured consistency in following the
140 measurement process for each child. They also monitored data quality and ensured accurate
141 recording of measurements.

142 **Figure 1: Measurement process for one child**

143

144 Statistical methods

145 All measurements collected were recorded manually on a paper data collection form (one form per
146 child), which were entered into a REDCap digital form by the study supervisors. All data were
147 downloaded from REDCap and analysed using StataSE 17 software and Microsoft Excel.

148

149 We analysed our data based on the recommendations from the World Health Organization's (WHO)
150 Multicentre Growth Reference Study (MGRS) and the Standardized Monitoring and Assessment for
151 Relief and Transition (SMART) Manual 2.0 [19, 20]. The MGRS created the global WHO Growth
152 Standards, and provided guidance on how anthropometric measurements should be standardised.
153 The data collectors and supervisors did not have these reference standards on hand during the data
154 collection process. We followed the MGRS protocols for analysis where we took the first two
155 measurements for both tools except where the first two measurements exceeded the maximum
156 allowable difference of 0.7cm, the third measurement collected was used, and we analysed these
157 measurements for precision and accuracy [19].

158

159 The precision and accuracy results were compared with the standards set by the SMART manual
160 which represents the acceptable limits for the respective Technical Error of Measurements [20].
161 These are shown in Table 1. Both the MRGS and SMART are widely accepted to have set the
162 standard in the way anthropometric measurements should be taken from children.

163 **Table 1: SMART Acceptable Limits for TEMs of precision and accuracy.**

Parameter for	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Rejected
height (cm)				
Precision for TEM	<0.4	<0.6	<1.2	≥1.2
Accuracy TEM	<0.4	<0.6	<1.4	≥1.4

164

165 TEMs are commonly used in anthropometric assessments as a measure of accuracy and precision,
166 and they can detect levels of variation from repeated measurements of the same individual, by the
167 same measurer [21]. Its interpretation is that the differences between repeated measurements will
168 be within \pm the value of TEM two-thirds (66%) of the time, and 95% of the differences will be within
169 $\pm 2 \times$ TEM [21]. The lower the TEM, the smaller the variation in the repeated measurements. Hence,
170 the TEM assesses the spread of measurements taken for the individual child being measured.

171 The precision and accuracy were analysed by calculating TEMs (as per $TEM = \sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2}{2N}}$ where D is the
172 difference between the measurements taken and N is the total number of participants).

173

174 We define precision as the TEM between measurements taken with the same device to assess the
175 consistency of the measurements taken. We define accuracy as the TEM between measurements
176 taken with different devices, comparing the One Grows™ device to the measurement board.[20]

177

178
$$TEM \text{ Precision} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum \text{Difference between two measurements of the same device}^2}{2N}}$$

179

180
$$TEM \text{ Accuracy} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum \text{Difference between two average from different devices}^2}{2N}}$$

181

182 We used StateSE 17 for the Bland-Altman analysis and MS Excel to create the Bland-Altman plot. We
183 compared the difference between the measurement devices across children of varying heights and
184 ages, as well as the assessment of systematic bias. The Bland-Altman plot is a common way to
185 represent results comparing two measurement methods [22]. The x-axis of the Bland-Altman plot is
186 the average height measured by both the ultrasound device and the measurement board using the
187 MGRS method, and the y-axis is the difference of the average ultrasound measurements subtracted

188 from the average board measurements in centimetres. The mean difference between the average
189 measurements for both devices was then calculated to assess systematic bias. That is, to assess how
190 closely the ultrasound device is measuring to the measurement board. The upper and lower limits of
191 agreement were plotted as two standard deviations from the mean difference of the two devices.
192 We used the Pitman's test of difference in variance to determine if the difference between methods
193 (y-axis) changed at different levels of average height (x-axis), where average height can be used as a
194 proxy for age groups.

195

196 Results

197 Characteristics of study participants

198 In total, 222 children aged between 24-60 months (mean age 41.3 months) participated. Of the 222
199 children, 52.7% (n=117) were male and 47.3% (n=105) were female. For age, 20.3% of children were
200 aged between 24-35 months (n=45), 39.6% aged between 36-47 months (n=88), 26.6% aged
201 between 48-59 months (n= 59) and 13.5% aged at 60 months (n=30) (Table 2).

