

Effects of prenatal small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements on pregnancy, birth and infant outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data from randomized controlled trials in low- and middle-income countries

Kathryn G. Dewey, K. Ryan Wessells, Charles D. Arnold, Seth Adu-Afarwuah, Benjamin F. Arnold, Per Ashorn, Ulla Ashorn, Ana Garcés, Lieven Huybregts, Nancy F. Krebs, Anna Lartey, Jef L. Leroy, Kenneth Maleta, Susana L. Matias, Sophie E. Moore, Malay K. Mridha, Harriet Okronipa, Christine P. Stewart

Institute for Global Nutrition and Department of Nutrition, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, USA (KGD, KRW, CDA, CPS)

Department of Nutrition and Food Science, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana (SAA, AL)

Francis I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA (BFA)

Center for Child, Adolescent and Maternal Health Research, Faculty of Medicine and Health Technology, Tampere University, Tampere, Finland (PA, UA)

Department of Paediatrics, Tampere University Hospital, Tampere, Finland (PA)

Proyecto Salud y Nutrición, Jhpiego, Guatemala City, Guatemala (AG)

Poverty, Health, and Nutrition Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC, USA (LH, JL)

Section of Nutrition, Department of Pediatrics, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Denver, CO, USA (NFK)

Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, School of Global and Public Health, Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Blantyre, Malawi (KM)

Department of Nutritional Sciences and Toxicology, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA (SLM)

Department of Women & Children's Health, King's College London, London, UK and MRC Unit The Gambia at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Fajara, The Gambia (SEM)

Center for Non-communicable Diseases and Nutrition, BRAC James P Grant School of Public Health, Bangladesh (MKM)

Department of Nutritional Sciences, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, USA (HO)

Corresponding Author: Kathryn G. Dewey, Department of Nutrition, University of California, One Shields Ave., Davis, CA 95616; 530 752 0851; kgdewey@ucdavis.edu

Sources of Support: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation OPP49817. The funder had no role in the design, implementation, analysis or interpretation of the data.

Short running head: Effects of prenatal SQ-LNS

Abbreviations: BEP, balanced energy protein; BMIZ, body mass index-for-age z-score; EFA, essential fatty acids; GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; HCGAZ, head circumference-for-gestational age z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score; IFA, iron and folic acid supplement; IPD, individual participant data; IRB, institutional review board; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; LBW, low birth weight; LMIC, low-

and middle-income countries; LGA, large-for-gestational age; LGAZ, length-for-gestational age z-score; LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; LQ-LNS, large-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements; MD, mean difference; MMS, multiple micronutrient supplement; MQ-LNS, medium-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements; MUAC, mid-upper arm circumference; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference z-score; PR, prevalence ratio; RCT, randomized controlled trial; RR, relative risk; SAP, statistical analysis plan; SGA, small-for-gestational age; SOC, standard of care; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements; SVN, small vulnerable newborn; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; WGAZ, weight-for-gestational age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score.

Registry and registry number for systematic reviews or meta-analyses: Registered at www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO as CRD42021283391 on 11 April 2021.

Data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code will not be made available because they are compiled from 4 different trials, and access is under the control of the investigators of each of those trials.

Dr. Nancy Krebs is on the Editorial Board of the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition and played no role in the Journal's evaluation of the manuscript.

1 **Abstract**

2 Background: Undernutrition during pregnancy increases the risk of giving birth to a small
3 vulnerable newborn. Small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements (SQ-LNS) contain both
4 macro- and micronutrients and can help prevent nutritional deficiencies during pregnancy and
5 lactation.

6 Objectives: We examined effects of SQ-LNS provided to pregnant women, compared to a) iron
7 and folic acid or standard of care (IFA/SOC) or b) multiple micronutrient supplements (MMS),
8 and identified characteristics that modified effects of SQ-LNS on birth outcomes.

9 Methods: We conducted a 2-stage meta-analysis of individual participant data from 4
10 randomized controlled trials of SQ-LNS provided to pregnant women ($n = 5,273$). We generated
11 study-specific and subgroup estimates of SQ-LNS compared with IFA/SOC or MMS and pooled
12 the estimates. In sensitivity analyses, we examined whether results differed depending on
13 methods for gestational age dating, birth anthropometry, or study design.

14 Results: SQ-LNS (vs IFA/SOC) increased birth weight (mean difference: +49g; 95% CI: 26,
15 71g), duration of gestation (+0.12 wk; 95% CI: 0.01, 0.24 wk), and all birth anthropometric z-
16 scores (+0.10-0.13 SD); it reduced risk of low birthweight by 11%, newborn stunting by 17%,
17 newborn wasting by 11%, and small head size by 11%. Only 2 trials compared SQ-LNS and
18 MMS; birth outcomes did not differ except for a marginal increase in head circumference for
19 gestational age (+0.11; 95% CI: -0.01, 0.23). Effect estimates for SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC were
20 greater among female infants and among women with body mass index $< 20 \text{ kg/m}^2$,
21 inflammation, malaria, or household food insecurity. Effect estimates for SQ-LNS vs MMS were
22 greater among female infants, first-born infants, and women $< 25 \text{ y}$.

23 Conclusions: SQ-LNS had positive impacts on multiple outcomes compared to IFA/SOC, but
24 further research directly comparing SQ-LNS and MMS is needed. Targeting SQ-LNS to
25 vulnerable subgroups may be worth considering. Analysis registered at
26 www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO (CRD42021283391).

27 Keywords: Maternal nutrition, low birthweight, preterm birth, fetal growth restriction, balanced
28 energy protein supplementation, antenatal interventions, infant wasting, infant stunting

29

30 Introduction

31 Undernutrition is prevalent among women of reproductive age globally, with an estimated 1.2
32 billion deficient in one or more micronutrients (1), 571 million (30%) with anemia (2-4), and 170
33 million (~10%) being underweight (3, 4). As a result, many women and girls enter pregnancy
34 with nutritional deficits. The risk of undernutrition during pregnancy is exacerbated by the
35 elevated nutrient needs to support gestation, particularly in low- and middle-income countries
36 (LMICs) where diets are often inadequate in multiple nutrients (5). This situation contributes to
37 poor maternal health and the risk of giving birth to a small vulnerable newborn (SVN), an
38 umbrella term that encompasses small-for-gestational age (SGA), preterm birth, and low
39 birthweight (LBW) (6). In 2020, 26.2% of all livebirths globally were SVNs, with 16.3% SGA,
40 8.8% preterm, and 1.1% both SGA and preterm (7). Although poor nutrition is not the only cause
41 of these outcomes (8), interventions to improve maternal nutrition, such as multiple
42 micronutrient supplements (MMS) and balanced energy-protein supplementation (BEP) for
43 undernourished mothers, should be considered critical elements of antenatal care packages aimed
44 at reducing SVN births (9).

45 Lipid-based nutrient supplements (LNS) provide multiple micronutrients embedded in a food
46 base that also provides energy, protein and fat. LNS for pregnant women are a type of BEP, as
47 they meet the criterion that protein contributes < 25% of the energy content (10). The intended
48 daily ration of LNS can be small- medium- or large-quantity (SQ-, MQ- or LQ-LNS) (11).
49 Maternal SQ-LNS was designed to fill nutrient gaps during pregnancy and the first 6 mo
50 postpartum with a daily ration of only 20 g (118 kcal/d) (11), which minimizes cost and potential
51 displacement of home-prepared foods. SQ-LNS is not primarily designed to fill energy gaps, as
52 such gaps can be filled by more affordable local foods (11). SQ-LNS provides several key

53 nutrients not provided by iron and folic acid (IFA) supplements or MMS, including essential
54 fatty acids (EFAs) as well as calcium, magnesium, potassium, and phosphorus (11). This
55 combination of macro- and micro-nutrients addresses multiple potential nutritional deficiencies
56 and thus can reduce maternal undernutrition. Maternal SQ-LNS is currently being distributed by
57 USAID in selected food aid programs (12), but its use is not yet widespread.

