

# Growth, physical and cognitive function in children who are born HIV-free: school-age follow-up of a cluster-randomized trial in rural Zimbabwe

Joe D Piper<sup>1,2</sup>, Clever Mazhanga<sup>1</sup>, Marian Mwapaura<sup>1</sup>, Gloria Mapako<sup>1</sup>, Idah Mapurisa<sup>1</sup>, Tsitsi Mashedze<sup>1</sup>, Eunice Munyama<sup>1</sup>, Maria Kuona<sup>1</sup>, Thombizodwa Mashiri<sup>1</sup>, Kundai Sibanda<sup>1</sup>, Dzidzai Matemavi<sup>1</sup>, Monica Tichagwa<sup>1</sup>, Soneni Nyoni<sup>1</sup>, Asinje Saidi<sup>1</sup>, Manasa Mangwende<sup>1</sup>, Dzivaidzo Chidhanguro<sup>1</sup>, Eddington Mpofu<sup>1</sup>, Joice Tome<sup>1</sup>, Gabriel Mbewe<sup>1</sup>, Batsirai Mutasa<sup>1</sup>, Bernard Chasekwa<sup>1</sup>, Handrea Njovo<sup>3</sup>, Chandiwana Nyachowe<sup>3</sup>, Mary Muchekeza<sup>3</sup>, Kuda Mutasa<sup>1</sup>, Virginia Sauramba<sup>1</sup>, Ceri Evans<sup>1,4</sup>, Melissa J Gladstone<sup>4</sup>, Jonathan C Wells<sup>5</sup>, Elizabeth Allen<sup>6</sup>, Melanie Smuk<sup>2</sup>, Jean H Humphrey<sup>7</sup>, Lisa F Langhaug<sup>1</sup>, Naume V Tavengwa<sup>1</sup>, Robert Ntozini<sup>1</sup>, Andrew J Prendergast<sup>1,2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Zvitambo Institute for Maternal and Child Health Research, Harare, Zimbabwe

<sup>2</sup>Blizard Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK

<sup>3</sup>Ministry of Health and Child Care, Harare, Zimbabwe

<sup>4</sup>Institute of Translational Medicine, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

<sup>5</sup>Population Policy and Practice Research and Teaching Department, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK

<sup>6</sup>London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

<sup>7</sup>Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

Corresponding author: Joe D. Piper, Blizard Institute, 4 Newark Street, London E1 2AT, UK

j.piper@qmul.ac.uk. phone: +44 7814 492757. Fax +44 207 882 2195

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## ABSTRACT

### Background

Globally, over 16 million children were exposed to HIV during pregnancy but remain HIV-free at birth and throughout childhood. Children born HIV-free (CBHF) have higher morbidity and mortality and poorer neurodevelopment in early life compared to children who are HIV-unexposed (CHU), but long-term outcomes remain uncertain. We characterized school-age growth, cognitive and physical function in CBHF and CHU previously enrolled in the Sanitation Hygiene Infant Nutrition Efficacy (SHINE) trial in rural Zimbabwe.

### Methods and Findings

Children in SHINE who had been followed to age 18 months, were re-enrolled to this follow-up study if they were aged 7 years, resident in Shurugwi district, and had a known pregnancy HIV exposure status. From 5280 pregnant women originally enrolled, 264 CBHF and 990 CHU were evaluated at age 7 years using the School-Age Health, Activity, Resilience, Anthropometry and Neurocognitive (SAHARAN) toolbox. Cognitive function was evaluated using the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (KABC-II), with additional tools measuring executive function, literacy, numeracy, fine motor skills and socioemotional function. Physical function was assessed using standing broad jump and handgrip for strength, and the shuttle-run test for cardiovascular fitness. Growth was assessed by anthropometry. Body composition was assessed by bioimpedance analysis for lean mass and skinfold thicknesses for fat mass. A caregiver questionnaire measured demographics, socioeconomic status, nurturing, child discipline, food and water insecurity. We prespecified the primary comparisons and used generalized estimating equations (GEE) with an exchangeable working correlation structure to account for clustering. Adjusted models used covariates derived from directed acyclic graphs, with separate models adjusted for contemporary and early-life variables. We found strong evidence that cognitive function was lower for CBHF compared to CHU across multiple domains. The adjusted mean difference in the mental processing index (MPI), derived from KABC-II, was 3 points lower (95%CI 2, 4;

P<0.001) in CBHF versus CHU. Similarly, the school achievement test (SAT) of literacy and numeracy was 7 points lower (95%CI 4, 11, P<0.001) and executive function, measured by the Plus-EF tablet-based test, was 5 points lower (95%CI 2, 8; P<0.001) in CBHF compared to CHU. CBHF also had smaller head circumferences by 0.3cm (95%CI 0.1, 0.5; P=0.009). CBHF had fewer years of schooling exposure and caregiver schooling, with higher rates of caregiver depression. CBHF had lower cardiovascular fitness from the shuttle-run test with a maximal oxygen consumption (VO<sub>2</sub>max) 0.8 ml/kg/min (95%CI 0.4, 1.2; P<0.001) lower than CHU. We found no evidence of differences in other growth, body composition or physical function outcomes. The main limitation of our study is that it was restricted to one of two previous study districts, with possible survivor bias and selection bias from children who had moved away.

## Conclusions

CBHF have reductions in cognitive function, head circumference and cardiovascular fitness compared to CHU at 7 years of age. Further research is needed to define the biological and psychosocial mechanisms underlying these differences, to inform future interventions that help CBHF thrive across the life-course.

## INTRODUCTION

Increasing coverage of prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) interventions has advanced progress towards paediatric HIV elimination in sub-Saharan Africa. The vast majority of children born to women with HIV are therefore now HIV-free, meaning they were exposed to HIV in pregnancy but remain uninfected themselves. The current global population of children born HIV-free (CBHF) is increasing, with estimates of 14.8 million in 2018[1, 2], and 15.9 million in 2021[3]. A disparity in clinical outcomes between CBHF and children who are HIV-unexposed (CHU) emerged in the pre-antiretroviral therapy (ART) era, with 3-fold higher mortality, higher frequency and severity of common infections, and more growth failure in CBHF[4, 5]. Clinical outcomes in the PMTCT era have been uncertain due to a paucity of studies, but emerging data from sub-Saharan Africa confirm that disparities persist in early life despite high coverage of maternal ART. CBHF are more likely to be born premature and small-for-gestational age[6], have a higher frequency of stunting[7], and poorer neurodevelopment[8] than CHU by 2 years of age. Multiple factors are likely to contribute to these clinical disparities[9] including both universal and HIV-specific risk factors, and the shared mechanisms through which they operate. Early-life exposures such as maternal HIV, co-infections, dysbiosis, inflammation, malnutrition and stress may have persistent effects long after the antenatal exposure has ended.

Few studies have conducted long-term follow-up of CBHF to establish whether early-life clinical disparities persist to school age. One study in Zambia found that differences in growth between CBHF and CHU had widened by 7.5 years of age compared to infancy[10], while a study of neurocognitive outcomes across five African countries[11] found no differences between CBHF and CHU groups at median age 7 years, but did not evaluate language, which may be most predictive of future function[11]. Other cohorts have reported poorer mathematic abilities[12] and reduced IQ among CBHF in south-east Asia[13], but studies have focused on a limited range of outcomes.

The Sanitation Hygiene Infant Nutrition Efficacy (SHINE) trial in rural Zimbabwe evaluated the effects of improved infant and young child feeding (IYCF) and/or improved water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) on child stunting and anaemia at 18 months of age. The trial showed that 50% of CBHF were stunted by age 18 months, and that neurodevelopmental scores were lower at 2 years of age among CBHF compared to CHU[14, 15]. Here, we report follow-up of a subgroup of CBHF and CHU at age 7 years to evaluate whether disparities in growth, physical and cognitive function persist to school age[16]. School-age function is highly predictive of later adult function, and therefore represents an important period of mid-childhood. Understanding whether CBHF thrive less well in the long-term is critical to inform the timing of interventions to improve long-term human capital in this expanding global population.

## Methods

### SHINE trial

The design and results of the SHINE trial have been previously reported[17]. In brief, between 2012 and 2015, SHINE recruited 5280 women during pregnancy from two rural Zimbabwean districts with 15% antenatal HIV prevalence (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT01824940). Women who resided in the study area were cluster-randomized to one of four intervention arms: standard-of-care (SOC, including promotion of PMTCT and optimal breastfeeding); IYCF (20 g daily small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement (SQ-LNS) for their infant from 6-18 months of age, with complementary feeding counselling); WASH (ventilated improved pit latrine and two handwashing stations, monthly liquid soap and chlorine, a play-space to separate children from livestock and to reduce geophagia, plus hygiene counselling); or IYCF plus WASH (all interventions). IYCF improved linear growth and haemoglobin at 18 months in both CBHF and CHU[14, 18], while WASH had no effect. The combined IYCF+WASH intervention improved child neurodevelopment at 2 years of age among CBHF, but neither intervention improved neurodevelopment in CHU[19, 20].

## **School-age follow-up**

To evaluate the long-term effects of HIV exposure on child health outcomes, we designed a sub-study to assess child growth, body composition, physical and cognitive function at 7 years of age. No further trial interventions had been provided after age 18 months. The protocol and statistical analysis plan for the follow-up study are registered at <https://osf.io/8e2zh>. Children were eligible if they were aged 7-8 years and still resident in Shurugwi district. Children were ineligible if they were no longer resident in Shurugwi, had an unknown maternal pregnancy HIV status, or were outside the age window. Among all children born to HIV-negative mothers (CHU) and evaluated at the trial endline at age 18 months, 250 per intervention arm meeting the eligibility criteria were randomly selected by computer; those who were unable to be visited or whose family declined participation were replaced by another eligible child randomly selected from the same trial arm. For CBHF, all children in Shurugwi district who were born to HIV-positive mothers and who tested HIV-negative at 18 months were offered enrolment. Families were approached through community health workers (CHWs) to determine if the child was available, and the household was interested in the follow-up study. Written informed consent from the primary caregiver and written assent from the child were obtained by research nurses, following a demonstration of the tools used to conduct the measurements.

## *HIV status*

Mothers in the SHINE cohort were tested during pregnancy using an antibody rapid test algorithm (Alere Determine HIV-1/2 test, followed by INSTI HIV-1/2 test if positive). Mothers were offered HIV testing at baseline and again at 32 weeks for those who tested negative at baseline; further testing was offered at 18 months postpartum. CHU were defined as children born to mothers testing negative for HIV during pregnancy. Children who were HIV-exposed were defined as those born to mothers testing positive for HIV during pregnancy[20]. CBHF were defined as children who were HIV-exposed and confirmed HIV-negative through 18 months of age (trial endpoint)[14]. The early-life

child HIV status was determined by dried blood-spot DNA polymerase chain reaction (PCR), plasma RNA PCR, or rapid test algorithm, depending on child age and sample type.

For the school-age visit, HIV testing was offered to all caregiver-child pairs to ensure that an updated HIV exposure status (in case of maternal incident infection since the end of the trial) and infection status (in case of prolonged breastfeeding and postnatal transmission since the 18-month trial endpoint) was available. If the mother's HIV test was negative, the child was not tested. If the mother tested positive for HIV, declined testing or was unavailable, HIV testing was offered to the child with age-appropriate assent using role plays. The Determine HIV-1/2 rapid test (Abbott) was used for initial testing; positive results were repeated using the HIV 1/2 Stat-Pak rapid test (Chembio). Any children who tested positive for HIV were referred to local clinics for ART and were excluded from this analysis. All assessments were done by study nurses who were blinded to the caregiver and child HIV status.

### **School-age measurements using the SAHARAN toolbox**

We developed a battery of tests to measure growth, physical and cognitive outcomes, termed the School-Age Health, Activity, Resilience, Anthropometry and Neurocognitive (SAHARAN) toolbox[21]. Measurements were performed during a single home visit by extensively trained and supervised primary care nurses, using one or two tents pitched in the household or nearby. Briefly, the SAHARAN toolbox comprises a caregiver questionnaire, child questionnaire, and direct tests undertaken with the child to assess cognitive function, growth and physical function. All tests had standardised explanations, demonstrations, and translations in local languages (Shona and Ndebele). Data collectors underwent standardisations in anthropometry and cognition tests every 9 months and had regular supported supervision.