202 **Table 3: Summary statistics for all measurements taken using both devices (n=222 children).**

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min Measurement	Max Measurement	Standard Error
Ultrasound measurements					
Ultrasound Measurement 1 (cm)	97.06	8.22	77.90	119.30	0.55
Ultrasound Measurement 2 (cm)	97.04	8.21	77.60	119.40	0.55
Ultrasound Measurement 3 (cm)	97.03	8.23	77.40	119.30	0.55
Average of all Ultrasound Measurements (cm)	97.04	8.22	77.63	119.33	0.55
Board measurements					

Board Measurement 1 (cm)	96.96	8.21	77.00	119.20	0.55
Board Measurement 2 (cm)	96.93	8.22	77.00	119.30	0.55
Board Measurement 3 (cm)	96.93	8.21	77.10	119.30	0.55
Average of all Board Measurements (cm)	96.94	8.21	77.03	119.27	0.55

203

204 **Table 4: Difference of measurements between ultrasound and board measurements (cm) using the**
 205 **MGRS method.**

	Mean difference	Difference range	Standard Deviation of difference	Limits-of-agreement
Difference of measurements	0.1	-0.60 and 1.05	0.28	-0.46, 0.65

206

207 [Comparison of measurement methods using the Bland Alman method](#)

208 The summary statistics are presented in Tables 3 and 4. The average of all three measurements
 209 taken using the digital ultrasound device was 97.04cm (range, 77.63 to 119.33cm; SD = 8.22cm)
 210 compared to the average of all three measurements taken with the measurement board of 96.94cm
 211 (range, 77.03 to 119.27cm; SD = 8.21cm).

212

213 The Bland-Altman plot in Figure 2 indicates that the 95% limits-of-agreement between the board
 214 and the ultrasound device using the MRGS method was between -0.46cm to 0.65cm (SD = 0.28cm).
 215 There was a range of difference when we subtracted the ultrasound measurements from the board
 216 measurements, between -0.6 and 1.05cm. The Bland-Altman analysis using StataSE 17 calculated the
 217 overall mean difference, or systematic bias, to be 0.1cm (95%CI 0.06 to 0.13cm). This indicates that

218 the ultrasound device was consistently measuring the children 0.1cm taller than the board in this
219 population.

220 **Figure 2: Bland-Altman Plot**

221

222 Pitman's test results show that the difference between the board and the ultrasound device did not
223 significantly differ by average height ($r = 0.002$, $p = 0.973$). This indicates that a child's age had no
224 relationship with the difference in height measurements between the two devices.

225

226 Precision and Accuracy

227 Precision

228 As shown in Table 5, the precision TEM for the ultrasound device was 0.157cm (females: 0.157cm,
229 males: 0.158m), and the precision TEM for the height board was 0.113cm (females: 0.101cm, males:
230 0.123cm). Based on the standards set by the SMART manual, TEMs for both ultrasound device and
231 height board were <0.4 cm, indicating 'good' precision.

232 **Table 5: Precision and bias of ultrasound and measurement board**

	Females	Males	All
Precision TEM Digital Ultrasound	0.157cm (n=210)	0.158cm (n=134)	0.157cm (n=444)
Precision TEM Measurement Board	0.101cm (n=210)	0.123cm (n=134)	0.113cm (n=444)
Accuracy TEM between Digital and Measurement Board	0.227cm (n=210)	0.190cm (n=134)	0.208cm (n=444)

233

234 Accuracy

235 The first accuracy calculation made using the two closest measurements between the ultrasound
236 and the height board was 0.208cm (females: 0.227cm, males: 0.190cm). Similarly, based on the
237 SMART standards, these bias levels also indicated 'good' accuracy between the two devices, with
238 girls showing a slightly greater bias than boys.

239

240 Discussion

241 This study of 222 children in Lao PDR compared measurements taken using the One Grows™
242 ultrasound device and the UNICEF wooden measurement board (standard of care). For reliability,
243 the TEM results were within acceptable SMART and WHO MGRS limits and indicated that each
244 device was consistent with itself. The measurement board showed a slightly higher precision than
245 the ultrasound device (TEM 0.113cm vs 0.157cm).