58 A previous meta-analysis of maternal LNS (13) demonstrated that LNS given during pregnancy,
59 compared to IFA, had positive effects on birth weight, length, duration of gestation, SGA, and
60 newborn stunting. That meta-analysis included 3 trials, all of which used SQ-LNS. In a separate
61 comparison of LNS vs MMS that also included 3 trials (2 SQ-LNS, 1 MQ-LNS), there were no
62 significant differences in birth outcomes (13). More recently, Hunter et al. (14) conducted a
63 meta-analysis of maternal LNS vs MMS that included 4 trials (2 SQ-LNS, 1 MQ-LNS, 1 LQ-
64 LNS); they found a significant reduction in LBW but not preterm birth or SGA. The authors of
65 these previous meta-analyses did not have individual participant data (IPD) and thus were not
66 able to examine individual-level effect modification.

67 Effect modification analysis can provide important insights regarding the potential for
68 participants to benefit from an intervention, as well as their potential to respond (15). These 2
69 concepts reflect different attributes, with potential to benefit most likely related to greater deficits
70 at baseline, and potential to respond related to lack of constraints on exhibiting an improvement
71 in the outcome due to factors such as infection or inflammation. In some cases, individuals with
72 greater potential to benefit may also have a lower potential to respond, which can limit the
73 beneficial impact of an intervention. Identification of subgroups of pregnant women with the
74 greatest potential to benefit from or respond to LNS can help inform decisions regarding
75 targeting. We conducted an IPD meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of SQ-

76 LNS provided to pregnant women that had 2 objectives: 1) to compare overall effects of SQ-
77 LNS with provision of a) IFA or standard of care (IFA/SOC) or b) MMS, and 2) examine
78 potential effect modifiers of the impact of SQ-LNS (as compared to either IFA/SOC or MMS) on
79 birth outcomes.

80

81 **Methods**

82 The protocol for this systematic review and IPD meta-analysis was prospectively registered on
83 PROSPERO (CRD42021283391) (16). The statistical analysis plan (SAP) is available on Open
84 Science Framework (<https://osf.io/nj5f9/>) (17) and was posted prior to analysis. The protocol was
85 reviewed by the institutional review board (IRB) of the University of California, Davis and
86 determined to be exempt from IRB approval given that protocols for each individual trial had
87 been previously approved by their respective ethical committees.

88

89 *Inclusion and exclusion criteria for this IPD meta-analysis*

90 We included prospective randomized controlled trials of maternal SQ-LNS that met the
91 following study-level inclusion criteria: 1) trial was conducted in a low- or middle-income
92 country (18), 2) maternal SQ-LNS (~125 kcal/d) was provided for at least part of pregnancy to
93 intervention group participants, 3) comparison group(s) received iron and folic acid (IFA),
94 multiple micronutrient supplements (MMS) (defined below) or standard of care (SOC), 4) trial
95 reported at least one outcome of interest (defined below), and 5) trial used an individual or
96 cluster randomized design in which the same participants were measured at baseline and endline
97 (longitudinal follow-up) or different participants were measured at baseline and endline

98 (repeated cross-sectional data collection). Trials were excluded if: 1) severe or moderate
99 malnutrition was an inclusion criterion for pregnant women to be eligible to participate, 2) study
100 was conducted with sick or hospitalized populations, 3) the only available comparison group
101 received other types of non-LNS maternal food supplementation, or 4) SQ-LNS provision was
102 combined with an additional nutrition-specific intervention within a single arm (e.g. SQ-LNS +
103 food rations vs. control), and there was no appropriate comparison group that would allow
104 isolation of the SQ-LNS effect (e.g., food rations alone).

105
106 For comparisons of SQ-LNS with MMS, MMS was defined as including at least 3
107 micronutrients (19), and similar in form (e.g. tablet or capsule) to globally used MMS
108 formulations (20). We used the same exclusion criterion as Smith et al. (19), i.e., excluding
109 micronutrient powders because they provide additional nutrients compared to MMS tablets that
110 might have independent effects on the outcomes of interest.

111
112 *Search methods and identification of studies*

113 We began the search by considering the studies identified by and included in the 2018 Cochrane
114 systematic review and meta-analysis of the provision of preventive LNS to pregnant women
115 (13). Then we repeated the database search methods employed in that review to capture any
116 studies published or registered as a randomized trial between January 2018 and September 2021.
117 There were no language restrictions. We searched the following international electronic
118 bibliographic databases: The Cochrane Library (Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials,
119 Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews), MEDLINE (Ovid, In-Process and Other Non-
120 Indexed Citations Ovid, Epub ahead of print Ovid), EMBASE (Ovid), CINAHL Complete

121 (EBSCOhost), Web of Science (Social Sciences Citation Index, Science Citation Index,
122 Conference Proceedings Citation Index-Science, Conference Proceedings Citation Index-Social
123 Sciences), Epistemonikos (current issue), ClinicalTrials.gov, and WHO International Clinical
124 Trials Registry Platform. In addition, we searched nine regional databases: IBECS, SciELO
125 (Scientific Electronic Library Online), AIM (Africa Index Medicus), IMEMR (Index Medicus
126 for the Eastern Mediterranean Region), LILACS (Latin American and Caribbean Health
127 Sciences Literature), IRIS (PAHO/WHO Institutional Repository for Information Sharing)
128 WPRIM (Western Pacific Index Medicus), IMSEAR (Index Medicus for the South-East Asian
129 Region), and Native Health Research Database.

130

131 After reviewing the titles and abstracts of all studies included in the previous review, as well as
132 the additional studies identified by the database searches, we selected all potentially relevant
133 studies for full text review and screened them based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. After
134 completing the search, we communicated with investigators of all potentially eligible studies in
135 progress, regardless of whether the results had been published.

136

137 *Data collection and harmonization*

138 We invited the principal investigators of eligible studies published or in progress to participate in
139 this IPD meta-analysis, and we provided a data dictionary listing definitions of variables
140 requested. Each contacted investigator provided de-identified individual participant datasets with
141 those variables to the IPD analyst (CDA), who communicated with investigators to request any
142 missing variables or other clarifications, as needed.

143

144 *IPD integrity*

145 We conducted a complete-case intention-to-treat analysis (21). We evaluated whether the study
146 sample sizes in our pooled data set were the same as in study protocols and publications. To
147 address missing outcome data, we tabulated the percentage of participants lost to follow-up
148 between enrollment and the assessment of the outcomes for each study. We also assessed
149 whether missing data were differential with respect to intervention group by comparing rates of
150 missingness across randomized arms.

151
152 We flagged biologically implausible values. For anthropometric outcomes, we calculated z-
153 scores using the 2006 WHO child growth standards (22, 23) and the INTERGROWTH standards
154 (24), checked the values for acceptable SDs, and flagged implausible values if they were outside
155 of published WHO acceptable ranges (22, 23). Implausible values were inspected for errors and
156 either winsorized (25) if within 2 SD of the WHO acceptable ranges or removed from analysis if
157 clearly impossible on an outcome-by-outcome basis. Such cleaning was necessary for <0.2% of
158 participants. There was a consistently low rate of implausibility across outcomes and studies. We
159 also checked summary statistics from the harmonized data-set (e.g., means and SDs) against each
160 trial's published values.

161
162 *Assessment of risk of bias in each study and quality of evidence across studies*

163 Two independent reviewers (KRW and CDA) assessed risk of bias in each trial against the
164 following criteria: random sequence generation and allocation concealment (selection bias),
165 blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias), blinding of outcome assessment
166 (detection bias), incomplete outcome data (attrition bias), selective reporting (reporting bias), and

167 other sources of bias (26). Any discrepancies were resolved by discussion or consultation with
168 the core working group, as needed. KRW, CDA and CPS assessed the quality of evidence for
169 anthropometric outcomes across all trials based on the 5 Grading of Recommendations
170 Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) criteria: risk of bias, inconsistency of
171 effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias (27).