Cognitive function was assessed using the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (KABC-II; Pearson UK)[22, 23]; a previously piloted School Achievement Test (SAT) which measures literacy

and numeracy; and a coordination test[24] which measures fine motor skills by finger tapping. Three subtests from the android tablet-based Plus-EF test[25] measured executive function. The child's socioemotional function and behaviour were measured by the caregiver-reported Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) (<https://www.sdqinfo.com/>). An overall score of the child's functional abilities was provided by the Washington Group/UNICEF screening tool[26], which helped identify underlying physical disabilities in sight, hearing and mobility, or behavioural and learning difficulties.

Growth measurements included height, knee-heel length, weight, head circumference, mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC), and waist, hip and calf circumferences. Body composition was assessed using Holtain calipers (Crosswell, UK) to measure peripheral subcutaneous fat (triceps and calf skinfold thicknesses) and central subcutaneous fat (subscapular and supra-iliac skinfold thicknesses). Bioimpedance analysis (BIA) using a BodyStat 1500 MDD machine (BodyStat, Isle of Man, UK) assessed lean mass, measured as the impedance index ( $\text{height}^2/\text{impedance}$ ) and lean mass index ( $1/\text{impedance}$ )[27]; and tissue health, measured as the phase angle.

Physical function outcomes included; leg strength, by measuring the distance jumped in the broad jump from a standing position, and handgrip strength in each hand using a dynamometer (Takei, Japan). Cardiovascular fitness was measured by the shuttle-run test, where the child repeatedly ran between two markers placed 20 metres apart, arriving at each end before a timed beep from an android app (Beep Test, Ruval Enterprises, Canada) connected to a Bluetooth speaker. The child ran until either they missed the beep three times in a row or stopped due to tiredness.  $\text{VO}_2\text{max}$ , which represents the maximum rate at which the body uses oxygen during exercise, was calculated[28]. Resting and post-exercise blood pressure was measured using a manual aneroid sphygmomanometer (Medisave, UK). Haemoglobin was measured (Hemocue) on a finger-prick blood sample.

A caregiver questionnaire was used to record contemporary household demographics, socioeconomic status using a locally validated wealth index[29], schooling exposure, adversities, nurturing (including the Child-Parent Relationship scale[30] and the MICS Child Discipline questionnaire[31, 32]), caregiver depression[33], gender norms[34], caregiver social support[34], and food[35, 36] and water[37] insecurity.

Most data were collected electronically using Open Data Kit (ODK, [opendatakit.org](https://opendatakit.org)) on android tablets (Samsung Galaxy Tab A). The KABC-II and SAT used paper forms subsequently transcribed onto ODK. The Plus-EF tool recorded data directly into the Plus-EF application.

## Statistical analysis

A pre-specified statistical analysis plan is available at <https://osf.io/8e2zh>. Stata v13 and v17 were used for analyses. Baseline characteristics between CBHF and CHU groups were compared using multinomial and ordinal regression models and Somers' D for medians, while handling within-cluster correlation with robust variance estimation. Generalised estimating equations (GEE) were used to compare each functional outcome between CBHF and CHU groups. Model 1 adjusted for trial factors: randomized intervention arm, study nurse performing the assessment, exact age of child, sex of child, and calendar season. Model 2 included these trial factors plus contemporary socioeconomic and demographic confounders identified from a directed acyclic graph (DAG) with online software (Dagitty.net; see Supporting Information): socioeconomic status, caregiver depression (Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Score, EPDS), household food insecurity assessment scale (HFIAS), household religion, caregiver social support[38], caregiver gender norms[38], caregiver age, caregiver education, adversity score and the number of children's books at home. Model 3 adjusted for the trial factors and baseline socioeconomic and demographic confounders: birthweight, baseline EPDS, household dietary diversity score, health facility births, maternal haemoglobin, household socioeconomic score, maternal education and maternal gender norms. A


pre-specified subgroup analysis was also performed if there was evidence for an interaction of CBHF with child sex ( $p < 0.10$ ).

## Ethics


The Medical Research Council of Zimbabwe approved the study protocol (MRCZ/A/1675). The SHINE follow-up study was registered with the Pan-African Clinical Trials Registry (PACTR202201828512110). Written informed consent from the primary caregiver and written assent from the child were obtained, following a demonstration of the tools used to conduct the measurements.

## Results


Between 22 November 2012 and 27 March 2015, 5280 pregnant women were enrolled from 211 clusters at median 12 (IQR 9, 16) gestational weeks in Chirumanzu and Shurugwi districts (Figure 1). In Shurugwi, there were 420 births to women with HIV and 2174 births to women without HIV; 376 HIV-exposed and 2016 HIV-unexposed children completed the 18-month primary endpoint visit. Between 18 months and 7 years, 2 (0.5%) CBHF and 5 (0.2%) CHU died, whilst 6 (1.6%) CBHF and 42 (2.1%) CHU were lost to follow-up. Two caregivers of CBHF and 9 caregivers of CHU declined follow-up at 7 years. There were 87 (23.2%) relocations among CBHF and 387 (19.2%) relocations among CHU; these children were therefore ineligible for inclusion. Overall, 273 HIV-exposed children were measured, of whom 5 were HIV positive and 4 had severe disability, leaving 264 CBHF in the current analysis. Of 1002 HIV-unexposed children measured, 12 were subsequently excluded: 2 were HIV-positive (due to mothers seroconverting during breastfeeding) and 10 had severe disability; 990 CHU were included in the current analysis.



## CBHF



## CHU



*Figure 1: CONSORT diagram showing CBHF and CHU selected into SHINE Follow-up. Note that 6 children born to HIV positive women aged out because initially children with known HIV positive status were not included for measurement. 1 child born to HIV negative mothers also aged out due to heavy rains making their area inaccessible before they turned 8 years. Participants were recorded as lost to follow-up (LTFU) at three stages: shortly after enrolment as pregnant mothers, during the first 18 months before the trial primary endpoint was measured, or between 18 months and 7 years. Children with severe disability or who were HIV positive were not included in the current analysis.*

## Participant characteristics

Characteristics of the child, caregiver and household at the time of the follow-up visit are shown in Table 1. CBHF compared to CHU had a higher proportion of caregivers who were mothers (83.1% vs 75.9%) compared to other types of caregiver such as grandmothers or other family members. CBHF also had a greater proportion had been randomized to WASH or combined arms. CBHF households had higher levels of food insecurity as measured by the HFIAS score (12.9 vs 12.0) and a higher adversity score (1.95 vs 1.77) compared to CHU households. Caregivers of CBHF versus CHU had slightly fewer years of schooling (9.5 vs 10.0), although both were relatively high. CBHF caregivers also higher depression scores (4.1 vs 3.2) compared to CHU. CBHF also had lower total schooling exposure (3.1 vs 3.3 years).

Baseline characteristics of the mother and household, which were measured at enrolment to the original trial during pregnancy, together with child characteristics between birth and 18 months (trial endpoint) are shown in Suppl Table 1. Mothers with HIV had lower haemoglobin and MUAC, and higher parity than mothers without HIV, together with higher depression and food insecurity scores, and lower socioeconomic scores. In pregnancy, women with HIV had a mean (SD) CD4 count of 474 (215); 83% were receiving ART, which was predominantly tenofovir-based regimens (70%). Between birth and 18 months, CBHF had lower anthropometry, with higher rates of stunting and a lower breastfeeding duration, compared to CHU (see Suppl Table 1).

Variable at 7-year visit	CBHF N=264	CHU N=990	p-value
Proportion female [N]	51.1% [135]	51.1% [506]	0.99
Child age, years; mean (SD)	7.3 (0.3)	7.3 (0.2)	0.07
Mean years of schooling (SD)	3.1 (0.7)	3.3 (0.8)	0.01
<b>Caregiver characteristics</b>			
Mother as caregiver, % [N]	83.3% [219]	75.8% [750]	0.01
Mean years of schooling (SD)	9.5 (2.7)	10.0 (2.6)	0.01

Mean Edinburgh Postnatal Depression score (SD)	4.0 (4.7)	3.2 (4.4)	0.01
Mean Social support score (SD)	3.8 (0.6)	3.9 (0.5)	0.38
Mean Gender norm attitudes (SD)	4.1 (0.6)	4.1 (0.6)	0.62
Mean Total Discipline score (SD)	2.0 (2.1)	1.9 (2.0)	0.62
Mean Child parent relationship score (SD)	3.3 (0.8)	3.3 (0.7)	0.21
<b>Household characteristics</b>			
SES quintile, % [N]			
lowest	23.7% [62]	19.1% [186]	0.50
second	20.3% [53]	19.8% [193]	
middle	19.2% [50]	20.2% [197]	
fourth	19.2% [51]	20.2% [197]	
highest	17.7% [46]	20.6% [201]	
Mean SES scale (SD)	1.5 (0.7)	1.6 (0.6)	0.06
Mean Household Food Insecurity Assessment Scale (SD)	12.9 (4.7)	12.0 (4.2)	0.005
Mean Household Dietary Diversity Scale (SD)	7.7 (2.0)	7.7 (1.8)	0.91
Mean Total Household Water Insecurity Experiences scale (SD)	12.2 (1.3)	12.1 (0.9)	0.41
Female headed household, % [N]	18.6% [50]	17.1% [171]	0.56
Mean Adversity Score (SD)	1.9 (1.5)	1.8 (1.4)	0.07
Median number of children's books at home (IQR)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	0.02
<b>Original trial arm, % [N]</b>			
SOC	19.3% [51]	24.9% [246]	<0.001
IYCF	17.4% [46]	25.3% [250]	
WASH	35.2% [93]	25.0% [247]	
Combined	28.0% [74]	25.0% [247]	

**Table 1: Baseline characteristics.** Variables all measured at the time of the follow-up visit. Baseline factors measured during participation in the original trial are shown in Supplementary Table 1. [21]. All scales are further explained in supplementary materials. IQR: inter-quartile range.

## Cognitive, physical and growth outcomes

Cognitive outcomes for CBHF and HUU children are shown in Table 2. CBHF had lower total neurodevelopmental scores, as measured by the Mental Processing Index from the KABC-II test, which reflects overall cognitive function. There was still strong evidence of difference after

adjustment for contemporary or baseline factors. CBHF also had lower scores on the School Achievement Test and showed reduced executive function as measured by the Plus-EF score. Fine motor function was lower among CBHF, with weaker evidence of difference after adjustment for contemporary or baseline factors. There was no evidence of difference between groups in the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire or total socioemotional score. Taken together, CBHF showed 0.2-0.3 standard deviation reductions in neurodevelopmental scores across a range of measures of cognition, executive function and academic achievement.

**Table 2: Cognitive function in CBHF and CHU**

Outcome	CBHF		CHU		GEE Mean difference (95% CI)			
	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	Unadjusted difference	Adjusted difference Model 1 (Trial factors)	Adjusted difference Model 2 (Trial factors & contemporary covariates)	Adjusted difference Model 3 (Trial factors & baseline covariates)
Mental Processing Index	264	45 (11)	990	48 (11)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (1, 4)	3 (2, 4)
School Achievement Test	264	39 (26)	990	46 (28)	7 (4, 11)	7 (3, 11)	6 (2, 10)	6 (3, 10)
Plus EF executive function score	251	109 (25)	978	114 (24)	5 (2, 8)	5 (2, 8)	5 (2, 8)	5 (2, 9)
Fine motor speed, seconds	262	25.0 (6.7)	986	24.1 (6.6)	-1.0 (-1.8, -0.1)	-0.8 (-1.7, 0.1)	-0.8 (-1.7, 0.1)	-0.7 (-1.6, 0.2)
Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire score	263	9 (5)	989	9 (5)	0 (-1, 0)	-1 (-1, 0)	0 (-1, 1)	0 (-1, 0)
Child socioemotional score	256	4 (1)	973	4 (1)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)

**Table 2: Cognitive function in CBHF and CHU.** Model 1 is adjusted for trial factors (arm, study nurse, exact child age, calendar month recruited, temperature, sex). Model 2 is adjusted for trial factors from Model 1 and contemporary factors (socioeconomic status, caregiver depression score (EPDS), household food insecurity (HFIAS), household religion, caregiver social support, caregiver gender norms, caregiver age, caregiver education, adversity score, children's books at home). Model 3 is adjusted for trial factors from Model 1 and early-life factors (length for age Z-score (LAZ) at 18mo, birthweight, maternal baseline depression score (EPDS), household diet, maternal haemoglobin, socioeconomic status, facility birth, gender norms, and maternal years of schooling). Overall, 25 Plus-EF measurements were missing due to a programming error on encryption which led to some results being lost. For fine motor assessments, 6 children did not perform the task: 1 child's caregiver refused, and 5 children were unable to fully understand or concentrate for the finger tapping task. Two caregivers did not answer all SDQ questions. Overall, 25 children refused to answer all questions on the child socioemotional scale, hence were unable to provide a full score.