246

247 For accuracy, the TEM of 0.208cm was well within the acceptable limits of the SMART and WHO
248 MGRS guidelines [19]. There was a small difference in bias TEM among girls and boys - the bias TEM
249 among girls was higher by 0.037cm. Upon closer inspection of the measurements recorded, among
250 the ultrasound measurements, there were three occasions where the third measurement had to be
251 used because the maximum allowable difference was exceeded among the girls, but only one
252 occasion of this occurred when measuring the boys. None of the board measurements required
253 adjusting (using a third measurement). During the study, we observed that girls often had long hair
254 tied up in elaborate styles. It is possible that when the measurer releases a child's hair to perform
255 measurement, their hair is still messy and might cause additional movement (and hence additional
256 differences between measurements) when using the handheld ultrasound device. Conversely, the
257 headpiece of the measurement board is heavy and thus may be steadier. Further investigation of

258 possible sources of measurement-to-measurement variation when using a handheld ultrasound
259 device is required.

260

261 The ultrasound device produced a systematic bias of 0.1cm and was shown to measure higher than
262 the measurement board. It is difficult to conclude that the ultrasound device is truly measuring
263 children taller than their true height because the measurement board itself is not a gold standard,
264 rather an operational standard since no other tools are currently used to measure height. Therefore,
265 without proper calibration of either the ultrasound device or the board, it is not possible to say for
266 certain whether the ultrasound device is measuring the child taller, or the board is measuring the
267 child shorter. Future studies need to consider calibration of both devices.

268

269 When child height is measured in a clinical setting, usually only one measurement is taken. Although
270 the board showed slightly higher precision, our findings suggest the ultrasound device can be used in
271 clinical settings. Given the greater portability, lightweight nature, lower cost, and ease-of-use of the
272 ultrasound device, it could be a better choice for clinical use, particularly in limited-resource settings.

273

274 The 2017 UNICEF TPP [7] suggested a novel height measurement device needed to meet two
275 essential requirements: firstly, to improve upon currently available measurement boards with a
276 digital output; and secondly to use innovative technologies (such as ultrasound, infrared or laser).

277 The One Grows™ device meets both UNICEF TPP essential requirements, as well as several optional
278 requirements including an associated mobile application (app) whereby the measurement taken by
279 the device is automatically entered via Bluetooth technology. The app also allows for multiple
280 measurements on multiple children. Our device also met the accuracy range set by the TPP, which
281 was within 0.3cm for TEM. Our study showed that the One Grows™ device meets the main
282 requirements from the UNICEF TPP except for a low battery indicator and assessments for
283 commercialization requirements.

284

285 To our knowledge, this is the first study to compare this handheld ultrasound device with the
286 measurement board. Few other ultrasound devices have been studied in detail on children, and
287 none of these studies were done in the context of rural health workers in a low or middle-income
288 country. In 1998, Watt, Pickering and Wales published a study with 18 children (ages unspecified) in
289 the United Kingdom using the Gulliver G-100 ultrasound device, which showed an average bias
290 between 0.74-0.88cm when compared with a Harpenden stadiometer [12]. In 1999, Glock et al also
291 used the G-100 device to assess growth hormone treatment of 101 children with severe dwarfism in
292 Germany, with results showing an average bias of 0.49cm when compared to the Harpenden
293 stadiometer [14]. For both these studies, the difference in measurement between the devices were
294 more than five times greater than our results (0.1cm vs. >0.49cm). In 2013, Syafiq and Fikawati [15]
295 tested the feasibility of a prototype measurement board using an ultrasound attachment (the
296 P2B2D) on 53 infants in Malaysia compared to a plastic length board. Their inter-method TEM of
297 3.66cm is rejected based on SMART standards [20]. It is noteworthy that Syafiq and Fikawati
298 measured the length of infants, whereas our study measured standing height in children 2-5 years.
299 Length is known to be more difficult to measure correctly than standing height, as it requires careful
300 positioning to ensure the child is appropriately stretched before taking the measurement [3]. In
301 2020, Cho et al validated a handheld ultrasound device (InLab S50) among 100 adults in South Korea,
302 this device is similar to the One Grows™ device used in this study, and reported similar findings.[13]
303 When compared to the stadiometer, the InLab S50 had a mean bias of -0.15cm (95% limits-of-
304 agreement: -1.69cm, 1.38cm), whereas in our study, the mean bias was 0.1cm (95% limits-of-
305 agreement: -0.46cm, 0.66cm). By comparison, the InLab S50 consistently measured lower height
306 compared to the board, while the One Grows™ measured greater than the board. Our study also
307 showed smaller margins of difference compared to the InLab S50 device.