172

173 *Specification of outcomes and effect measures*

174 We prespecified all outcomes in the SAP (17). As shown in **Box 1**, there were 3 categories of
175 outcomes: 1) birth size and duration of gestation, 2) anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo of age,
176 and 3) adverse outcomes (miscarriage, stillbirth, Cesarean-section, early neonatal mortality,
177 neonatal mortality, and 0-6 mo mortality). Continuous birth size outcomes included values in
178 units of measurement (e.g., birth weight in g; birth length, head circumference and mid-upper
179 arm circumference (MUAC) in cm), as z-scores (length-for-age z-score (LAZ), weight-for-age z-
180 score (WAZ), weight-for-length z-score (WLZ), BMI-for-age z-score (BMIZ), and head
181 circumference-for-age z-score (HCZ)) based on WHO Child Growth Standards at birth (22, 23)),
182 and as z-scores for gestational age (weight-for-gestational age z-score (WGAZ), length-for-
183 gestational age z-score (LGAZ) and head circumference-for-gestational age z-score (HCGAZ)
184 based on INTERGROWTH-21st standards (24)). At birth, BMIZ was used instead of WLZ
185 because the latter cannot be calculated for children with lengths <45 cm and exclusion of those
186 infants would create bias; when WLZ can be calculated these 2 variables are highly correlated
187 ($r>0.90$). For continuous outcomes based on INTERGROWTH-21st standards, we excluded
188 participants without ultrasound data for calculation of gestational age. Binary birth size outcomes
189 included low birth weight (LBW, < 2500 g), birth weight < 2000 g, small-for gestational age

190 (SGA, < 10th percentile based on INTERGROWTH-21st), large-for-gestational age (LGA,
191 >90th percentile based on INTERGROWTH-21st), newborn stunting (LAZ < -2 SD), low LGAZ
192 (< -2 SD), low BMIZ (< -2 SD), low HCZ (< -2 SD), and low HCGAZ (< -2 SD). Duration of
193 gestation was expressed in wk, and preterm birth was defined as delivery < 37 wk. For binary
194 outcomes based on gestational age, we retained participants without ultrasound dating but
195 conducted a sensitivity analysis in which they were excluded.

196
197 For continuous outcomes, the principal measure of effect was the mean difference (MD) between
198 intervention and comparison groups; for binary outcomes it was the relative risk (RR) for birth
199 outcomes and adverse outcomes, and the prevalence ratio (PR; relative difference in proportions
200 between groups) for anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo of age. We also estimated the effect for
201 binary outcomes as the absolute differences between intervention groups in events per 1000
202 individuals. The absolute differences are useful for assessing public health impact, but we
203 considered them secondary outcomes because they can be less consistent than RRs or PRs across
204 studies (26).

205
206 The comparisons of interest were 1) SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC and 2) SQ-LNS vs MMS. Study arms
207 in which SQ-LNS began prior to conception were excluded from the main analyses because the
208 objectives were to evaluate effects of SQ-LNS when given during pregnancy; however, the pre-
209 conception study arms were included in sensitivity analyses.

210

211 *Synthesis methods and exploration of variation in effects*

212 We followed the same procedures for analysis as described previously (28), which included
213 evaluation of full sample main effects of the intervention as well as effect modification by
214 individual-level characteristics. We had also planned to evaluate effect modification by study
215 level characteristics (17) but only 4 eligible trials were identified, so there was inadequate
216 statistical power for study-level effect modification; thus those analyses are not described herein.

217
218 Briefly, we followed a two-stage meta-analysis approach (29). In the first stage, intervention
219 effect estimates (or effect modification interaction term estimates) were generated within each
220 individual study according to its study design. In the second stage, the first-stage estimates were
221 pooled using both inverse-variance fixed effects and random effects.

222
223 The individual-level characteristics considered as potential effect modifiers were similar to those
224 included in our previous IPD meta-analysis of trials using child SQ-LNS (28). The potential
225 effect modifiers for this analysis are shown in **Box 2**.

226
227 We assessed heterogeneity of effect estimates using I^2 and Tau^2 statistics, within strata when
228 relevant (30). We used a P value <0.05 for main effects and a p-for-interaction < 0.10 for effect
229 modification by individual-level characteristics. Given that the birth outcomes are highly
230 correlated and the effect modification analyses are inherently exploratory, we did not adjust for
231 multiple hypothesis testing because doing so may be unnecessary and counterproductive (31).

232

233 *Additional sensitivity analyses*

234 We pre-specified several sensitivity analyses:

- 235 • Exclusion of trials with a high level of missingness (>20%) of outcome data relative to
236 enrollment for pregnancy outcomes and relative to live births for later outcomes.
- 237 • For outcomes that rely on gestational age, exclusion of individuals for whom there is no
238 ultrasound dating of the gestational age of the fetus.
- 239 • For birth outcomes (e.g., infant anthropometry), exclusion of individuals for whom data
240 were collected >72 hours after birth.
- 241 • Exclusion of studies in which additional LNS was provided to certain mothers (e.g., those
242 with low BMI or gestational weight gain).
- 243 • Inclusion of trials/arms that provided SQ-LNS prior to conception (pooled main effects
244 only).

245

246 **Results**

247 *Literature search and study characteristics*

248 We identified 4 trials that met our selection criteria and were completed in time to be included in
249 our analyses, all of which provided IPD (**Figure 1, Table 1**). The trials were conducted in
250 Bangladesh (32), Ghana (33), Malawi (34), and Guatemala (35) between 2009 and 2017. The
251 Guatemala study was one of 4 sites in the Women First trial (35). In that trial, an unfortified LNS
252 (in addition to SQ-LNS) supplying 300 kcal/d was provided to intervention group women who
253 were either underweight or who had inadequate gestational weight gain. In 3 of the 4 study sites
254 (Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, and Pakistan), >90% of enrolled women in the
255 intervention groups received this supplement in addition to SQ-LNS, so the total amount of LNS
256 provided to them was ~418 kcal/d, which would be categorized as MQ-LNS rather than SQ-

257 LNS. Therefore, only the Guatemala site is included in these analyses (where < 10% of enrolled
258 women received the unfortified LNS in addition to SQ-LNS).

259
260 All 4 trials provided data for the comparison of SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC; in 3 trials IFA was
261 provided to this comparison group (32-34), and in 1 trial (Guatemala) the comparison group
262 received SOC (biweekly visits to monitor pregnancy status) (35). Two of the 4 trials (Ghana and
263 Malawi) also included an arm that received MMS and thus provided data for the comparison of
264 SQ-LNS vs MMS (33, 34). In Ghana and in the “complete follow-up” cohort in Malawi (who
265 received supplementation beyond pregnancy, see Table 1), SQ-LNS and MMS were provided
266 until 6 mo postpartum and IFA was provided until delivery followed by placebo (low dose
267 calcium) until 6 mo postpartum; in the “simplified follow-up” cohort in Malawi
268 (supplementation only during pregnancy), SQ-LNS, MMS or IFA were provided only until
269 delivery (33, 34). In Bangladesh, SQ-LNS was provided until 6 mo postpartum and IFA until 3
270 mo postpartum (32), and in Guatemala, SQ-LNS was provided only until delivery (35). The
271 nutrient composition of SQ-LNS was nearly identical across trials (**Supplemental Table 1**),
272 except for more vitamin D and less zinc in the version used in Guatemala. The MMS used in
273 Ghana and Malawi was a formulation designed to match the micronutrient content of the SQ-
274 LNS (11), which was based in part on results of a trial in Guinea-Bissau (36) that demonstrated a
275 greater impact on birth weight when the MMS contained 2X (vs 1X) the recommended dietary
276 allowance of most of the nutrients (except for iron, folic acid and vitamin A). Thus, the MMS
277 used in Ghana and Malawi had higher levels of most of the micronutrients compared to the
278 United Nations International Multiple Micronutrient Antenatal Preparation (UNIMMAP) (37).

279

280 Mean gestational age when prenatal supplementation began was ~12 wk in Guatemala, ~13 wk
281 in Bangladesh, and 16-17 wk in Ghana and Malawi (**Table 1**). Mean maternal age was lowest in
282 Bangladesh (~22 y) and 24-27 y in the other sites. Mean maternal BMI was lowest in
283 Bangladesh (20.1 kg/m²) and Malawi (20.5 kg/m²), and was considerably higher in Ghana and
284 Guatemala (~24-25 kg/m²). The proportion of women who were nulliparous at enrollment was
285 highest in Bangladesh and lowest in Guatemala. In the 3 sites in which household food insecurity
286 was assessed (Ghana, Malawi and Bangladesh), the percentage reporting moderate or severe
287 food insecurity ranged from 30% in Ghana to 66% in Malawi. Additional information on
288 maternal, child and household characteristics is available in **Supplemental Table 2**.