**Table 3: Physical function in CBHF and CHU**

Outcome	CBHF		CHU		GEE Mean difference (95% CI)			
	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	Unadjusted difference	Adjusted difference Model 1 (Trial factors)	Adjusted difference Model 2 (Trial factors & contemporary covariates)	Adjusted difference Model 3 (Trial factors & baseline covariates)
Grip Strength, Kg	262	10.5 (1.9)	990	10.7 (1.9)	0.2 (-0.1, 0.5)	0.3 (0.0, 0.5)	0.3 (0.0, 0.5)	0.2 (-0.0, 0.5)
Broad jump, cm	259	111.0 (17.3)	987	112.8 (15.1)	2.1 (-0.2, 4.3)	2.5 (0.3, 4.6)	2.1 (-0.2, 4.3)	1.8 (-0.3, 4.0)
VO2max, ml kg <sup>-1</sup> min <sup>-1</sup>	255	50.2 (2.7)	986	50.9 (2.7)	0.8 (0.4, 1.2)	0.6 (0.2, 1.0)	0.5 (0.1, 0.9)	0.5 (0.1, 0.9)
Systolic BP, mm Hg	264	96.7 (9.0)	988	97.0 (9.3)	0.1 (-1.1, 1.2)	0.5 (-0.5, 1.6)	0.6 (-0.4, 1.7)	0.6 (-0.5, 1.6)
Diastolic BP, mm Hg	264	62.8 (7.3)	988	62.3 (7.5)	-0.5 (-1.5, 0.4)	0.0 (-0.9, 1.0)	0.0 (-0.9, 1.0)	0.1 (-0.9, 1.1)

**Table 3: Physical function in CBHF and CHU.** Model 1 is adjusted for trial factors (arm, study nurse, exact child age, calendar month recruited, temperature, sex). Model 2 is adjusted for trial factors from Model 1 and contemporary factors (socioeconomic status, caregiver depression score (EPDS), household food insecurity (HFIAS), household religion, caregiver social support, caregiver gender norms, caregiver age, caregiver education, adversity score, children's books at home). Model 3 is adjusted for trial factors from Model 1 and early-life factors (length for age Z-score (LAZ) at 18mo, birthweight, maternal baseline depression score (EPDS), household diet, maternal haemoglobin, socioeconomic status, facility birth, gender norms, and maternal years of schooling). Two children (both CBHF) did not perform the grip strength test: 1 was not motivated and 1 had a caregiver who refused the measurements. Eight children did not perform the broad jump test for a variety of reasons: 1 caregiver refused, 1 visit was performed during heavy rains and the ground was too slippery, 2 children had painful legs, 2 children's caregivers refused due to the child being known to have asthma, 1 child refused and 1 measurement was missing without a recorded reason. In addition, 5 children did not do the shuttle run test: 3 children refused, 1 was recorded as having asthma, and 1 measurement was missing without a recorded reason. Two children refused blood pressure measurements.

**Table 4: Growth and body composition in CBHF and CHU**

Outcome	CBHF		CHU		GEE Mean difference (95% CI)			
	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	Unadjusted difference	Adjusted difference Model 1 (Trial factors)	Adjusted difference Model 2 (Trial factors & contemporary covariates)	Adjusted difference Model 3 (Trial factors & baseline covariates)
Height-for-age Z score	263	-0.6 (0.9)	990	-0.5 (0.9)	0.1 (0.0, 0.3)	0.1 (0.0, 0.3)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)
Weight-for-age Z score	262	-0.7 (0.9)	988	-0.6 (0.9)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)
Body mass index, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	262	-0.5 (0.9)	988	-0.5 (0.8)	0.0 (-0.2, 0.1)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)	0.0 (-0.2, 0.1)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)
Knee-heel length, cm	262	37.3 (2.0)	989	37.4 (1.9)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.4)	0.2 (0.0, 0.5)	0.2 (-0.1, 0.4)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.4)
Head circumference, cm	263	51.0 (1.5)	990	51.3 (1.4)	0.3 (0.1, 0.5)	0.3 (0.1, 0.5)	0.3 (0.1, 0.5)	0.3 (0.1, 0.5)
Mid-upper arm circumference, cm	262	17.0 (1.4)	989	16.9 (1.3)	-0.1 (-0.3, 0.1)	0.0 (-0.2, 0.2)	0 (-0.2, 0.2)	0.0 (-0.2, 0.1)
Waist circumference, cm	263	54.1 (3.1)	989	54.1 (3.1)	-0.1 (-0.6, 0.3)	0.1 (-0.3, 0.5)	0.1 (-0.3, 0.5)	0.0 (-0.4, 0.4)
Hip circumference, cm	263	61.0 (4.1)	990	60.9 (3.9)	-0.1 (-0.7, 0.5)	0.1 (-0.5, 0.7)	0.1 (-0.5, 0.7)	0.0 (-0.6, 0.6)
Calf circumference, cm	263	23.3 (1.6)	989	23.4 (1.7)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.3)	0.2 (0.0, 0.4)	0.2 (0, 0.4)	0.2 (-0.1, 0.4)
Lean mass index, Ohms <sup>-1</sup>	262	12.1 (1.3)	982	12.1 (1.3)	0.0 (-0.2, 0.2)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.2)	0.0 (-0.2, 0.2)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.2)
Impedance Index, m <sup>2</sup> /Ohms <sup>-1</sup>	262	1.7 (0.3)	982	1.8 (0.3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)
Phase angle, degrees	261	5.1 (0.5)	982	4.9 (0.6)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.1, 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0)	-0.1 (-0.1, 0.0)
Total skinfold thicknesses, mm	261	26.4 (6.0)	987	27.1 (6.2)	0.6 (-0.3, 1.5)	0.7 (-0.2, 1.6)	0.7 (-0.2, 1.6)	0.6 (-0.2, 1.5)
Peripheral skinfold thickness, mm	261	15.7 (3.6)	988	16.2 (3.7)	0.5 (0.0, 1.0)	0.5 (0.0, 1.0)	0.5 (0.0, 1.0)	0.5 (0.0, 1.0)
Central skinfold thickness, mm	263	10.9 (3.1)	989	10.9 (3.1)	0.1 (-0.4, 0.5)	0.1 (-0.3, 0.6)	0.1 (-0.4, 0.7)	0.1 (-0.4, 0.6)
Haemoglobin, g dl <sup>-1</sup>	261	12.6 (1.3)	990	12.7 (1.2)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.2)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.2)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.3)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.2)

**Table 4: Growth and body composition in CBHF and CHU.** Model 1 is adjusted for trial factors (arm, study nurse, exact child age, calendar month recruited, temperature, sex). Model 2 is adjusted for trial factors from Model 1 and contemporary factors (socioeconomic status, caregiver depression score (EPDS), household food insecurity (HFIAS), household religion, caregiver social support, caregiver gender norms, caregiver age, caregiver education, adversity score, children's books at home). Model 3 is adjusted for trial factors from Model 1 and early-life factors (length for age Z-score (LAZ) at 18mo, birthweight, maternal baseline depression score (EPDS), household diet, maternal haemoglobin, socioeconomic status, facility birth, gender norms, and maternal years of schooling). One caregiver refused all anthropometry measurements. Five children refused skinfold measurements, three children had a missing weight due to faulty weighing scales, nine children had missing bioimpedance measurements because of faulty machines or measurements that were excluded for inconsistency, two children refused haemoglobin measurements, and one child had missing knee-heel length, MUAC, waist and calf circumference measurements.

Physical function scores for both groups are shown in Table 3. Whilst CBHF generally had lower scores for all tests, the only test with strong evidence of difference between groups was the level achieved in the shuttle run test, which reflects  $VO_2\text{max}$  as a measure of cardiovascular fitness. CBHF compared to CHU had a  $0.7 \text{ ml kg}^{-1} \text{ min}^{-1}$  lower  $VO_2\text{max}$ , representing 0.3 lower average level (or approximately 60 metres shorter distance) on the shuttle run test. Growth and body composition for both groups are shown in Table 4. CBHF generally had lower growth and body composition values than CHU, but there was only strong evidence of difference in head circumference, which was 0.3 cm lower in CBHF, across all models. Taken together, CBHF generally had lower physical fitness scores and reduced growth, with strong evidence of difference for cardiovascular fitness and head circumference.

### Subgroup analysis

Among cognitive outcomes, there was evidence of an interaction between child sex and the Strengths and Difficulties questionnaire: among boys, CHU scored better than CBHF (1 mark, 95% CI 0, 2) but among girls, there was no evidence of difference in SDQ score between CBHF and CHU (Supplementary Table S3). Among physical function outcomes, there was evidence of an interaction between child sex and  $VO_2\text{max}$ , whereby CHU boys had better cardiovascular fitness than CBHF boys (1.2, 95% CI 0.6, 1.8), while there was no evidence of difference between groups among girls. For growth outcomes, there was evidence of an interaction between sex and calf circumference such that CHU girls had weak evidence for a slightly larger calf circumference (0.3 cm, 95% CI 0.0, 0.6) but there was no evidence of a difference for boys. There were no significant interactions with child sex for other growth or body composition outcomes.

## Discussion

The population of children born HIV-free continues to expand due to improved coverage of PMTCT interventions among women living with HIV. It is now apparent that, despite ART during pregnancy, CBHF in sub-Saharan Africa have poorer early-life growth[7] and neurodevelopment[39]; however, few studies have evaluated child outcomes beyond 2 years of age and it remains unclear if disparities resolve, persist, or even widen over time. In this study from rural Zimbabwe, we show ongoing disparities in cognitive and physical function among CBHF at 7 years of age. Potential biological and environmental explanations for these disparities in CBHF are discussed below. The gap in neurodevelopment is substantial and interestingly is greater than the disparity in neurodevelopmental scores at age 2 years in the same cohort[20]. We also found that CBHF have reduced cardiovascular fitness, which may have consequences for adult health and function. Collectively, these data highlight the ongoing modest reductions in cognitive and physical function that CBHF experience, many years after exposure to HIV *in utero*, which may have a substantial long-term impact on human capital in areas of high HIV prevalence. There is an evident need to understand the underlying drivers of these differences, so that appropriate interventions can be deployed to improve long-term outcomes in this growing population of children.

The reduction in performance in CBHF was consistent across multiple domains of cognitive function including cognitive processing, academic and executive function. These tools had been specifically adapted[40] or developed for children at this age and in this setting[21]. CBHF compared to CHU had a 0.3 standard deviation reduction in the Mental Processing Index, representing the overall cognitive processing score, together with lower school achievement and executive function scores. This consistency across a range of cognitive domains has been previously shown in early life[8]. In a meta-analysis of 11 studies (6 outside the USA) CBHF showed reduced neurodevelopment compared to CHU at young ages, although sample sizes were small[39]. More recent studies have shown increased risk of language delay in CBHF[41, 42], but most studies are from children aged below 2

years. Here, we show that effects persist across cognitive domains by 7 years of age. Exploratory *post hoc* analysis showed reductions occurred across all subtests of these assessments, with the exception of the Flanker test in the executive function test battery (Supplementary Table S4). CBHF also had evidence of smaller head circumference, which has previously been noted in early life [43]. Reduced postnatal head circumference at age 2 years has been strongly associated with poor neurodevelopmental outcomes[44]. Evidence of structural differences among CBHF is emerging, with a reduction in grey matter volume apparent as early as 3 weeks of age using MRI[45], or diffuse tensor imaging combined with neuropsychological testing[46]. Head circumference is predominantly a marker of early-life growth, particularly in the first 2 years[47], and despite catch-up in other anthropometric measures over time, the signal of reduced head growth persists at school-age, consistent with the accompanying reductions in neurodevelopment.