308

309 Strengths and limitations

310 Our study demonstrated the One Grows™ ultrasound device performs valid height measurements in
311 standing children 2-5 years of age. These measurements were accurate and as precise as wooden
312 measurement boards, which has not been shown in the few previous studies evaluating ultrasound-
313 based height measurement devices. Strengths of this study included a large sample size (222
314 children), adherence to the WHO MGRS methodology, and comparing our results to the SMART
315 standards. An additional strength is novelty – this study is the first to evaluate an ultrasound device
316 for child height measurement in a limited-resource setting, performed by healthcare personnel with
317 limited formal training who routinely perform child nutritional surveillance activities. The study
318 setting and training approach closely reflects the real-world needs for novel, digital devices. Hence,
319 this study is a critical step in the investigation into how handheld height measurement devices can
320 be used to measure child stature in limited-resource contexts. These results demonstrate that this
321 device may be appropriate in place of the measurement board, though further research in other
322 contexts is warranted.

323

324 While our study findings demonstrate that the two devices were comparable to each other, a
325 limitation was that we only measured children who could stand at 2 to 5 years of age – we did not
326 test it on children under two years where recumbent length is measured. We also note that the
327 comparison TEMs are set against children aged 0-5 years, not children aged 2-5 years. For
328 recumbent length, this ultrasound device would measure length from foot to head, rather than
329 height from head to ground. This would require further investigation to determine if the accuracy is
330 similar in recumbent measurement. Our measurement process of alternating device for the same
331 child could contribute to measurers being biased by previous measurements. To reduce this bias, in
332 future studies, it may be worth considering the measurement of an entire group of children once
333 with both devices, then re-measuring the same group of children another time over. Our study

334 design also did not permit assessment of intra-measurer reliability, as only one measurer performed
335 all measurements for a single child. While we did not formally assess the cost-effectiveness of the
336 ultrasound device, it is cheaper than the measurement board (USD 50 compared to USD 114-259
337 from the UNICEF Supply Catalogue) [7]. We consider that a formal cost-effective evaluation that
338 considers durability and recurrent costs would be useful to guide procurement decision-making.
339

340 Conclusion

341 In a methods-comparison study of 222 children between 2-5 years old in Lao PDR, the One Grows™
342 ultrasound device showed good levels of precision and accuracy in measuring height of standing
343 children. However, there was a systematic bias between the devices, with the ultrasound
344 measurement being 0.1cm greater than that of the measurement board. Future studies showing
345 calibration of both devices will be required to ascertain which of these devices measures the closest
346 to the true height/length of a child; and whether the ultrasound device will require further
347 recalibration. The measurement board is bulky and heavy to carry, whereas this ultrasound device is
348 handheld, lightweight, and cheaper. Additional studies involving measurement of recumbent height
349 in younger children are required, as well as further assessments to explore intra-measurer reliability,
350 and device performance in other settings.
351

352 Acknowledgements

353 The study would like to thank the Feung District Hospital and the Tropical and Public Health Institute
354 in Lao People’s Democratic Republic for their data collection efforts and field work supervision. The
355 study team would like to acknowledge the children, teachers and communities of the Son Samai,
356 Chang Noi kindergartens and Phonexay, Nakang and Phonsavath villages for their involvement. The
357 authors also acknowledges funding from the Burnet Institute to support this study.