289

290 The study populations differed with regard to risk of adverse birth outcomes, with Bangladesh
291 having the highest incidence (in the IFA/SOC group) of LBW (37%), SGA (59%), newborn
292 stunting (23%), low BMIZ (34%) and preterm birth (14%) (**Supplemental Table 3**). The
293 incidence of these outcomes in the IFA/SOC groups in the other 3 sites was 13-14% for LBW,
294 22-27% for SGA, 10-17% for newborn stunting, 6-11% for low BMIZ, and 8-12% for preterm
295 birth. Study-level data on anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo of age and adverse outcomes in the
296 IFA/SOC groups are available in **Supplemental Tables 4-5**.

297

298 All trials were judged to have low risk of bias for 6 of the 7 categories: random sequence
299 generation, allocation concealment, outcome assessment (except for 1 trial labeled “unclear”),
300 incomplete outcome, selective reporting, and “other” (**Supplemental Table 6 and Supplemental**
301 **Figure 1**). All trials had a high risk of bias for blinding of participants, as blinding was not
302 possible given the physical difference in the supplements provided.

303

304 ***SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC***

305 *Main effects*

306 For most birth outcomes, all 4 trials contributed to the pooled effect estimates and the total
307 sample size was 4,922-5,348 (**Table 2**). For continuous birth outcomes based on
308 INTERGROWTH-21st standards, we excluded participants without ultrasound data, as
309 mentioned above, and as a result only 3 trials contributed to the estimates for WGAZ, LGAZ and
310 HCGAZ (total n ~1,460-1,717).

311 Maternal SQ-LNS had a significant positive effect on all of the continuous birth outcomes, with
312 a MD compared to IFA/SOC of +49 g for birth weight, +0.2 cm for birth length, +0.10-0.13 z-
313 scores for WAZ, WGAZ, LAZ, LGAZ, BMIZ, HCZ, and HCGAZ, +0.08 cm for MUAC, and
314 +0.12 wk for duration of gestation. Maternal SQ-LNS reduced the risk of LBW by 11%,
315 newborn stunting by 17%, low BMIZ by 11%, and low HCZ by 11%. Effect estimates for the
316 other binary birth outcomes were not statistically significant but were in the same direction
317 (except for LGA, RR 1.00 (0.61, 1.65)).

318 We rated the quality of the evidence for all birth outcomes as moderate based on the GRADE
319 criteria listed in the Methods: 3-4 RCTs were available for all outcomes, risk of bias was low
320 except for blinding of participants, heterogeneity was low, precision was rated as high because
321 all trials had sample sizes > 400, all trials were directly aimed at evaluating SQ-LNSs, and funnel
322 plots revealed no indication of publication bias.

323 In general, there was consistency across studies in the direction of effects, with very low
324 heterogeneity based on I^2 values (**Figures 2A-F** for birth weight, LBW, newborn LAZ, newborn

325 HCZ, newborn BMIZ and duration of gestation; **Supplemental Figures 2A-BM** for all
326 outcomes). Low I^2 values may be attributable to relatively wide CIs for some of the point
327 estimates rather than low variability in the RRs. For nearly all outcomes, fixed effects and
328 random-effects models generated identical estimates.

329 With regard to the sensitivity analyses, no trials had a high level of missingness of outcome data,
330 so no sensitivity analyses for that reason were needed. When including only ultrasound dating
331 for outcomes dependent on gestational age (which excluded the Bangladesh trial), the magnitude
332 of the effect estimates increased but effects remained non-significant: RR=0.86 (0.73, 1.01) for
333 SGA (n=1,717), MD=0.15 (-0.03, 0.33) for duration of gestation (n=1,880) and RR=0.90 (0.68,
334 1.18) for preterm birth (n=1,880) (**Supplemental Table 7A**). For the other sensitivity analyses,
335 restricting birth size outcomes to data collected within 72 h of birth, or excluding the Guatemala
336 trial (in which some women received additional LNS), or including the pre-conception arm of
337 the Guatemala trial, there was very little change in the findings.

338
339 For most of the effects of SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC on anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo of age, all
340 4 trials contributed to the pooled estimates and the total sample size was ~5,030; outcomes based
341 on MUACZ were not available for Guatemala (**Table 3**). Maternal SQ-LNS reduced
342 underweight at 6 mo (PR 0.85 (0.73, 0.99)), but effects on the other outcomes were not
343 statistically significant. In sensitivity analyses, the PR for underweight became non-significant
344 when Guatemala was excluded (0.96 (0.80, 1.16)) (with or without exclusion of the “simplified
345 follow-up” cohort in Malawi; in this cohort and in Guatemala, maternal supplementation did not
346 continue after delivery). The PR for underweight was not strengthened when the pre-conception

347 arm was included for Guatemala (0.90 (0.78, 1.13)). For other outcomes, these sensitivity
348 analyses did not substantively alter the findings (**Supplemental Table 7B**).

349
350 There were no significant differences in any of the adverse outcomes for the SQ-LNS vs
351 IFA/SOC comparison, and the RR was generally ≤ 1 except for incidence of stillbirths (**Table 4**).
352 Because of uncertainty in gestational age dating, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between
353 miscarriage and stillbirths (i.e., before vs. after 28 wk gestation), and in low resource settings it
354 can also be difficult to differentiate between stillbirth and early neonatal death (34). For these
355 reasons, Table 4 includes comparisons for 2 composite variables for these outcomes (miscarriage
356 or stillbirth; miscarriage or stillbirth or early neonatal mortality). The RRs for those composite
357 adverse outcomes were both < 1.0 . Adverse outcome findings were similar in the sensitivity
358 analyses (**Supplemental Table 7C**).

359
360 *Effect modification by individual-level characteristics*

361 For several characteristics, the p-for-interaction was > 0.10 for all or almost all infant birth
362 outcomes, i.e., effect modification was generally not evident for child birth order, maternal
363 height, education, or anemia at baseline, gestational age at start of supplementation, compliance
364 with supplementation, household socio-economic status or sanitation (see **Supplemental**
365 **Figures 3A-N** for results stratified by all characteristics). For 5 characteristics, the p-for-
366 interaction was < 0.10 for at least 2 birth outcomes, and data from at least 3 trials were available
367 (**Figures 3A-J** show 12 selected birth outcomes for each of these characteristics, though the
368 number of outcomes for which p-for-interaction was < 0.10 varied). The estimated effects of
369 maternal SQ-LNS on birth outcomes were greater among a) female (vs. male) infants, for birth

370 weight, WAZ, LBW, birth weight < 2 kg, BMIZ, low BMIZ, HCZ, duration of gestation, and
371 preterm birth; b) women with lower BMI (< 20 vs. ≥ 20 kg/m²), for MUAC and low infant HCZ;
372 c) younger women (< 25 vs. ≥ 25 y), for duration of gestation and birth weight <2 kg (although a
373 greater effect on SGA was seen among women ≥ 25 y); d) women with inflammation at baseline
374 (vs. without inflammation), for WAZ (Supplemental Figure 3H1), duration of gestation and low
375 infant HCZ; and e) women with greater household food insecurity (moderate to severe vs. mild
376 or secure), for birth length (Supplemental Figure 3M1), LAZ, head circumference (Supplemental
377 Figure 3M1) and newborn stunting. Only 2 trials had information on maternal malaria at
378 baseline, but in those trials the effect estimates for maternal SQ-LNS were greater among women
379 with a positive rapid test for malaria at baseline (vs. those with a negative test) for birth weight,
380 WAZ, LBW and SGA (Supplemental Figures 3I1-2). In sensitivity analyses including only
381 ultrasound dating for outcomes dependent on gestational age (**Supplemental Table 8**), the
382 interaction with child sex was still evident for duration of gestation but not preterm birth; the
383 interaction with maternal age was still significant (and stronger) for duration of gestation but not
384 for SGA; the interaction with maternal inflammation became weaker for duration of gestation;
385 and there was no change in the interaction with maternal malaria for SGA. In sensitivity analyses
386 restricted to anthropometric outcomes assessed within 72 h of birth, results were generally
387 stronger for the interactions with child sex and maternal inflammation, similar for maternal BMI,
388 age, and household food insecurity, and weaker for maternal malaria (for birth weight and LBW,
389 but not SGA). The other sensitivity analyses (e.g., exclusion of the Guatemala study) did not
390 substantively alter the results of the effect modification analyses (available at <https://osf.io/nj5f9/>
391 (17)).