It is likely that both universal and HIV-specific risk factors contribute to cognitive disparities[9]. The psychosocial and socioeconomic environment was poorer in CBHF, including worse food security, higher adversity scores, caregivers with fewer years of schooling, and higher caregiver depression scores, which may all affect the way caregivers provide nurturing care and how children learn. However, adjusted models including either contemporary or baseline psychosocial variables did not eliminate cognitive differences between groups, although the disparity was attenuated. Antenatal HIV, ART exposure, co-infections, and greater inflammation may drive biological differences in growth and function which are still evident at 7 years[16]. A combined intervention approach addressing both universal and HIV-specific pathways is likely needed to reduce the cognitive gap between groups, delivered throughout early life and up to school-age.

Cardiovascular fitness was also reduced in CBHF as shown by a reduction in the level obtained in the shuttle run, reflecting a lower VO<sub>2</sub>max than CHU. There could be several mechanisms for this. Emerging data suggest effects of HIV exposure on cardiac structure and function in high-income

CBHF cohorts[48, 49]. Fetal exposure to ART may impair myocardial growth[49]. Zidovudine has been shown to alter fetal cardiac remodelling and to cause mild antenatal dysfunction[50]. It may also be due to HIV itself: In a large study of 400 American CBHF, greater cardiac inflammation and left ventricular stress were found in children living with HIV than those perinatally exposed to HIV[51]. A separate case-control study showed a 0.5 standard deviation reduction in left ventricular mass index in 30 school-age American CBHF compared to CHU[52]. A subgroup analysis in the current study showed that the reduction in cardiovascular fitness was only seen in boys. However, cardiac remodelling has been noted to be more pronounced in girls in the USA[48] so this sex difference may be due instead to differences in lung function between groups. CBHF have increased mortality from respiratory infections[9] which may also cause long-term morbidity: CBHF in South Africa showed negative associations between lung function and delays in starting ART, low maternal CD4 count and high viral loads[53]. Further detailed studies of cardiac and lung physiology are needed in cohorts of CBHF to better understand the reasons for reduced cardiovascular fitness in mid-childhood. The weak evidence for reduced calf circumference in CBHF girls did not associate with any evidence for reductions in strength or cardiovascular fitness for CBHF girls.

This study has several strengths, particularly the use of an extensively piloted toolbox[21] with suitably adapted assessments[23], which provided simultaneous phenotyping of growth, physical and cognitive function. The cohort has well-characterised longitudinal HIV exposure status, and includes a rich dataset including baseline and contemporary maternal, socioeconomic and nurturing factors for use as covariates. This substudy is likely to be representative of the broader SHINE cohort since there were no significant differences between those included and excluded in the follow-up study. There are also several study limitations, particularly possible survivor bias due to higher mortality in CBHF[7]. There may also be selection bias due to the high number of relocations since the end of the trial, which may be related to household socioeconomic status. Although we collected data during pregnancy on HIV treatment, it was not available for all women, and this substudy was

not powered to evaluate the impact of specific antiretroviral regimens on long-term child health outcomes. Finally, we measured several outcomes and did not adjust for multiple comparisons since this was an exploratory analysis with many correlated outcomes; however, the consistent findings across cognitive tests provides reassurance that these results are unlikely simply due to inflated type 1 error.

In conclusion, this study of CBHF and CHU in rural Zimbabwe represents one of the few birth cohorts in sub-Saharan Africa to be followed to school-age to ascertain longer-term outcomes. We show ongoing vulnerabilities among CBHF in multiple domains of cognitive function and cardiovascular fitness, which could affect health and human capital across the life-course. The pressing goal now is to understand the relative contributions of biological and psychosocial factors to these long-term disparities, to inform future interventions, which could potentially include nurturing care and educational provision for children, combined with improved food security and psychosocial support to caregivers[16]. Given the expanding global population of CBHF there is a need for further long-term follow-up studies to understand how we can ensure that all children survive and thrive across the life-course.

## References

1. Slogrove AL, Becquet R, Chadwick EG, Côté HCF, Essajee S, Hazra R, et al. Surviving and Thriving—Shifting the Public Health Response to HIV-Exposed Uninfected Children: Report of the 3rd HIV-Exposed Uninfected Child Workshop. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*. 2018;6. doi: 10.3389/fped.2018.00157.
2. Slogrove AL, Powis KM, Johnson LF, Stover J, Mahy M. Estimates of the global population of children who are HIV-exposed and uninfected, 2000-18: a modelling study. *The Lancet Global health*. 2020;8(1):e67-e75. Epub 20191129. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(19)30448-6. PubMed PMID: 31791800; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6981259.
3. UNAIDS. UNAIDS 2022 [12/06/2023]. Available from: <http://aidsinfo.unaids.org/>.
4. Marinda E, Humphrey JH, Iliff PJ, Mutasa K, Nathoo KJ, Piwoz EG, et al. Child mortality according to maternal and infant HIV status in Zimbabwe. *The Pediatric infectious disease journal*. 2007;26(6):519-26. Epub 2007/05/29. doi: 10.1097/01.inf.0000264527.69954.4c. PubMed PMID: 17529870.
5. Omoni AO, Ntozini R, Evans C, Prendergast AJ, Moulton LH, Christian PS, et al. Child Growth According to Maternal and Child HIV Status in Zimbabwe. *The Pediatric infectious disease journal*. 2017;36(9):869-76. Epub 2017/02/16. doi: 10.1097/inf.0000000000001574. PubMed PMID: 28198792; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5571879.
6. Evans C, Humphrey JH, Ntozini R, Prendergast AJ. HIV-Exposed Uninfected Infants in Zimbabwe: Insights into Health Outcomes in the Pre-Antiretroviral Therapy Era. *Frontiers in Immunology*. 2016;7. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2016.00190.
7. Evans C, Chasekwa B, Ntozini R, Majo FD, Mutasa K, Tavengwa N, et al. Mortality, Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Transmission, and Growth in Children Exposed to HIV in Rural Zimbabwe. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021;72(4):586-94. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa076.
8. Wedderburn CJ, Weldon E, Bertran-Cobo C, Rehman AM, Stein DJ, Gibb DM, et al. Early neurodevelopment of HIV-exposed uninfected children in the era of antiretroviral therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2022;6(6):393-408. Epub 20220426. doi: 10.1016/s2352-4642(22)00071-2. PubMed PMID: 35483380; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9090907.
9. Wedderburn CJ, Evans C, Yeung S, Gibb DM, Donald KA, Prendergast AJ. Growth and Neurodevelopment of HIV-Exposed Uninfected Children: a Conceptual Framework. *Current HIV/AIDS Reports*. 2019. doi: 10.1007/s11904-019-00459-0.
10. Rosala-Hallas A, Bartlett JW, Filteau S. Growth of HIV-exposed uninfected, compared with HIV-unexposed, Zambian children: a longitudinal analysis from infancy to school age. *BMC Pediatrics*. 2017;17(1):80. doi: 10.1186/s12887-017-0828-6.
11. Boivin MJ, Barlow-Mosha L, Chernoff MC, Laughton B, Zimmer B, Joyce C, et al. Neuropsychological performance in African children with HIV enrolled in a multisite antiretroviral clinical trial. *AIDS (London, England)*. 2018;32(2):189-204. doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000001683.
12. Nicholson L, Chisenga M, Siame J, Kasonka L, Filteau S. Growth and health outcomes at school age in HIV-exposed, uninfected Zambian children: follow-up of two cohorts studied in infancy. *BMC pediatrics*. 2015;15:66-. doi: 10.1186/s12887-015-0386-8. PubMed PMID: 26048411.
13. Kerr SJ, Puthanakit T, Vibol U, Aupibul L, Vonthanak S, Kosalaraksa P, et al. Neurodevelopmental outcomes in HIV-exposed-uninfected children versus those not exposed to HIV. *AIDS Care*. 2014;26(11):1327-35. doi: 10.1080/09540121.2014.920949.
14. Prendergast AJ, Chasekwa B, Evans C, Mutasa K, Mbuya MNN, Stoltzfus RJ, et al. Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on stunting and anaemia among HIV-exposed children in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*. 2019;3(2):77-90. doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30340-7.
15. Chandna J, Ntozini R, Evans C, Kandawasvika G, Chasekwa B, Majo F, et al. Effects of improved complementary feeding and improved water, sanitation and hygiene on early child development among HIV-exposed children: substudy of a cluster randomised trial in

- rural Zimbabwe. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020;5(1):e001718. Epub 2020/03/07. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001718. PubMed PMID: 32133164; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC7042608.
16. Prendergast AJ, Evans C. Children who are HIV-exposed and uninfected: evidence for action. *AIDS (London, England)*. 2023;37(2):205-15. doi: 10.1097/qad.0000000000003409. PubMed PMID: 00002030-202302010-00001.
17. Humphrey JH, Jones AD, Manges A, Mangwadu G, Maluccio JA, Mbuya MN, et al. The Sanitation Hygiene Infant Nutrition Efficacy (SHINE) Trial: Rationale, Design, and Methods. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;61 Suppl 7:S685-702. Epub 2015/11/26. doi: 10.1093/cid/civ844. PubMed PMID: 26602296; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC4657589.
18. Humphrey JH, Mbuya MNN, Ntozini R, Moulton LH, Stoltzfus RJ, Tavengwa NV, et al. Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on child stunting and anaemia in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised trial. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2019;7(1):e132-e47. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30374-7.
19. Gladstone MJ, Chandna J, Kandawasvika G, Ntozini R, Majo FD, Tavengwa NV, et al. Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) and improved complementary feeding on early neurodevelopment among children born to HIV-negative mothers in rural Zimbabwe: Substudy of a cluster-randomized trial. *PLOS Medicine*. 2019;16(3):e1002766. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002766.
20. Ntozini R, Chandna J, Evans C, Chasekwa B, Majo FD, Kandawasvika G, et al. Early child development in children who are HIV-exposed uninfected compared to children who are HIV-unexposed: observational sub-study of a cluster-randomized trial in rural Zimbabwe. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2020;23(5):e25456-e. doi: 10.1002/jia2.25456. PubMed PMID: 32386127.
21. Piper JD, Mazhanga C, Mapako G, Mapurisa I, Mashedze T, Munyama E, et al. Characterising school-age health and function in rural Zimbabwe using the SAHARAN toolbox. *PLOS ONE*. 2023;18(5):e0285570. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0285570.
22. Mitchell JM, Tomlinson M, Bland RM, Houle B, Stein A, Rochat TJ. Confirmatory factor analysis of the Kaufman assessment battery in a sample of primary school-aged children in rural South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*. 2018;48(4):434-52. doi: 10.1177/0081246317741822.
23. Piper J, Mazhanga C, Mapako G, Mapurisa I, Mashedze T, Munyama E, et al. Piloting the adaptation of the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children 2nd edition (KABC-II) to assess school-age neurodevelopment in rural Zimbabwe [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2022;7(274). doi: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17902.1.
24. Chang SM, Walker SP, Grantham-Macgregor S, Powell CA. Early childhood stunting and later fine motor abilities. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*. 2010;52(9):831-6. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8749.2010.03640.x.
25. Obradović J, Sulik MJ, Finch JE, Tirado-Strayer N. Assessing students' executive functions in the classroom: Validating a scalable group-based procedure. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 2018;55:4-13. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2017.03.003.
26. Cappa C, Mont D, Loeb M, Misunas C, Madans J, Comic T, et al. The development and testing of a module on child functioning for identifying children with disabilities on surveys. III: Field testing. *Disabil Health J*. 2018;11(4):510-8. doi: 10.1016/j.dhjo.2018.06.004.
27. Wells JCK, Williams JE, Fewtrell M, Singhal A, Lucas A, Cole TJ. A simplified approach to analysing bio-electrical impedance data in epidemiological surveys. *Int J Obes*. 2007;31(3):507-14. doi: 10.1038/sj.ijo.0803441.
28. Léger LA, Mercier D, Gadoury C, Lambert J. The multistage 20 metre shuttle run test for aerobic fitness. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. 1988;6(2):93-101. doi: 10.1080/02640418808729800.
29. Chasekwa B, Maluccio JA, Ntozini R, Moulton LH, Wu F, Smith LE, et al. Measuring wealth in rural communities: Lessons from the Sanitation, Hygiene, Infant Nutrition Efficacy (SHINE) trial. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13(6):e0199393. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0199393.