358

359

360

361 References

- 362 [1] World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund, *Recommendations for data*
363 *collection, analysis and reporting on anthropometric indicators in children under 5 years old*.
364 Geneva: World Health Organization, 2019.
- 365 [2] E. Grellety and M. H. Golden, "The Effect of Random Error on Diagnostic Accuracy Illustrated
366 with the Anthropometric Diagnosis of Malnutrition," *PLoS One*, vol. 11, no. 12, p. e0168585,
367 2016, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0168585.
- 368 [3] M. E. Laar, G. S. Marquis, A. Lartey, and K. Gray-Donald, "Reliability of length measurements
369 collected by community nurses and health volunteers in rural growth monitoring and
370 promotion services," (in eng), *BMC Health Serv Res*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 118, Feb 17 2018, doi:
371 10.1186/s12913-018-2909-0.
- 372 [4] S. B. Ickes, C. Craig, and R. Heidkamp, "Design Factors for Food Supplementation and
373 Nutrition Education Interventions That Limit Conclusions about Effectiveness for Wasting
374 Prevention: A Scoping Review of Peer-Reviewed Literature," *Advances in Nutrition*, 2021,
375 doi: 10.1093/advances/nmab107.
- 376 [5] Global Nutrition Report, "Global Nutrition Report 2021," 2021. Accessed: 24/01/2022.
377 [Online]. Available: <https://globalnutritionreport.org/reports/2021-global-nutrition-report/>
- 378 [6] J. Conkle, P. S. Suchdev, E. Alexander, R. Flores-Ayala, U. Ramakrishnan, and R. Martorell,
379 "Accuracy and reliability of a low-cost, handheld 3D imaging system for child
380 anthropometry," *PLoS One*, vol. 13, no. 10, p. e0205320, 2018, doi:
381 10.1371/journal.pone.0205320.
- 382 [7] United Nations Children's Fund, "UNICEF Target Product Profile: Height/length
383 Measurement Device(s)," ed, 2017.
- 384 [8] M. Yorkin *et al.*, "A Tool to Improve Accuracy of Parental Measurements of Preschool Child
385 Height," *Advances in Public Health*, vol. 2015, p. 965371, 2015/08/04 2015, doi:
386 10.1155/2015/965371.

- 387 [9] AliExpress. "Digital Ultrasonic Height Measuring Ruler Precision Measuring Device Adult Kids
388 E7CB."
389 https://www.aliexpress.com/item/4000945500834.html?randl_currency=AUD&randl_shipto=AU&src=google&src=google&albch=shopping&acnt=708-803-3821&slnk=&plac=&mtctp=&albbt=Google_7_shopping&albagn=888888&isSmbAutoCall=false&needSmbHouyi=false&albcp=9604210690&albag=100463787298&trgt=313429380675&crea=en4000945500834&netw=u&device=c&albp=313429380675&albpd=en4000945500834&gclid=CjwKCAiAx8KQBhAGEiwAD3EiP2XZo2kPLgjVlyBljEYA3-b_gLn01XZQHDbWIR8b4keWDSdvt-kr5hoCbVgQAvD_BwE&gclsrc=aw.ds&aff_fcid=033f652edd4d42c3b4895b2c696a3e57-1645267468205-08339-UnaMJZVf&aff_fsk=UnaMJZVf&aff_platform=aaf&sk=UnaMJZVf&aff_trace_key=033f652edd4d42c3b4895b2c696a3e57-1645267468205-08339-UnaMJZVf&terminal_id=47ee2f0b5db4459189bc7884663bf55b&afSmartRedirect=y
400 (accessed 19 February, 2022).
- 401
402 [10] Amazon Australia. "Hashy Giraffe Digital Wireless Body Height Meter Ultrasonic Height
403 Measuring Instrument Stature Fast Meter For Kids Measuring Moving Height Ruler."
404 https://www.amazon.com.au/Hashy-Wireless-Ultrasonic-Measuring-Instrument/dp/B07WX7L5TM/ref=asc_df_B07WX7L5TM/?tag=googleshopdsk-22&linkCode=df0&hvadid=540211181902&hvpos=&hvnetw=g&hvrnd=15015573022282604586&hvpone=&hvptwo=&hvqmt=&hvdev=c&hvdvcmdl=&hvlocint=&hvlocphy=9071309&hvtargid=pla-1599882403177&psc=1 (accessed 19 February, 2022).
- 405
406
407
408
- 409 [11] eBay Australia. "Digital Ultrasonic Height Measuring Ruler Precision Measuring Device Adult
410 Kids."
411 https://www.ebay.com.au/itm/254834252135?chn=ps&_ul=AU&_trkparms=ispr%3D1&amdata=enc%3A12MCTszVbQHSqwTzUJE_4BQ6&norover=1&mkevt=1&mkrid=705-139619-
412