392 We explored whether the greater effect of SQ-LNS on birth size outcomes among females (vs.
393 males) could be attributed mainly to the mediating effects on duration of gestation: when
394 including duration of gestation in the models, the p-for-interaction was > 0.10 for birth weight,
395 WAZ, BMIZ and HCZ but remained < 0.10 for LBW, birth weight < 2 kg, and low BMIZ
396 (available at [https://osf.io/nj5f9/\(17\)](https://osf.io/nj5f9/(17))).

397 Some of the above characteristics also modified the effect estimates for maternal SQ-LNS vs.
398 IFA/SOC with respect to infant anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo, particularly infant sex. Effect
399 estimates were larger for females than for males, as was the case for the birth outcomes (**Figure**
400 **4**). Among females, maternal SQ-LNS was associated with a 26% reduction in underweight and
401 a 30% reduction in low HCZ, whereas there was no reduction among males. These findings were
402 very similar in the sensitivity analyses excluding Guatemala (with or without exclusion of the
403 “simplified follow-up” cohort in Malawi) (available at [https://osf.io/nj5f9/\(17\)](https://osf.io/nj5f9/(17))). For 3 other
404 characteristics, the p-for-interaction was < 0.10 for at least 2 distinct infant outcomes at 6 mo.
405 Effect estimates for maternal SQ-LNS were greater among a) women with greater food
406 insecurity, for LAZ and underweight at 6 mo (**Supplemental Figures 3M3-4**); b) women with
407 improved sanitation, for WAZ and WLZ at 6 mo (**Supplemental Figure 3N3**); and c) later-born
408 children, for underweight and stunting at 6 mo (**Supplemental Figure 3B4**).

409 **Supplemental Figures 4A-N** present pooled estimates for adverse outcomes, stratified by
410 potential individual-level effect modifiers. For many of the potential effect modifiers, the p-for-
411 interaction was > 0.10 for all of the adverse outcomes; for several other potential effect
412 modifiers, the p-for-interaction was < 0.10 for only one adverse outcome, and for that outcome
413 the difference between SQ-LNS and IFA/SOC groups was not significant in either subgroup. For
414 birth order, the p-for-interaction was < 0.10 for 2 outcomes: neonatal mortality and mortality 0-6

415 mo. In both cases, the stratum-specific estimates were not significant: neonatal and 0-6 mo
416 mortality RRs were respectively 0.54 (0.27, 1.06) and 0.60 (0.32, 1.15) among first-born infants,
417 and 1.08 (0.69, 1.70) and 1.22 (0.86, 1.73) among later-born infants. These results were similar
418 in the sensitivity analyses (available at <https://osf.io/nj5f9/> (17)).

419 *SQ-LNS vs MMS*

420 *Main effects*

421 Effects of SQ-LNS vs MMS on birth outcomes are based on 2 trials and a total sample size of
422 1,121-1,539 (**Table 5**). There were marginally significant differences in head circumference
423 (+0.14 (-0.02, 0.31) cm) and HCGAZ (+0.11 (-0.01, 0.23)) favoring the SQ-LNS group, but p-
424 values for all other outcomes were > 0.10. There was low heterogeneity, and fixed effects and
425 random-effects models generated nearly identical estimates (**Figures 5A-C** and **Supplemental**
426 **Figures 5A-AF**). We rated the quality of the evidence for all outcomes as low because data were
427 available for only 2 trials, both conducted in Africa.

428 Most of the pre-planned sensitivity analyses were not applicable to these 2 trials, except for the
429 one restricting birth size outcomes to data collected within 72 h of birth. In that sensitivity
430 analysis, there was little change in the results except that the MDs for head circumference (+0.21
431 (-0.03, 0.45)) and HCGAZ (+0.16 (-0.01, 0.34)) became larger (though still marginally
432 significant).

433 **Table 6** shows that there were no significant effects of SQ-LNS vs MMS on anthropometric
434 outcomes at 6 mo of age. Findings were not altered when excluding the “simplified cohort
435 follow-up” in Malawi. **Table 7** shows no significant differences in adverse outcomes for the SQ-
436 LNS vs MMS comparison.

437 *Effect modification by individual-level characteristics*

438 For most characteristics, the p-for-interaction was > 0.10 for all infant birth outcomes, i.e., effect
439 modification was not evident for maternal height, BMI, education, or anemia at baseline,
440 gestational age at start of supplementation, compliance with supplementation, household socio-
441 economic status, food insecurity, or sanitation (**Supplemental Figures 6A-M**). The p-for-
442 interaction was < 0.10 for at least 1 birth size outcome for 5 characteristics: child sex, birth order,
443 maternal age, inflammation at baseline, and malaria at baseline. Effect modification estimates for
444 maternal SQ-LNS vs MMS were greater (p-for-interaction < 0.10) among a) female (vs. male)
445 infants for head circumference, HCZ, birth weight < 2 kg, SGA, low BMIZ and low HCZ
446 (Supplemental Figures 6A1-2), b) first-born (vs. later-born) infants for birth weight and WAZ
447 (Supplemental Figure 6B1), and c) younger women (< 25 vs. > 25 y) for SGA (Supplemental
448 Figure 6E). Effect modification by maternal inflammation was difficult to interpret: effect
449 estimates for maternal SQ-LNS vs. MMS were greater among women with inflammation for
450 birth weight, but greater among those without inflammation for HCZ and HCGAZ
451 (Supplemental Figure 6H1). Results for effect modification by maternal malaria were not
452 interpretable because they could not be confirmed in the sensitivity analysis restricted to
453 anthropometric outcomes measured within 72 h of birth, due to insufficient sample sizes in the
454 subgroup with malaria at enrollment. Results of the sensitivity analysis restricted to birth size
455 measured within 72 h for effect modification by child sex, birth order and maternal age are
456 available at <https://osf.io/nj5f9/> (17); the findings were similar but for some outcomes the sample
457 sizes in certain subgroups were insufficient to generate effect estimates.

458 Some of the above characteristics also modified the effect estimates for maternal SQ-LNS vs.
459 MMS with regard to a few of the anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo, but the results were not
460 always consistent across outcomes (Supplemental Figures 6A3&4-6M3&4).

461 For most of the adverse outcomes, statistical power to examine effect modification was low
462 because they are rare events and the total sample size for this comparison, with both trials
463 combined, was $\leq 1,566$.

464

465

466 **Discussion**

467 In this IPD meta-analysis, data from 4 trials showed that maternal SQ-LNS, compared to IFA or
468 SOC, increased mean birth weight, length, head circumference, BMIZ, MUAC and duration of
469 gestation, and on average reduced the incidence of LBW by 11%, newborn stunting by 17%,
470 newborn wasting (low BMIZ) by 11%, and small head size (low HCZ) by 15%. Only 2 trials
471 directly compared maternal SQ-LNS and MMS; birth outcomes did not differ significantly
472 between these groups, although there was a marginally significant difference in newborn head
473 circumference. Several individual-level characteristics appeared to modify the impact of
474 maternal SQ-LNS. For the comparison with IFA or SOC, effect estimates for SQ-LNS were
475 greater among female infants and among women with BMI $< 20 \text{ kg/m}^2$, inflammation or malaria
476 at enrollment, or greater household food insecurity. For the comparison with MMS, effect
477 estimates for SQ-LNS were greater among female infants, first-born infants, and women $< 25 \text{ y}$
478 of age. Some of these findings may have implications with regard to potential targeting of SQ-
479 LNS to vulnerable women, as discussed below.