30. Driscoll KS, Pianta RC. Mothers' and fathers' perceptions of conflict and closeness in parent-child relationships during early childhood. *Psychology*. 2011.
31. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Finkelhor D, Moore DW, Runyan D. Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: development and psychometric data for a national sample of American parents. *Child Abuse Negl*. 1998;22(4):249-70. Epub 1998/05/20. doi: 10.1016/s0145-2134(97)00174-9. PubMed PMID: 9589178.
32. ZIMSTAT, UNICEF. Zimbabwe Multi-Indicator Cluster Survey 2019; Snapshots of Key Findings. <https://www.unicef.org/zimbabwe/>; 2019.
33. Chibanda D, Mangezi W, Tshimanga M, Woelk G, Rusakaniko P, Stranix-Chibanda L, et al. Validation of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale among women in a high HIV prevalence area in urban Zimbabwe. *Arch Womens Ment Health*. 2010;13(3):201-6. Epub 2009/09/18. doi: 10.1007/s00737-009-0073-6. PubMed PMID: 19760051.
34. Tome J, Mbuya MNN, Makasi RR, Ntozini R, Prendergast AJ, Dickin KL, et al. Maternal caregiving capabilities are associated with child linear growth in rural Zimbabwe. *Maternal & child nutrition*. 2021;17(2):e13122. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13122>.
35. Bhalla G, Handa S, Angeles G, Seidenfeld D. The effect of cash transfers and household vulnerability on food security in Zimbabwe. *Food Policy*. 2018;74:82-99. doi: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2017.11.007.
36. Gandure S, Drimie S, Faber M. Food Security Indicators after Humanitarian Interventions Including Food Aid in Zimbabwe. *Food and nutrition bulletin*. 2010;31(4):513-23. doi: 10.1177/156482651003100405.
37. Young SL, Boateng GO, Jamaluddine Z, Miller JD, Frongillo EA, Neilands TB, et al. The Household Water InSecurity Experiences (HWISE) Scale: development and validation of a household water insecurity measure for low-income and middle-income countries. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2019;4(5):e001750. Epub 2019/10/23. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001750. PubMed PMID: 31637027; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6768340.
38. Matare CR, Mbuya MNN, Pelto G, Dickin KL, Stoltzfus RJ, Sanitation Hygiene Infant Nutrition Efficacy Trial T. Assessing Maternal Capabilities in the SHINE Trial: Highlighting a Hidden Link in the Causal Pathway to Child Health. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2015;61 Suppl 7(Suppl 7):S745-S51. Epub 11/11. doi: 10.1093/cid/civ851. PubMed PMID: 26602303.
39. McHenry MS, McAteer CI, Oyungu E, McDonald BC, Bosma CB, Mpofu PB, et al. Neurodevelopment in Young Children Born to HIV-Infected Mothers: A Meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*. 2018;141(2):e20172888. doi: 10.1542/peds.2017-2888.
40. Adaptation of the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children—2nd edition (KABC-II) to assess school-age neurodevelopment in rural Zimbabwe [Internet]. 2022. Available from: [osf.io/ybct4](https://osf.io/ybct4)
41. le Roux SM, Donald KA, Brittain K, Phillips TK, Zerbe A, Nguyen KK, et al. Neurodevelopment of breastfed HIV-exposed uninfected and HIV-unexposed children in South Africa. *AIDS (London, England)*. 2018;32(13):1781-91. Epub 2018/05/26. doi: 10.1097/qad.0000000000001872. PubMed PMID: 29794831; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6341164.
42. Wedderburn CJ, Yeung S, Rehman AM, Stadler JAM, Nhapi RT, Barnett W, et al. Neurodevelopment of HIV-exposed uninfected children in South Africa: outcomes from an observational birth cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2019;3(11):803-13. Epub 20190909. doi: 10.1016/s2352-4642(19)30250-0. PubMed PMID: 31515160; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6876655.
43. Evans C, Chasekwa B, Ntozini R, Humphrey JH, Prendergast AJ. Head circumferences of children born to HIV-infected and HIV-uninfected mothers in Zimbabwe during the preantiretroviral therapy era. *AIDS (London, England)*. 2016;30(15):2323-8. doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000001196. PubMed PMID: 27428746.
44. Cheong JLY, Hunt RW, Anderson PJ, Howard K, Thompson DK, Wang HX, et al. Head Growth in Preterm Infants: Correlation With Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Neurodevelopmental Outcome. *Pediatrics*. 2008;121(6):e1534-e40. doi: 10.1542/peds.2007-2671.
45. Wedderburn CJ, Groenewold NA, Roos A, Yeung S, Fouche JP, Rehman AM, et al. Early structural brain development in infants exposed to HIV and antiretroviral therapy in

- utero in a South African birth cohort. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2022;25(1):e25863. doi: 10.1002/jia2.25863. PubMed PMID: 35041774; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8765561.
46. Yadav SK, Gupta RK, Hashem S, Nisar S, Azeem T, Bhat AA, et al. Brain microstructural changes support cognitive deficits in HIV uninfected children born to HIV infected mothers. *Brain Behav Immun Health.* 2020;2:100039. Epub 20200126. doi: 10.1016/j.bbih.2020.100039. PubMed PMID: 34589830; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8474176.
47. Frisk V, Amsel R, Whyte HE. The importance of head growth patterns in predicting the cognitive abilities and literacy skills of small-for-gestational-age children. *Developmental neuropsychology.* 2002;22(3):565-93. Epub 2003/03/29. doi: 10.1207/s15326942dn2203\_2. PubMed PMID: 12661971.
48. Lipshultz SE, Shearer WT, Thompson B, Rich KC, Cheng I, Orav EJ, et al. Cardiac effects of antiretroviral therapy in HIV-negative infants born to HIV-positive mothers: NHLBI CHART-1 (National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Cardiovascular Status of HAART Therapy in HIV-Exposed Infants and Children cohort study). *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2011;57(1):76-85. Epub 2010/12/28. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2010.08.620. PubMed PMID: 21185505; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3243620.
49. Lipshultz SE, Williams PL, Zeldow B, Wilkinson JD, Rich KC, van Dyke RB, et al. Cardiac effects of in-utero exposure to antiretroviral therapy in HIV-uninfected children born to HIV-infected mothers. *AIDS (London, England).* 2015;29(1):91-100. Epub 2015/01/07. doi: 10.1097/qad.0000000000000499. PubMed PMID: 25562493; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4287991.
50. García-Alonso Y, García-Hermoso A, Alonso-Martínez AM, Legarra-Gorgoñon G, Izquierdo M, Ramírez-Vélez R. Associations between physical fitness components with muscle ultrasound parameters in prepuberal children. *Int J Obes.* 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41366-022-01066-7.
51. Wilkinson JD, Williams PL, Yu W, Colan SD, Mendez A, Zachariah JPV, et al. Cardiac and inflammatory biomarkers in perinatally HIV-infected and HIV-exposed uninfected children. *AIDS (London, England).* 2018;32(10):1267-77. doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000001810. PubMed PMID: 29596110.
52. Cade WT, Waggoner AD, Hubert S, Krauss MJ, Singh GK, Overton ET. Reduced diastolic function and left ventricular mass in HIV-negative preadolescent children exposed to antiretroviral therapy in utero. *AIDS (London, England).* 2012;26(16):2053-8. Epub 2012/08/10. doi: 10.1097/QAD.0b013e328358d4d7. PubMed PMID: 22874520; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3641749.
53. Gray DM, Wedderburn CJ, MacGinty RP, McMillan L, Jacobs C, Stadler JA, et al. Impact of HIV and antiretroviral drug exposure on lung growth and function over 2 years in an African Birth Cohort. *AIDS (London, England).* 2019. Epub 2019/11/13. doi: 10.1097/qad.0000000000002444. PubMed PMID: 31714357.

# Supporting information: Growth, physical and cognitive function in children who are born HIV-free: school-age follow-up of a cluster-randomized trial in rural Zimbabwe

## Further description of scales used in baseline questionnaire

The socioeconomic status was recorded using a locally validated wealth index based on the household's type of buildings and ownership of assets such as a wheelbarrow or chickens[1], with a higher score indicating greater household wealth. The coping strategies index is a validated measure of food insecurity, with a higher score showing greater food insecurity[2]. Caregiver depression was measured using the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale, a 10-item self-report questionnaire which has previously been validated as a screening tool for depression in Zimbabwe[3], where a higher score represents more severe depressive symptoms. A higher score in gender norm attitudes reflects more equitable gender norms in the caregiver[4]. Similarly, an increase in the social support score reflects the caregiver's perception of improved support from neighbours and family, particularly in sharing problems[4]. Both gender norms and social support scores have previously been associated with improved child growth at 18 months [5]. Maternal schooling exposure was measured by number of years of education.

## Further description of scales used in contemporary caregiver questionnaire

Child schooling exposure was measured in number of years of education combined with months of school attended in the current year. Adversity was measured using a range of questions exploring recent adversities in the child, caregiver or household, based on previous work in India[6] and used in a pilot study[7], with a higher score reflecting greater adversity. Nurturing was measured using the Child-Parent Relationship scale, where a higher score represents a more positive relationship of the child with the caregiver[8]. The MICS Child Discipline questionnaire asks a series of questions on methods of discipline used for the child, with a higher score reflecting more harsh methods of discipline[9, 10]. The Household Food Insecurity Assessment Scale (HFIAS) reflects food coping behaviours in the previous 28 days, with a higher score indicating greater food insecurity[11]. The Household Dietary Diversity Scale (HDDS) represents the range of foods eaten in the past week, with a higher score representing greater diversity[12]. Both HFIAS and HDDS have been previously used in Zimbabwe together to describe food security[13]. The Household Water Insecurity Experiences Scale

(HWISE) also reflects water scarcity coping behaviours within the past 28 days, with a higher score representing more water insecurity[14].

**Table S1a. Baseline characteristics of HIV-positive women and their infants enrolled or not enrolled in the follow-up cohort**

	Included in follow-up	Not included in follow-up	p-value
Caregiver assessed, N*	267	459	
Children assessed, N	273	465	
<b>Household characteristics</b>			
Median number of occupants [IQR]	4.0 (3.0 ; 6.0)	4.0 (3.0 ; 6.0)	0.03
Wealth quintile, n (%)			
Lowest	64/258 (24.8%)	129/453 (28.5%)	0.49
Second	55/258 (21.3%)	108/453 (23.8%)	
Middle	57/258 (22.1%)	83/453 (18.3%)	
Fourth	41/258 (15.9%)	63/453 (13.9%)	
Highest	41/258 (15.9%)	70/453 (15.5%)	
<b>Electricity</b>			
Electricity in home, n (%)	6/260 (2.3%)	13/452 (2.9%)	0.65
Other electric power, n (%)			
Generator	9/260 (3.5%)	9/453 (2.0%)	0.10
Solar panel	171/260 (65.8%)	269/453 (59.4%)	
Inverter	5/260 (1.9%)	8/453 (1.8%)	
No other type	75/260 (28.9%)	167/453 (36.9%)	
<b>Sanitation</b>			
Any latrine at household, n (%)	92/255 (36.1%)	142/447 (31.8%)	0.28
Improved latrine at household, n (%)	79/255 (31.0%)	124/446 (27.8%)	0.42
<b>Water</b>			
Main source of household drinking water improved, n (%)	159/255 (62.4%)	263/446 (59.0%)	0.46
Treat drinking water to make it safer, n (%)	28/255 (11.0%)	56/438 (12.8%)	0.50
One-way walk time to fetch drinking water (min) , median (IQR)	10.0 (5.0 ; 25.0)	10.0 (5.0 ; 20.0)	0.01
Per capita water volume collected past 24 hr, median (IQR)	6.7 (4.0 ; 10.0)	8.6 (5.0 ; 13.3)	<0.001
<b>Hygiene</b>			
Handwashing station at household, n (%)	35/246 (14.2%)	33/412 (8.0%)	0.02
Improved floor, n (%)	115/258 (44.6%)	222/444 (50.0%)	0.20
Number of chickens, median (IQR)	5.0 (2.0 ; 10.0)	4.0 (0.0 ; 8.0)	0.01
Livestock observed inside the house, n (%)	103/258 (39.9%)	140/453 (30.0%)	0.02
Faeces observed in the yard, n (%)	86/256 (33.6%)	123/450 (27.3%)	0.09
<b>Diet quality and food security</b>			
Household meets minimum dietary diversity score, n (%)	85/243 (35.0%)	151/369 (40.9%)	0.15
Coping strategies index, median (IQR)	3.0 (0.0 ; 9.0)	2.0 (0.0 ; 12.0)	0.12
<b>Maternal characteristics</b>			
Mean age (SD), years	30.2 (6.1)	28.6 (6.3)	<0.001
Mean height (SD), cm	160.2 (6.2)	160.2 (6.2)	0.88