- 413 5960-
- 414 0&mkcid=2&itemid=254834252135&targetid=1597821229585&device=c&mktype=pla&goo
- 415 gleloc=9071309&poi=&campaignid=14474119807&mkgroupid=127424473355&rlsatarget=p
- 416 la-
- 417 1597821229585&abcd=9300653&merchantid=494542047&gclid=CjwKCAiAx8KQBhAGEiWA
- 418 D3EiP-hEtIJI2Wi8gyL2Li0RE5OARJHtBLbo8uSi8qHzJgH87BvZGMBxBocWw4QAvD_BwE
- 419 (accessed 19 February, 2022).
- 420 [12] V. Watt, M. Pickering, and J. K. H. Wales, "A comparison of ultrasonic and mechanical
- 421 stadiometry," (in English), *Arch. Dis. Child.*, Article vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 269-270, 01 / 01 / 1998,
- 422 doi: 10.1136/adc.78.3.269.
- 423 [13] S. H. Cho, Y. G. Cho, H. A. Park, and A. R. Bong, "Reliability and Validity of an Ultrasonic
- 424 Device for Measuring Height in Adults," (in eng), *Korean J Fam Med*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 376-
- 425 381, 2021, doi: 10.4082/kjfm.20.0202.
- 426 [14] M. Glock, M. Hermanussen, E. Keller, and K. K. Hartmann, "Gulliver G-100 - A new device to
- 427 evaluate daily growth measurement in comparison with Harpenden stadiometer," (in eng),
- 428 *Horm. Res.*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 287-90, 1999, doi: 10.1159/000023497.
- 429 [15] A. Syafiq and S. Fikawati, "Reliability and validity test of digital infant length measurement
- 430 board with sonar sensor precision," *Malays. J. Nutr.*, vol. 19, pp. 303-309, 01/01 2013.
- 431 [16] United Nations Children's Fund. "Supply Catalogue: Wooden Height Board."
- 432 <https://supply.unicef.org/catalogsearch/result/?q=wooden+height+board> (accessed 1
- 433 March, 2022).
- 434 [17] Government of Lao, "National Nutrition Strategy to 2025 and Place of Action 2016-2025,"
- 435 Vientiane, Lao PDR, 28 December 2015 2015. Accessed: 24 January 2022. [Online]. Available:
- 436 <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/lao168828.pdf>

- 437 [18] M.-J. Lu, W.-H. Zhong, Y.-X. Liu, H.-Z. Miao, Y.-C. Li, and M.-H. Ji, "Sample Size for Assessing
438 Agreement between Two Methods of Measurement by Bland–Altman Method," *The*
439 *International Journal of Biostatistics*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2016, doi: doi:10.1515/ijb-2015-0039.
- 440 [19] M. De Onis, "Reliability of anthropometric measurements in the WHO Multicentre Growth
441 Reference Study," (in eng), *Acta Paediatrica*, no. 0803-5326 (Print), 450, 2006.
- 442 [20] A. A. H. C. SMART, "Standardised Monitoring and Assessment for Relief and Transitions
443 Manual 2.0," Action Against Hunger, Toronto, Canada, 2017. [Online]. Available:
444 <https://smartmethodology.org/survey-planning-tools/smart-methodology/>
- 445 [21] S. J. Ulijaszek and D. A. Kerr, "Anthropometric measurement error and the assessment of
446 nutritional status," (in eng), *Br. J. Nutr.*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 165-77, Sep 1999, doi:
447 10.1017/s0007114599001348.
- 448 [22] J. M. Bland and D. G. Altman, "Agreement between methods of measurement with multiple
449 observations per individual," *J. Biopharm. Stat.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 571-582, 2007, doi:
450 10.1080/10543400701329422.
- 451

452 Supporting Information

453 **S1 Fig. Depiction of the measurement process**

454 **S2 Fig. Bland-Altman Plot**



455

Measurement process one child





Measurement 1:
digital device

Measurement 2:
measurement
board




Measurement 3:
digital device

Measurement 4:
measurement
board




Measurement 5:
digital device

Measurement 6:
measurement
board



then alternate for next child

Bland-Altman Plot comparing height measurements using ultrasound and measurement board



Figure