480 Main effects on birth outcomes and adverse outcomes

481 For SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC, our estimated main effects for birth outcomes are similar to those of
482 Das et al. (13), which is expected because their analysis included 3 of the 4 trials in our IPD
483 analysis. We report on several birth outcomes not included in the Das et al. meta-analysis:
484 newborn BMIZ and low BMIZ, and birth size for gestational age outcomes using the
485 INTERGROWTH-21st standard. The MD in birth weight was 49 g, which is similar to the
486 estimated impact of other types of BEP (10). The RR of 0.89 for LBW translates into an
487 estimated absolute difference of ~29 events per 1000 births. For newborn stunting, wasting, and
488 small head size, the estimated absolute differences are 32, 24 and 22 events per 1000 births,
489 respectively. For SGA (RR 0.96 (0.92, 1.01)), the upper bound of the 95% CI slightly exceeded
490 1.0; in a sensitivity analysis restricted to results based on ultrasound dating of gestational age
491 (which required exclusion of the largest trial, in Bangladesh), the RR was more substantial but
492 the upper bound of the 95% CI did not change (0.86 (0.73, 1.01)). The RR for preterm birth was
493 not significant in the main analysis (0.94 (0.80, 1.10)) or in the sensitivity analysis restricted to
494 ultrasound dating (0.90 (0.68, 1.18)). The effect estimates for birth size z-scores for gestational
495 age (+0.13 in WGAZ, +0.13 in LGAZ, and +0.11 in HCGAZ) were similar to those for WAZ
496 (+0.12), LAZ (+0.11) and HCZ (+0.10), suggesting that the impact of SQ-LNS on birth size was
497 mainly attributable to improvements in fetal growth.

498 For SQ-LNS vs MMS, we cannot directly compare our estimated main effects to those of Das et
499 al. (13) because their analysis included 1 MQ-LNS trial in addition to the 2 SQ-LNS trials that
500 are in our IPD meta-analysis. Although neither meta-analysis showed significant differences in
501 birth outcomes between (SQ-)LNS and MMS groups, the MDs for all of the birth size outcomes
502 in our IPD analysis were in the same direction as those for the SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC analysis,

503 though generally of lower magnitude except for the MD in head circumference (which was
504 almost identical between the SQ-LNS vs MMS and SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC comparisons, e.g.,
505 HCGAZ +0.11 (-0.01, 0.23) and +0.11 (0.02, 0.20), respectively).

506 Because only 2 trials have directly compared SQ-LNS with MMS, it is useful to examine how
507 the estimated effects of SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC compare with those of MMS vs IFA in previous
508 meta-analyses, which included a large number of trials (19, 38). Effects of MMS vs IFA on mean
509 birth weight (+48 (40, 57) g in Smith et al. (19)) and RR for LBW (0.86-0.88) (19, 38) are quite
510 similar to those shown for SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC herein, and the results for SGA and preterm
511 birth are also similar. However, we have demonstrated positive effects of SQ-LNS on newborn
512 LAZ, stunting, HCZ, and small HCZ, whereas these outcomes have not been reported in the
513 MMS vs IFA meta-analyses. The MD for head circumference in the SQ-LNS vs MMS
514 comparison suggests that the differences in nutrient composition between these two supplements
515 (e.g., inclusion of EFAs, calcium in SQ-LNS) may influence certain parameters of fetal growth,
516 even if effects on birth weight are similar.

517 In both the SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC and SQ-LNS vs MMS comparisons, we did not find significant
518 differences in incidence of Caesarian-section, miscarriage, stillbirths, early neonatal mortality,
519 neonatal mortality or mortality from birth to 6 mo of age, although it should be noted that the
520 statistical power to detect differences in some of these rare outcomes was particularly limited.

521 Effect modification for birth outcomes

522 *SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC*

523 The impact of SQ-LNS was greater among female than among male infants for many of the birth
524 outcomes. Among females, effect estimates for SQ-LNS suggested reductions of 20% for LBW,

525 24%, for newborn stunting, 22% for newborn wasting and 17% for small head size, and an
526 increase in duration of gestation of +0.3 (0.15, 0.45) wk. In exploratory analyses, we found that
527 the effects on birth size were only partially explained by the increased duration of gestation,
528 suggesting that among female fetuses, SQ-LNS influenced both of the pathways leading to
529 SVNs, i.e., “born too soon” and “born too small” (6). It is noteworthy that child sex did not
530 modify the effects of MMS (vs IFA) on LBW or SGA (19). It is unclear why the effects of SQ-
531 LNS were stronger among female fetuses. In our previous IPD meta-analysis of SQ-LNS
532 provided directly to infants and young children 6-23 mo of age, we also found a greater impact
533 among females than among males for child stunting, wasting and small head size (15), as well as
534 anemia (39). We interpreted this as a greater potential to respond to nutritional interventions
535 among females than among males (15). Males are more vulnerable to environmental stressors
536 (40, 41), and are at higher risk of morbidity and mortality in early life, which could constrain
537 their response to nutrition interventions. Our results suggest that this vulnerability begins prior to
538 birth and is thus likely to be biologically rather than socially driven.

539 For some outcomes, effects of SQ-LNS were greater among mothers with a low BMI at
540 enrollment than among those with $\text{BMI} \geq 20 \text{ kg/m}^2$. The p-for-interaction was significant only
541 for low HCZ and mean MUAC but effect estimates were also somewhat larger among low BMI
542 mothers for most of the other birth size outcomes (though not for duration of gestation or preterm
543 birth). Among mothers with low BMI, effect estimates for SQ-LNS suggested reductions of 23%
544 for newborn small head size and 20% for newborn stunting. This could be interpreted as a
545 greater potential to benefit among infants of low BMI mothers.

546 Similarly, effects of SQ-LNS were greater among infants of women with inflammation or
547 malaria at enrolment. For inflammation, the p-for-interaction was significant for WAZ, duration

548 of gestation and small head size and there was a similar pattern for several other birth outcomes.
549 Among women with inflammation, effect estimates for SQ-LNS suggested reductions of 33% for
550 LBW, 31% for newborn stunting, 33% for newborn wasting and 40% for small head size. For
551 malaria, the p-for-interaction was significant for birth weight, WAZ, LBW, and SGA. Among
552 women with malaria, effect estimates for SQ-LNS suggested reductions of 47% for LBW and
553 40% for SGA. These are large relative reductions in the risk of being “born too small”, and
554 suggest that SQ-LNS may be mitigating the adverse effects of maternal inflammation and
555 possibly malaria on fetal growth (42, 43).

556 Effects of SQ-LNS were also greater among women in households with moderate-to-severe food
557 insecurity than in those with less food insecurity. The p-for-interaction was significant for birth
558 length, LAZ, newborn stunting, and head circumference (in cm) and there was a similar pattern
559 for several other birth outcomes. Among women with greater food insecurity, effect estimates for
560 SQ-LNS suggested reductions of 16% for LBW and 25% for newborn stunting. These findings
561 suggest a greater potential to benefit among women with food insecurity, perhaps because they
562 are at greater risk of nutrient inadequacy.

563 Effects of SQ-LNS on birth size outcomes tended to be greater among infants of mothers who
564 consumed supplements ≥ 4 days/wk than in those with lower compliance, although the p-for-
565 interaction was significant only for stunting. Among women with higher compliance, effect
566 estimates for SQ-LNS suggested reductions of 16% for LBW, 22% for newborn stunting, 14%
567 for newborn wasting, and 18% for small head size.

568 Effect modification was generally not evident for other maternal characteristics. This could be
569 important, as it suggests that a response to maternal SQ-LNS is not constrained by short maternal
570 stature, low education, anemia at baseline, later gestational age at start of supplementation, or

571 low household socio-economic status. In the IPD meta-analysis of MMS vs IFA (19), there was a
572 greater impact of MMS on SGA among women with more education, compared to those with
573 less education. This type of interaction was not observed for SQ-LNS. The lack of interaction of
574 SQ-LNS with maternal anemia is also noteworthy because the iron content of SQ-LNS (20 mg)
575 was much lower than that of IFA (60 mg) in these trials. Although this difference in iron content
576 may influence the risk of maternal iron-deficiency anemia (44-46), it does not appear to
577 compromise the impact of maternal SQ-LNS on infant outcomes (47).

578

579 *SQ-LNS vs MMS*

580 As was found for the comparison of SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC, effect estimates for SQ-LNS vs MMS
581 were greater among female than among male infants. The p-for-interaction with infant sex was
582 significant for several outcomes (HCZ, SGA, birth weight < 2 kg, low BMIZ, and small head
583 size), and the effect estimates for SQ-LNS were significant among females for LGAZ (+0.17
584 (0.00, 0.33)), HCZ (+0.21 (0.01, 0.40)) and HCGAZ (+0.19 (0.02, 0.37)). It is noteworthy that
585 these differences between intervention groups among females are for outcomes that reflect linear
586 growth and head size, and may be attributable to the differences in nutrient content between SQ-
587 LNS and MMS, particularly EFAs (important for brain development) (48) and minerals such as
588 calcium, potassium and magnesium (important for linear growth).