Mean mid-upper-arm circumference (SD), cm	26.5 (2.8)	26.1 (3.00)	0.01
Mean maternal Hb (SD), g/dL	11.5 (1.4)	11.1 (1.8)	0.01
Mother meets minimum dietary diversity score, n (%)	90/250 (36.0%)	182/439 (41.5%)	0.16
Mean years of schooling completed (SD)	9.2 (1.9)	9.1 (2.2)	0.54
Median parity (IQR)	2.0 (1.0 ; 3.0)	2.0 (1.0 ; 3.0)	0.01
Married, n (%)	231/248 (93.2%)	412/434 (94.9%)	0.71
Employed, n (%)	17/260 (6.5%)	50/450 (11.1%)	0.04
Religion, n (%)			
Apostolic	118/252 (46.8%)	212/437 (48.5%)	0.85
Other Christian	106/252 (42.1%)	182/437 (41.7%)	
Other religion	28/252 (11.1%)	43/437 (9.8%)	
Maternal capabilities			
Median Gender norms attitudes (IQR)	1.8 (1.5 ; 3.0)	1.7 (1.5 ; 3.0)	0.57
Median Perceived social support (IQR)	3.5 (3.0 ; 3.9)	3.5 (3.1 ; 4.0)	0.04
Median EPDS depression scale (IQR)	2.0 (0.0 ; 8.0)	2.0 (0.0 ; 6.0)	0.01
<b>Infant characteristics</b>			
Female, n (%)	137/273 (50.2%)	230/460 (50.0%)	0.96
Mean birth weight (SD), kg	3.0 (0.5)	3.0 (0.5)	0.01
Low birthweight, n (%)	26/254 (10.2%)	58/397 (14.6%)	0.10
Institutional delivery, n (%)	216/247 (87.5%)	328/402 (81.6%)	0.06
Vaginal delivery, n (%)	240/258 (93.0%)	369/401 (92.0%)	0.73
<b>18 month endpoint characteristics</b>			
Mean LAZ at 18 months, (SD)	-1.9 (1.1)	-1.9 (1.2)	0.92
Mean WAZ at 18 months, (SD)	-1.0 (1.1)	-0.9 (1.1)	0.51
Mean WHZ at 18 months, (SD)	-0.1 (1.1)	-0.02 (1.2)	0.31
Mean Head circumference Z score at 18 months, (SD)	-0.5 (1.1)	-0.5 (1.2)	0.90
Mean MUAC Z score at 18 months, cm (SD)	-0.1 (0.9)	-0.2 (0.9)	0.01
Mean Hb at 18 months, g/dL (SD)	11.8 (1.2)	11.8 (1.2)	0.79

*Table 0-1 Children born to HIV positive mothers (CBHPM) recruited into SHINE follow-up study (SFU) compared with children not recruited into SFU but were in the original SHINE study. \* Of the 267 caregivers, data were not available for 2 women at baseline entry to the trial, and for 7 of the not included group.*

**Table S1b. Baseline characteristics of HIV-negative women and their infants enrolled or not enrolled in the follow-up cohort**

<b>Supplementary table 1</b>	<b>HUU included in SFU (1002)</b>	<b>HUU Not included in SFU</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Caregiver assessed, N*	988	2949	
Children assessed, N	1002**	2987	
<b>Household characteristics</b>			
Median number of occupants [IQR]	5.0 (4.0; 6.0)	5.5 (3.0 ; 6.0)	0.09
Wealth quintile, n (%)			
Lowest	164/914 (17.9%)	511/2744 (18.6%)	0.84
Second	168/914 (18.4%)	544/2744 (19.8%)	
Middle	186/914 (20.4%)	553/2744 (20.2%)	
Fourth	200/914 (21.9%)	576/2744 (21.0%)	
Highest	196/914 (21.4%)	560/2744 (20.4%)	
<b>Electricity</b>			
Electricity in home, n (%)	31/914 (3.4%)	69/2738 (2.5%)	0.18
Other electric power, n (%)			
Generator	32/914 (3.5%)	86/2743 (3.1%)	0.21
Solar panel	631/914 (69.0%)	1795/2743 (65.4%)	
Inverter	13/914 (1.4%)	44/ 2743 (1.6%)	
No other type	238/914 (26.0%)	818/2743 (29.8%)	
<b>Sanitation</b>			
Any latrine at household, n (%)	343/899 (38.2%)	981/2707 (36.2%)	0.42
Improved latrine at household, n (%)	290/898 (32.3%)	867/2703 (32.1%)	0.92
<b>Water</b>			
Main source of household drinking water improved, n (%)	618/900 (68.7%)	1675/2725 (61.5%)	0.01
Treat drinking water to make it safer, n (%)	127/895 (14.2%)	322/2673 (12.1%)	0.12
One-way walk time to fetch drinking water (min) , median (IQR)	10.0 (5.0 ; 20.0)	10.0 (5.0 ; 20.0)	0.30
Per capita water volume collected past 24 hr, median (IQR)	6.7 (4.4 ; 10.0)	7.5 (5.0 ; 12.0)	<0.001
<b>Hygiene</b>			
Handwashing station at household, n (%)	101/876 (11.5%)	207/2557 (8.1%)	0.01
Improved floor, n (%)	484/900 (53.8%)	1512/2707 (55.9%)	0.44
Number of chickens, median (IQR)	6.0 (2.0 ; 10.0)	6.0 (2.0 ; 10.0)	0.12
Livestock observed inside the house, n (%)	390/963 (40.5%)	1039/2886 (36.0%)	0.02
Faeces observed in the yard, n (%)	322/958 (33.6%)	877/2879 (30.5%)	0.15
<b>Diet quality and food security</b>			
Household meets minimum dietary diversity score, n (%)	328/880 (37.3%)	965/2344 (41.2%)	0.10
Coping strategies index, median (IQR)	0.0 (0.0 ; 6.0)	1.0 (0.0 ; 7.0)	0.01
<b>Maternal characteristics</b>			
Mean age (SD), years	25.7 (6.3)	25.6 (6.7)	0.15
Mean height (SD), cm	159.9 (6.0)	160.2 (5.6)	0.08
Mean mid-upper-arm circumference (SD), cm	26.6 (3.3)	26.3 (3.0)	0.05
Maternal Hb, g/dL (SD)	12.2 (1.4)	12.1 (1.5)	0.21
Mother meets minimum dietary diversity score, n (%)	330/901 (36.6%)	1081/2675 (40.4%)	0.10
Mean years of schooling completed (SD)	9.7 (1.7)	9.6 (1.8)	0.10
Median parity (IQR)	2.0 (1.0 ; 3.0)	2.0 (1.0 ; 3.0)	0.03
Married, n (%)	889/935 (95.1%)	2657/2782 (95.5%)	0.29

Employed, n (%)	69/916 (7.5%)	242/2739 (8.8%)	0.23
Religion, n (%)			
Apostolic	455/941 (48.4%)	1308/2804 (46.7%)	0.097
Other Christian	395/941 (42.0%)	1289/2804 (46.0%)	
Other religion	91/941 (9.7%)	207/2804 (7.4%)	
Maternal capabilities			
Median Gender norms and attitudes (IQR)	2.3 (1.5 ; 3.0)	1.7 (1.5 ; 3.0)	<0.001
Median Perceived social support (IQR)	3.6 (3.2 ; 4.0)	3.7 (3.3 ; 4.0)	0.05
Median EPDS depression scale (IQR)	1.0 (0.0 ; 5.0)	1.0 (0.0 ; 4.0)	0.81
<b>Infant characteristics</b>			
Female, n (%)	511/1002 (51.0%)	1451/2972 (48.8%)	0.28
Mean birth weight (SD), kg	3.1 (0.5)	3.1 (0.5)	0.43
Low birthweight, n (%)	90/957 (9.4%)	235/2616 (9.0%)	0.74
Institutional delivery, n (%)	855/935 (91.4%)	2353/2669 (88.2%)	0.01
Vaginal delivery, n (%)	909/965 (94.2%)	2482/2699 (92.0%)	0.10
<b>18 month endpoint characteristics</b>			
Mean LAZ at 18 months, (SD)	-1.5 (1.0)	-1.5 (1.1)	0.18
Mean WAZ at 18 months, (SD)	-0.7 (1.0)	-0.7 (1.0)	0.06
Mean WHZ at 18 months, (SD)	-0.04 (1.0)	0.1 (1.1)	0.001
Mean Head circumference Z score at 18 months, (SD)	-0.2 (1.1)	-0.2 (1.5)	0.48
Mean MUAC Z score at 18 months (SD)	0.1 (0.9)	0.02 (0.9)	0.03
Mean Hb at 18 months, g/dL (SD)	11.8 (1.1)	11.7 (1.2)	0.12

*Table 0-2 Children born to HIV negative mothers who were recruited or not recruited into SHINE follow-up study. There were less mothers than children due to some households having twins. \*Note that of the 988 HIV negative mothers recruited into SHINE follow-up, data were not available for 66 mothers at the baseline visit and similarly for the 2949 HIV negative mothers not recruited, data were not available for 182 mothers at the baseline visit. \*\*Note that 1002 children included two children who were HIV positive as their mothers seroconverted during breastfeeding and the children became HIV positive. These two children were excluded from all analyses.*

**Table S2: Baseline characteristics of children born HIV-free (CBHF) and children HIV-unexposed**

**(CHU)**

<b>Maternal characteristics in pregnancy</b>	<b>CBHF</b>	<b>CHU</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Mean age (SD), years	30.3 (6.0)	25.7 (6.3)	<0.001
Mean height (SD), cm	160.4 (6.1)	160.0 (6.0)	0.35
Mean MUAC (SD), cm	26.6 (2.8)	26.6 (3.2)	0.99
Mean haemoglobin (SD), g/dl	11.5 (1.4)	12.2 (1.4)	<0.001
Mean years of schooling (SD)	9.1 (1.9)	9.7 (1.7)	<0.001
Median parity (IQR)	2 (1, 3)	2 (1, 3)	<0.001
Married, % [N]	93.5% [229/245]	95.2% [893/938]	0.45
Employed, % [N]	6.6% [17/256]	7.5% [69/919]	0.64
Religion, % [N]			
Apostolic, % [N]	45.6% [113]	48.1% [454]	0.60
Other Christian	42.7% [106]	42.0% [398]	
Other non-Christian	11.7% [29]	9.8% [92]	
Maternal capabilities			
Mean Gender norms (SD)	2.2 (0.8)	2.3 (0.8)	0.16
Mean perceived social support (SD)	3.4 (0.7)	3.5 (0.6)	0.03
Mean Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Score (SD)	4.6 (5.6)	2.8 (4.0)	<0.001
<b>Maternal HIV disease severity and treatment</b>			
Mean CD4 count in pregnancy, cells/uL (SD)	474.3 (SD 214.6) [n=210]	N/A	
Documented antiretroviral therapy during pregnancy	82.8% [226/273]	N/A	
Tenofovir disoproxil fumarate-based ART regimen	69.9% [158/226]	N/A	
Zidovudine based ART regimen	18.6% [42/226]	N/A	
Other/unknown ART regimen	11.5% [26/226]	N/A	
Documented co-trimoxazole prophylaxis during pregnancy	66.7% [182/273]	N/A	
<b>Household characteristics in pregnancy</b>			
Median household size (IQR)	4 (3, 6)	5 (4, 6)	0.08
Median Coping Strategies Index (IQR)	3 (0, 9)	0 (0, 9)	<0.001
Baseline wealth quintile, % [N]			
lowest	25.2% [64 /254]	17.7% [162 / 917]	0.007
second	21.7% [55 / 254]	18.4% [169 / 917]	

middle	21.7% [55 / 254]	20.5% [188 / 917]	
fourth	15.0% [38 / 254]	21.7% [199 / 917]	
highest	16.5% [42 / 254]	21.7% [199 / 917]	
Electricity in house, % [N]	2.3% [6 / 256]	3.4% [31 / 917]	0.40
Any latrine, % [N]	36.3% [91 / 251]	38.0% [343 / 902]	0.61
Improved latrine, % [N]	30.7% [77 / 251]	32.1% [289 / 901]	0.67
Improved water source, % [N]	61.8% [155 / 251]	68.3% [617 / 903]	0.05
Treat drinking water in any way, % [N]	11.2% [28 / 251]	14.5% [130 / 898]	0.18
HH meets min dietary diversity, % [N]	36.4% [87 / 239]	37.7% [333 / 884]	0.72
Women meet min dietary diversity score, % [N]	37.4% [92 / 246]	36.8% [333 / 904]	0.87
<b>Child Variables</b>	<b>CBHF</b>	<b>CHU</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Mean Birthweight, Kg (SD)	3.03 (0.46)	3.10 (0.47)	0.06
Proportion Low Birthweight, % [N]	10.2% [25 / 246]	9.2% s[87 / 945]	0.65
Proportion Institutional delivery, % [N]	87.0% [207 / 238]	91.4% [844 / 923]	0.04
Proportion vaginal delivery, % [N]	93.2% [232 / 249]	94.4% [900 / 953]	0.45
Mean breastfeeding duration, months (SD)	17.7 (4.5)	19.1 (3.7)	<0.001
Mean 18-month LAZ (SD)	-1.83 (1.06)	-1.50 (1.02)	<0.001
Stunted at 18 months, % [N]	45.2% [118 / 261]	29.6% [290 / 981]	<0.001
Mean 18-month WAZ (SD)	-0.96 (1.05)	-0.74 (0.98)	0.003
Underweight at 18 months, % [N]	16.9% [44 / 261]	8.8% [86 / 981]	<0.001
Mean 18-month WHZ (SD)	-0.11 (1.06)	-0.03 (1.00)	0.28
Mean 18-month HCZ (SD)	-0.46 (1.07)	-0.21 (0.98)	0.001
Mean 18-month MUACZ (SD)	-0.06 (0.87)	0.10 (0.87)	0.01
Mean 18-month Hb, g/dL (SD)	11.8 (1.1)	11.8 (1.1)	0.93

*Table 0-3 Baseline household, maternal and child characteristics between children born HIV free (CBHF) compared with children born HIV unexposed (CHU). Note that household and maternal characteristics were all measured in pregnancy at the baseline visit. Child characteristics were measured at birth for birth outcomes, and when the child was 18 months old for the growth outcomes specified.*

# Directed Acyclic Graph for Contemporary Covariates




Figure 0-1: Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) used to determine covariates for Model 2: adjustment by contemporary covariates asked in the contemporary questionnaire. DC: Data collector, sex: Child sex, Arm: SHINE trial intervention arm, Date measure: calendar quarter when measurement performed, Exact age: exact age of child, ambient temperature: average temperature during SAHARAN toolbox measurements, Confounders: unmeasured confounders, Caregiver edn: Caregiver schooling in number of years, Caregiver age: age of primary caregiver at 7 year visit, 7yr SES: contemporary socioeconomic status (wealth index), adversity: contemporary adversity score,, EPDS: contemporary caregiver Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Score, Gender norms: contemporary caregiver gender norm scale, Social support: contemporary caregiver social support scale, Water insecurity (HWISE): Household water insecurity experiences scale, Food insecurity (HFIAS): Household food insecurity experiences scale, Books: number of children's books at home, Child schooling: Total child schooling in years and months, Hb: child contemporary haemoglobin measured during visit, CPRS: Child parent relationship scale (measure of nurturing), Discipline: child discipline scale, Religion: household religion, mat HIV: Maternal HIV status during pregnancy (the exposure), 7yr Gro & fnc: child growth, cognitive and physical function at 7 years (the outcome). Adjustment variables for model 2 were arm, DC, age of child, calendar age recruited, temperature, sex, Socioeconomic status, Caregiver depression measure (EPDS), Household food insecurity (HFIAS), Household religion, Caregiver social support, Caregiver gender norms, Caregiver age, Caregiver education, Adversity score, Children's books at home.

## Directed Acyclic Graph for Baseline Factors




Figure 0-2: DAG used to determine covariates for Model 3: adjustment by baseline covariates. DC: Data collector, sex: Child sex, Arm: SHINE trial intervention arm, Date measure :calendar quarter when measurement performed, Exact age: exact age of child, ambient temperature: average temperature during SAHARAN toolbox measurements, Confounders: unmeasured confounders, Mat schooling: Maternal schooling in number of years, mat age: maternal age, SES: baseline socioeconomic status (wealth index), employed: whether mother was employed or not, EPDS: Baseline maternal Edinburgh postnatal depression score, Gender norms: baseline maternal gender norm scale, social support: baseline maternal social support scale, CSI: Coping strategies index (measure of food insecurity), HH diet: household dietary score, Mat HB: Maternal haemoglobin in pregnancy, Mat diet: maternal diet score, Mat anthro: Maternal anthropometry (note height was used in model), Bweight: child birthweight, mat HIV: Maternal HIV status during pregnancy (the exposure), anthro at 18 months: child anthropometry at 18 months (length-for-age-z-score used in model), religion: household religion, Hb at 18 months: child haemoglobin at 18 months of age. Adjustment variables were: Arm, cata collector, age of child, calendar age recruited, temperature, Anthropometry at 18mo, Birthweight, maternal depression score (EPDS), household dietary score, maternal haemoglobin in pregnancy, baseline socioeconomic scale, born in facility, gender norms, maternal years of schooling.

### S3 Interaction analysis by child sex

Variable	P-value of interaction of HIV-exposure with child sex	GEE Coefficient for Girls (95% CI)	GEE coefficient for Boys (95% CI)
Mental Processing Index	0.20	N/A	N/A
School Achievement Test	0.99	N/A	N/A
Plus EF test score	0.87	N/A	N/A
Fine motor , sec	0.58	N/A	N/A
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire	0.04	0.3 (-0.6, 1.2)	1.2 (0.2, 2.3)
Child socioemotional score	0.05	0.1 (-0.0, 0.2)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.0)
Mean Grip Strength, Kg	0.47	N/A	N/A
Mean Broad jump, m	0.61	N/A	N/A
VO2max, ml kg <sup>-1</sup> min <sup>-1</sup>	0.07	0.4 (-0.0, 0.8)	1.1 (0.5, 1.7)
Diastolic BP, mm Hg	0.89	N/A	N/A
Systolic BP, mm Hg	0.90	N/A	N/A
Height-for-age Z-score	0.37	N/A	N/A
Weight-for-age Z-score	0.99	N/A	N/A
BMI Z-score	0.30	N/A	N/A
Knee-heel length	0.63	N/A	N/A
Head circ, cm	0.72	N/A	N/A
MUAC, cm	0.24	N/A	N/A
Waist circ, cm	0.97	N/A	N/A
Hip circ, cm	0.37	N/A	N/A
Calf circ, m	0.08	0.3 (-0.0, 0.6)	-0.2 (-0.4, 0.2)
Lean mass index	0.41	N/A	N/A
Impedance Index	0.84	N/A	N/A
Phase angle	0.45	N/A	N/A
Total skinfold thicknesses, mm	0.19	N/A	N/A
Peripheral skinfold thickness, mm	0.21	N/A	N/A
Central skinfold thickness, mm	0.29	N/A	N/A
Hb, g dl <sup>-1</sup>	0.30	N/A	N/A

Table 0-4 Results of subgroup analysis exploring interaction of child sex with HIV-exposure for SAHARAN toolbox outcomes. If the p-value was greater than 0.1, the interaction was not considered significant, hence N/A (not applicable) was completed for the difference between boys and girls.

#### S4 Cognition subtests & secondary physical function outcomes compared between CBHF and CHU

	Outcome	CBHF		CHU		GEE Mean difference (95% CI)			
	Cognitive subtests	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	Unadjusted	Adjusted difference Model 1 (Trial factors)	Adjusted difference Model 2 (Trial factors & contemporary covariates)	Adjusted difference Model 3 (Trial factors & baseline covariates)
KABC-II domain & subtest	Atlantis	264	6 (2)	990	6 (2)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>
	Story completion	264	4 (2)	990	5 (2)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>
	Number recall	264	7 (2)	990	7 (2)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>
	Atlantis delayed	264	7 (2)	990	7 (2)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>
	Rover	264	7 (2)	990	7 (2)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>
	Triangles	264	4 (2)	990	4 (2)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>
	Word Order	264	5 (2)	990	6 (2)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 1)	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>
	Pattern reasoning	264	5 (2)	990	6 (3)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 1)	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>
	Learning (domain)	264	13 (3)	990	13 (4)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 1)	<b>1 (0, 1)</b>	<b>1 (0, 1)</b>
	Planning (domain)	264	10 (3)	990	11 (4)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 1)	<b>0 (0, 1)</b>	<b>1 (0, 1)</b>
	Simultaneous (domain)	264	10 (3)	990	11 (4)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 1)	<b>1 (0, 1)</b>	<b>1 (0, 1)</b>
SAT	Sequential (domain)	264	12 (4)	990	13 (4)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 1)	<b>1 (0, 1)</b>	<b>1 (0, 1)</b>
	Numeracy	264	17 (6)	990	18 (6)	2 (1, 2)	2 (1, 2)	<b>1 (0, 2)</b>	<b>1 (0, 2)</b>
	Reading	264	10 (12)	990	14 (13)	3 (2, 5)	3 (2, 5)	<b>2 (1, 4)</b>	<b>3 (1, 5)</b>
Plus-EF	Writing	264	12 (9)	990	14 (10)	2 (1, 3)	2 (1, 3)	<b>2 (0, 3)</b>	<b>2 (1, 3)</b>
	Multi-source interference test (MSIT)	251	22 (11)	978	24 (11)	2 (1, 4)	2 (1, 3)	<b>2 (0, 3)</b>	<b>2 (0, 3)</b>
	Stars and Flowers	251	41 (10)	978	43 (9)	2 (0, 3)	2 (0, 3)	<b>1 (0, 3)</b>	<b>2 (0, 3)</b>
FM	Fish flanker	251	46 (12)	978	47 (12)	1 (0, 3)	1 (0, 3)	<b>1 (-1, 2)</b>	<b>1 (-1, 2)</b>
	Finger tapping (dominant), sec	262	24 (7)	986	23 (7)	-1 (-1.8, -0.2)	-1.1 (-1.9, -0.2)	<b>-0.5 (-1.3, 0.4)</b>	<b>-0.7 (-1.6, 0.1)</b>
SDQ	Finger tapping (non-dominant), sec	262	26 (7)	986	25 (7)	-0.9 (-1.9, 0)	-1 (-2, 0)	<b>-0.5 (-1.5, 0.5)</b>	<b>-0.7 (-1.7, 0.3)</b>
	Emotional	263	2 (2)	989	2 (2)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>
	Conduct	263	2 (2)	989	2 (2)	0 (0, 0)	0 (-1, 0)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>
	Hyperactivity / inattention	263	4 (2)	989	4 (2)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>
	Peer relationships	263	1 (1)	989	1 (1)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>
	Prosocial	263	8 (2)	989	8 (2)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>