589 Effects of SQ-LNS vs MMS appeared to be greater among first-born than among later-born
590 infants. The p-for-interaction was significant for birth weight and WAZ, and among first-born
591 infants the effect estimates for SQ-LNS were substantial for birth weight (+120 (35, 205) g) and
592 HCZ (+0.31 (0.05, 0.58)). However, there was heterogeneity between the 2 sites for this

593 interaction, with results being driven by greater effects of SQ-LNS among first-born infants in
594 Ghana but not in Malawi.

595 Effects of SQ-LNS on SGA were more beneficial among younger women than among those ≥ 25
596 y, and there was a similar pattern for other birth outcomes. Among infants of younger mothers,
597 effect estimates for SQ-LNS vs MMS were significant for birth weight (+69 (4, 135)), WAZ
598 (+0.16 (0.01, 0.31)), and HCZ (+0.20 (0.00, 0.40)). This could reflect a greater potential to
599 benefit among infants of younger mothers (who are also more likely to be first-born), among
600 whom improved intake of EFAs and certain minerals could be more critical.

601 Effects on anthropometric status at 6 mo

602 An important biological and programmatic question is whether prenatal supplementation has a
603 sustained impact on infant growth status after birth. Previous evidence on this question has been
604 mixed (49). In this meta-analysis, maternal SQ-LNS (compared to IFA or SOC) reduced the
605 prevalence of underweight at 6 mo of age by 15%, but effects on the other anthropometric
606 outcomes were not statistically significant. Among female infants, underweight at 6 mo was
607 reduced by 26%, whereas no effect was observed among male infants. In 3 cohorts (Bangladesh,
608 Ghana and half of the Malawi cohort), mothers continued to receive supplements after delivery
609 for up to 6 mo, so it is possible that some of the impact on infant underweight at 6 mo is
610 attributable to postpartum effects, e.g., through breast milk composition or maternal caregiving
611 capacity. However, when we excluded the two cohorts in which mothers did not continue to
612 receive supplements postpartum (Guatemala and half of the Malawi cohort), the effect estimate
613 for underweight was weaker rather than stronger, suggesting that the reduction in underweight is
614 likely related to SQ-LNS received prenatally. This is an important finding because underweight
615 among infants is a key risk factor for mortality (50-52).

616 There were no significant differences in infant anthropometric status at 6 mo in the comparison
617 of SQ-LNS vs MMS.

618 Strengths and limitations

619 Strengths of this IPD meta-analysis include the high quality of the randomized controlled trials
620 contributing to the estimates, data from diverse settings on 3 different continents, and the
621 consistency in findings between fixed-effects and random-effects models as well as in most of
622 the sensitivity analyses. Limitations include the relatively small number of trials (especially for
623 the SQ-LNS vs MMS comparison), and limited statistical power to detect differences in rare
624 outcomes. Results of the effect modification analyses should be interpreted with caution because
625 many of the potential effect modifiers are interrelated and also may be confounded by other
626 unmeasured factors. In addition, there was variation in the methods used in each study to assess
627 certain potential effect modifiers such as household food insecurity and socio-economic status.

628

629 Conclusions and implications

630 Maternal SQ-LNS has substantial positive effects on birth outcomes when compared with IFA or
631 SOC, especially among female infants and among vulnerable women such as those with low
632 BMI, inflammation or malaria at enrollment, or greater household food insecurity. Provision of
633 SQ-LNS to pregnant women may also reduce the prevalence of underweight among infants at 6
634 mo of age. An important programmatic question is whether maternal SQ-LNS is superior to
635 MMS, which is lower in cost and is currently being scaled-up (53, 54). Based on this meta-
636 analysis as well as the meta-analyses of MMS (19, 38), we conclude that SQ-LNS and MMS
637 have similar positive effects on birth weight outcomes when comparing each with IFA.

638 However, it is not known whether MMS has an impact on newborn LAZ, stunting, BMIZ,
639 wasting, HCZ, or small HCZ, all of which were improved in the SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC
640 comparisons herein. With only 2 trials directly comparing SQ-LNS and MMS, the statistical
641 power to detect differences between intervention groups was considerably lower than was the
642 case for the SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC comparison. Moreover, the MMS used in those 2 trials had
643 1.5-2 times the amounts of most micronutrients compared to the MMS formulation currently
644 being scaled up (UNIMMAP), which may have reduced the likelihood of detecting differences in
645 birth outcomes between the SQ-LNS and MMS groups. Further trials that include this
646 comparison are needed.

647 It is possible that the impact of SQ-LNS on certain birth outcomes is superior to that of MMS
648 within vulnerable populations, even if the main effects on those outcomes do not differ
649 significantly in the general population. For example, among infants of women < 25 y of age,
650 birth weight and head circumference were greater in the SQ-LNS group, compared to MMS. As
651 mentioned above, effects of SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC were largest in more vulnerable women,
652 whereas effects of MMS (vs IFA) on birth size (LBW or SGA) have not been shown to differ in
653 such subgroups (i.e., younger women, those with low BMI) (19). The MMS vs IFA IPD meta-
654 analysis did not include household food insecurity or maternal inflammation as potential effect
655 modifiers.

656 The large and consistent impact of SQ-LNS (vs IFA/SOC) among women with one or more
657 biomarkers of inflammation at enrollment on several different metrics of fetal growth (ponderal,
658 linear and head size) is noteworthy, given that the percentage of women in this subgroup was
659 40.8% in Ghana, 45.9% in Malawi and 16.6% in Bangladesh (this information was not available

660 for Guatemala). These findings suggest a greater potential to benefit from maternal SQ-LNS
661 among such women. The mechanisms underlying these findings require further investigation.
662 Further research is also needed to elucidate potential biological explanations for the stronger
663 effects of maternal SQ-LNS observed among female infants, compared to males, and how to
664 overcome the constraints on response among males. Regardless of the mechanism, the
665 substantial reduction in risk of newborn stunting among females may have implications with
666 regard to subsequent height during childhood, adolescence and adulthood (55, 56). Greater
667 maternal stature in females at the time of childbearing may reduce the risk of SGA and thereby
668 help prevent the intergenerational transmission of impaired growth.

669 From a programmatic perspective, the effects among vulnerable subgroups demonstrated herein
670 suggest that targeting provision of SQ-LNS to younger women, those with low BMI, or those in
671 households with food insecurity may be worth considering. This type of targeting is envisioned
672 for BEP interventions in general (9), and the 2016 WHO guideline on antenatal care (57) already
673 recommends prenatal BEP in populations with a high prevalence of undernutrition among
674 pregnant women. Given that SQ-LNS meets the definition of BEP, our results support the
675 strategy of targeting food-based supplements to pregnant women who have the greatest potential
676 to benefit. SQ-LNS provides less energy than most BEP supplements that have been evaluated,
677 but at present there is no clear dose-response relationship between the quantity of LNS (or BEP
678 of other types) and birth outcomes (58). Further research is needed to identify the optimal energy
679 content of LNS for pregnant women. However, it is noteworthy that the effects of SQ-LNS (vs
680 IFA/SOC) on birth outcomes in this IPD analysis were larger among women with greater food
681 insecurity, despite the small amount of energy provided. This implies that improving intake of
682 essential nutrients during pregnancy in high-risk populations is of paramount importance.

683

684 **Acknowledgments**

685 We thank all of the co-investigators, collaborators, study teams, participants and local
686 communities involved in the trials included in these analyses. These trials benefitted from the
687 contributions of many partner organizations, including: icddr,b (Rang-Din Nutrition Study); the
688 International Lipid-based Nutrient Supplements Project Steering Committee (iLiNS Project
689 trials); NICHD-Global Network for Women’s and Children’s Health Research and Institute of
690 Nutrition in Central America and Panama (INCAP) (Women First trial); and Nutriset (for
691 development of SQ-LNS).