CSE	Child socioemotional (removing food security question)	256	4 (1)	973	4 (1)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>	<b>0 (0, 0)</b>
	<b>Physical function</b>								
Grip	Grip strength dominant hand, Kg	262	10.6 (2.1)	990	10.8 (2.0)	0.2 (-0.1, 0.5)	0.2 (-0.1, 0.5)	<b>0.2 (0, 0.5)</b>	0.1 (-0.3, 0.4)
	Grip strength non-dominant hand, Kg	262	10.4 (1.9)	990	10.6 (2.1)	0.2 (-0.1, 0.5)	0.2 (-0.1, 0.5)	<b>0.2 (-0.1, 0.5)</b>	0 (-0.3, 0.3)
	Standardised Grip strength (a)	262	-0.1 (1)	990	0.0 (1.0)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	<b>0.1 (0, 0.2)</b>	0 (-0.1, 0.2)
BJ	Standardised Broad jump (b)	259	-0.1 (1.1)	987	0.0 (1.0)	0.1 (0.0, 0.3)	0.1 (0.0, 0.3)	<b>0.1 (0, 0.2)</b>	0.1 (-0.1, 0.2)
Run	Standardised VO2max (c)*	255	-0.2 (1)	986	0.1 (1.0)	0.3 (0.1, 0.4)	0.2 (0.1, 0.4)	<b>0.2 (0, 0.3)</b>	0.1 (0, 0.3)
Tot	Physical function (a)+(b)+(c)	254	-0.3 (2)	984	0.1 (2.1)	0.4 (0.1, 0.7)	0.4 (0.1, 0.7)	<b>0.3 (0.1, 0.6)</b>	0.2 (-0.1, 0.4)
Blood pressure	Resting pulse pressure, mm Hg	264	34 (7)	988	35 (7)	1 (0, 2)	1 (0, 2)	<b>1 (0, 1)</b>	0 (0, 1)
	Systolic BP 1 min after SRT, mm Hg	256	125 (11)	976	127 (11)	1 (0, 3)	1 (0, 3)	<b>1 (-1, 2)</b>	1 (-1, 2)
	Diastolic BP 1 min after SRT, mm Hg	256	85 (12)	985	86 (11)	1 (-1, 3)	1 (-1, 3)	<b>1 (-1, 2)</b>	1 (-1, 2)
	Pulse pressure 1 min after SRT, mm HG	256	39 (9)	985	40 (9)	1 (0, 2)	1 (0, 2)	<b>0 (-1, 1)</b>	0 (-1, 1)
	Difference between 1 <sup>st</sup> & 5 <sup>th</sup> systolic BP measurements, mm Hg	256	22 (9)	975	22 (8)	0 (-1, 1)	0 (-1, 1)	<b>0 (-1, 1)</b>	0 (-1, 1)
	Difference between 1 <sup>st</sup> & 5 <sup>th</sup> diastolic BP measurements, mm Hg	256	19 (9)	984	19 (8)	0 (-1, 1)	0 (-1, 1)	<b>0 (-2, 1)</b>	0 (-2, 1)
	<b>Growth</b>								
BI	Reactance at 50 kHz, Ohms	261	73.5 (10.3)	981	71.7 (10.5)	-1.7 (-3.4, 0)	-1.7 (-3.3, 0)	<b>-1.3 (-2.7, 0.2)</b>	-1.3 (-2.7, 0.2)
	Resistance at 50 kHz, Ohms	262	833 (95)	986	830 (94)	-2.9 (-18.3, 12.5)	-2.9 (-18.3, 12.4)	<b>-1.5 (-14.9, 11.9)</b>	0 (-14.8, 14.7)

*Table 0-5 Secondary outcomes comparing CBHF and CHU. Cognitive function included the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (KABC-II) with its 8 subtests Atlantis, Story completion, Number recall, Delayed Atlantis, Rover, Triangles, Word Order and Pattern reasoning. 2 from each of these 8 subtests were added together to form the 4 cognitive domains of Sequential, Planning, Learning and Simultaneous domains. The School Achievement Test (SAT) was formed of numeracy, reading and writing sections. The Plus-EF total was formed of 3 subtests Multi-Source Interference Test (MSIT), Stars and Flowers and Fish Flanker. The Fine motor (FM) test was measured by sequential finger tapping for both dominant and non-dominant hands, using seconds as a unit and hence a higher number represented slower fine motor coordination. The Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) total was measured using 4 subscales of emotional, conduct, hyperactivity and inattention with higher scores representing more difficulties. In addition the prosocial subscale was separately measured for positive behaviour. The child socioemotional subscore was the total with one question removed on food security. Grip strength (GS) was*

*measured with the highest value for both dominant and non-dominant hands. Standardised scores were included for broad jump (BJ) and the shuttle run test (Run). The total of the standardised scores provided the physical function score. Blood pressure included pulse pressure as the difference between systolic and diastolic, and included values measured after the shuttle run test. Bioimpedance (BIA) measured raw values of reactance and resistance in Ohms.*

\*Note that standardised VO<sub>2</sub>max score was used as this represented the distribution of shuttle run better by adjusting for differences between the number of sub-levels for each stage of the shuttle run test.

## Description of secondary outcomes

The Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (KABC-II) assesses cognitive processing using Luria's model by focusing on novel tests that have not been previously seen in schools. Hence the test results may be less dependent on overall schooling, which is suitable in circumstances where similar-aged children may have very different schooling exposure due to socioeconomic and environmental factors. The KABC-II can be condensed to eight subtests which are scaled based on the participant's age, so that younger children have a higher scaled score for each test. The scaled results from two of the eight subtests are added together to create the four Luria domains of cognitive processing. The Sequential memory domain focuses on short-term sequential memory using the Number Recall and Word Order subtests. The Planning domain represents pattern recognition and problem-solving using the Story Completion and Pattern Reasoning subtests (this included the adaptations for Zimbabwe previously published[15]). Short- and long-term memory provide the Learning domain, measured using the Atlantis and Atlantis Delayed subtests. Finally, the Simultaneous domain measures logical and spatial problem solving using the Rover and Triangles subtests.

The school achievement test (SAT) was created previously from a pilot study cohort[7] and measured numeracy, reading and writing skills. Briefly, numeracy was the total from counting, visual and figure-based questions based on previous studies[16] [10]. Reading was the total from timed questions on reading letters, words and a local story, with participants given a choice of local languages (Shona, Ndebele or English) [16]. Writing was the total from the participant writing letters, words and their name in local languages[17].

The *PLUS-EF* is a tablet-based executive function tool, that has been used in school-aged children[18]. The score from multi-source interference (MSIT) was the total that reflected accuracy from the child picking the correct number from different sequences. Stars and Flowers and the Fish Flanker scores was the total in accuracy for the child picking the correct side for different shapes or arrows in different sequences.

Fine motor (FM) was the number of seconds to complete six repetitions of finger tapping in sequence from the thumb to the 5<sup>th</sup> finger, divided into dominant and non-dominant hand, with a higher value indicating slower fine motor coordination.

The Strength and Difficulties questionnaire (SDQ) consists of 4 subscales with questions asking about emotional, behavioural, attention and relationship problems, with a higher score indicating more difficulties. These 4 subscales provided the SDQ total. A 5<sup>th</sup> prosocial subscale asks about positive behaviours[19]. The child socioemotional (CSE) subscale removed the one question on food security, and remained with 5 questions on how the child felt they were supported at home.

For physical function, grip strength (GS) was subdivided into dominant and non-dominant hands, and a standardised score calculated. Broad jump (BJ) and shuttle run (Run) also had a standardised score calculated, so that a standardised physical function score was calculated. Blood pressure (BP) was measured at rest, where the pulse pressure was the difference between systolic and diastolic blood pressures. Blood pressure was also measured sequentially 5 times after the shuttle run test. All units were in mm Hg. Finally, raw units of reactance and resistance at 50 kHz were recorded for bioimpedance analysis (BIA).

## Supporting information references

1. Chasekwa B, Maluccio JA, Ntozini R, Moulton LH, Wu F, Smith LE, et al. Measuring wealth in rural communities: Lessons from the Sanitation, Hygiene, Infant Nutrition Efficacy (SHINE) trial. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13(6):e0199393. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0199393.
2. Maxwell D, Caldwell R. The coping strategies index: field methods manual. Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere Inc USA. 2008.
3. Chibanda D, Mangezi W, Tshimanga M, Woelk G, Rusakaniko P, Stranix-Chibanda L, et al. Validation of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale among women in a high HIV prevalence area in urban Zimbabwe. *Arch Womens Ment Health*. 2010;13(3):201-6. Epub 2009/09/18. doi: 10.1007/s00737-009-0073-6. PubMed PMID: 19760051.
4. Matare CR, Mbuya MNN, Pelto G, Dickin KL, Stoltzfus RJ, Sanitation Hygiene Infant Nutrition Efficacy Trial T. Assessing Maternal Capabilities in the SHINE Trial: Highlighting a Hidden Link in the Causal Pathway to Child Health. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2015;61 Suppl 7(Suppl 7):S745-S51. Epub 11/11. doi: 10.1093/cid/civ851. PubMed PMID: 26602303.
5. Tome J, Mbuya MNN, Makasi RR, Ntozini R, Prendergast AJ, Dickin KL, et al. Maternal caregiving capabilities are associated with child linear growth in rural Zimbabwe. *Maternal & child nutrition*. 2021;17(2):e13122. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13122>.
6. Bhopal S, Roy R, Verma D, Kumar D, Avan B, Khan B, et al. Impact of adversity on early childhood growth & development in rural India: Findings from the early life stress sub-study of the SPRING cluster randomised controlled trial (SPRING-ELS). *PLOS ONE*. 2019;14(1):e0209122. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0209122.
7. Piper JD, Mazhanga C, Mapako G, Mapurisa I, Mashedze T, Munyama E, et al. Characterising school-age health and function in rural Zimbabwe using the SAHARAN toolbox. *PLOS ONE*. 2023;18(5):e0285570. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0285570.
8. Driscoll KS, Pianta RC. Mothers' and fathers' perceptions of conflict and closeness in parent-child relationships during early childhood. *Psychology*. 2011.
9. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Finkelhor D, Moore DW, Runyan D. Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: development and psychometric data for a national sample of American parents. *Child Abuse Negl*. 1998;22(4):249-70. Epub 1998/05/20. doi: 10.1016/s0145-2134(97)00174-9. PubMed PMID: 9589178.
10. ZIMSTAT, UNICEF. Zimbabwe Multi-Indicator Cluster Survey 2019; Snapshots of Key Findings. <https://www.unicef.org/zimbabwe/>; 2019.
11. Salvador Castell G, Pérez Rodrigo C, Ngo de la Cruz J, Aranceta Bartrina J. Household food insecurity access scale (HFIAS). *Nutr Hosp*. 2015;31 Suppl 3:272-8. Epub 20150226. doi: 10.3305/nh.2015.31.sup3.8775. PubMed PMID: 25719795.
12. Gandure S, Drimie S, Faber M. Food Security Indicators after Humanitarian Interventions Including Food Aid in Zimbabwe. *Food and nutrition bulletin*. 2010;31(4):513-23. doi: 10.1177/156482651003100405.
13. Bhalla G, Handa S, Angeles G, Seidenfeld D. The effect of cash transfers and household vulnerability on food security in Zimbabwe. *Food Policy*. 2018;74:82-99. doi: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2017.11.007.
14. Young SL, Boateng GO, Jamaluddine Z, Miller JD, Frongillo EA, Neilands TB, et al. The Household Water InSecurity Experiences (HWISE) Scale: development and validation of a household water insecurity measure for low-income and middle-income countries. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2019;4(5):e001750. Epub 2019/10/23. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001750. PubMed PMID: 31637027; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6768340.
15. Adaptation of the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children—2nd edition (KABC-II) to assess school-age neurodevelopment in rural Zimbabwe [Internet]. 2022. Available from: [osf.io/ybct4](https://osf.io/ybct4)
16. Gove A, Brunette T, Bulat J, Carrol B, Henny C, Macon W, et al. Assessing the Impact of Early Learning Programs in Africa. *New Dir Child Adolesc Dev*. 2017;2017(158):25-41. doi: 10.1002/cad.20224. PubMed PMID: 29243385.

17. Puranik CS, Lonigan CJ. Name-writing proficiency, not length of name, is associated with preschool children's emergent literacy skills. *Early Child Res Q.* 2012;27(2):284-94. Epub 2011/09/21. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2011.09.003. PubMed PMID: 22523450.
18. Obradović J, Sulik MJ, Finch JE, Tirado-Strayer N. Assessing students' executive functions in the classroom: Validating a scalable group-based procedure. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology.* 2018;55:4-13. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2017.03.003.
19. Hoosen N, Davids EL, de Vries PJ, Shung-King M. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) in Africa: a scoping review of its application and validation. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health.* 2018;12. doi: 10.1186/s13034-017-0212-1.