692

693 The authors’ responsibilities were as follows—KGD: drafted the manuscript with input from
694 KRW, CDA, CPS and other coauthors; KRW, CDA, KGD, and CPS: wrote the statistical
695 analysis plan; BFA, PA, LH, NFK, JL, SM: reviewed, contributed to, and approved the statistical
696 analysis plan; KRW and CDA: compiled the data; CDA: conducted the data analysis; and all
697 authors: read, contributed to, and approved the final manuscript; KGD is responsible for final
698 content.

699

700 Supported by Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation grant OPP49817 (to KGD). All authors report no
701 conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Stevens G.A., Beal T., Mbuya M.N.N., Luo H., Neufeld L.M., Global Micronutrient Deficiencies Research G. Micronutrient deficiencies among preschool-aged children and women of reproductive age worldwide: a pooled analysis of individual-level data from population-representative surveys. *Lancet Glob Health* 2022;10:e1590-e9.
2. World Health Organization. Global Anaemia Estimates. 2021. Available at: https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/topics/anaemia_in_women_and_children. Accessed on: 4 April 2022.
3. United Nations Children's Fund. UNICEF Programming Guidance. Prevention of malnutrition in women before and during pregnancy and while breastfeeding. New York: UNICEF, 2021. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/media/114561/file/Maternal%20Nutrition%20Programming%20Guidance.pdf>. Accessed on: 18 March 2024.
4. United Nations Children's Fund. UNICEF Data: Monitoring the situation of children and women. Women's Nutrition. 2021. Available at: <https://data.unicef.org/topic/nutrition/womens-nutrition/#resources>. Accessed on: 18 March 2024.
5. Torheim L.E., Ferguson E.L., Penrose K., Arimond M. Women in resource-poor settings are at risk of inadequate intakes of multiple micronutrients. *J Nutr* 2010;140:2051S-8S.
6. Ashorn P., Ashorn U., Muthiani Y., Aboubaker S., Askari S., Bahl R., et al. Small vulnerable newborns-big potential for impact. *Lancet* 2023;401:1692-706.
7. Lawn J.E., Ohuma E.O., Bradley E., Idueta L.S., Hazel E., Okwaraji Y.B., et al. Small babies, big risks: global estimates of prevalence and mortality for vulnerable newborns to accelerate change and improve counting. *Lancet* 2023;401:1707-19.
8. Hunter P.J., Awoyemi T., Ayede A.I., Chico R.M., David A.L., Dewey K.G., et al. Biological and pathological mechanisms leading to the birth of a small vulnerable newborn. *Lancet* 2023;401:1720-32.
9. Hofmeyr G.J., Black R.E., Rogozinska E., Heuer A., Walker N., Ashorn P., et al. Evidence-based antenatal interventions to reduce the incidence of small vulnerable newborns and their associated poor outcomes. *Lancet* 2023;401:1733-44.
10. Ota E., Hori H., Mori R., Tobe-Gai R., Farrar D. Antenatal dietary education and supplementation to increase energy and protein intake. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015:CD000032.
11. Arimond M., Zeilani M., Jungjohann S., Brown K.H., Ashorn P., Allen L.H., Dewey K.G. Considerations in developing lipid-based nutrient supplements for prevention of undernutrition: Experience from the International Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements (iLiNS) Project. *Matern Child Nutr* 2015;11 31-61.
12. USAID Advancing Nutrition. Small-Quantity Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplement Program implementation learnings and considerations for scale-up from International Food Relief Partnership partners in Honduras, Niger, and Somalia. Arlington, VA: USAID Advancing Nutrition. 2022. Available at: <https://www.advancingnutrition.org/resources/small-quantity-lipid-based-nutrient-supplement-program-implementation>. Accessed on: 12 April 2023.
13. Das J.K., Hoodbhoy Z., Salam R.A., Bhutta A.Z., Valenzuela-Rubio N.G., Weise Prinzo Z., Bhutta Z.A. Lipid-based nutrient supplements for maternal, birth, and infant developmental outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018;8:CD012610.

14. Hunter P.J., Muthiani Y., Nasanen-Gilmore P.K., Koivu A.M., Portfors P., Bastola K., et al. A modular systematic review of antenatal interventions to address undernutrition during pregnancy in the prevention of low birth weight. *Amer J Clin Nutr* 2023;117 Suppl 2:S134-S47.
15. Dewey K.G., Stewart C.P., Wessells K.R., Prado E.L., Arnold C.D. Small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements for the prevention of child malnutrition and promotion of healthy development: Overview of individual participant data meta-analysis and programmatic implications. *Amer J Clin Nutr* 2021;114:3S-14S.
16. Wessells R., Dewey K., Stewart C., Arnold C., Prado E. Modifiers of the effect of LNS provided to pregnant women on maternal, birth and infant outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data from randomized controlled trials in low- and middle-income countries. PROSPERO CRD42021283391. 2021. Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021283391 Accessed on: 18 March 2024..
17. Wessells K.R., Dewey K., Arnold C.D., Stewart C., Prado E. Modifiers of the effect of LNS provided to pregnant women on maternal, birth and infant outcomes. *Open Science Framework*. 2021. Available at: <https://osf.io/nj5f9/>. Accessed on: 18 March 2024.
18. World Bank Historical Classification by Income Group. Available at: <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/download/site-content/OGHIST.xls> Accessed on: 22 August 2019.
19. Smith E.R., Shankar A.H., Wu L.S., Aboud S., Adu-Afarwuah S., Ali H., et al. Modifiers of the effect of maternal multiple micronutrient supplementation on stillbirth, birth outcomes, and infant mortality: a meta-analysis of individual patient data from 17 randomised trials in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet Glob Health* 2017;5:e1090-e100.
20. WHO. WHO antenatal care recommendations for a positive pregnancy experience. Nutritional interventions update: Multiple micronutrient supplements during pregnancy. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2020.
21. Johnston B.C., Guyatt G.H. Best (but oft-forgotten) practices: intention-to-treat, treatment adherence, and missing participant outcome data in the nutrition literature. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2016;104:1197-201.
22. WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group. WHO Child Growth Standards: Length/height-for-age, weight-for-age, weight-for-length, weight-for-height and body mass index-for-age: Methods and development. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2006.
23. WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group. WHO Child Growth Standards: Head circumference-for-age, arm circumference-for-age, triceps skinfold-for-age and subscapular skinfold-for-age: Methods and development. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2007.
24. Villar J., Cheikh Ismail L., Victora C.G., Ohuma E.O., Bertino E., Altman D.G., et al. International standards for newborn weight, length, and head circumference by gestational age and sex: the Newborn Cross-Sectional Study of the INTERGROWTH-21st Project. *Lancet* 2014;384:857-68.
25. Tukey J. The future of data analysis. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 1962;33:1-67.
26. Higgins J., Green S. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews for Interventions*, Version 5.1.0. The Cochrane Collaboration 2011. Available from www.handbook.cochrane.org.

27. Balshem H., Helfand M., Schunemann H.J., Oxman A.D., Kunz R., Brozek J., et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:401-6.
28. Dewey K.G., Wessells K.R., Arnold C.D., Prado E.L., Abbeddou S., Adu-Afarwuah S., et al. Characteristics that modify the effect of small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplementation on child growth: An individual participant data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Amer J Clin Nutr* 2021;114 (Suppl 1):15S-42S.
29. Burke D.L., Ensor J., Riley R.D. Meta-analysis using individual participant data: one-stage and two-stage approaches, and why they may differ. *Stat Med* 2017;36:855-75.
30. Higgins J.P., Thompson S.G., Deeks J.J., Altman D.G. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003;327:557-60.
31. Streiner D.L. Best (but oft-forgotten) practices: the multiple problems of multiplicity-whether and how to correct for many statistical tests. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2015;102:721-8.
32. Mridha M.K., Matias S.L., Chaparro C.M., Paul R.R., Hussain S., Vosti S.A., et al. Lipid-based nutrient supplements for pregnant women reduce newborn stunting in a cluster-randomized controlled effectiveness trial in Bangladesh. *Amer J Clin Nutr* 2016;103:236-49.
33. Adu-Afarwuah S., Lartey A., Okronipa H., Ashorn P., Zeilani M., Peerson J.M., et al. Lipid-based nutrient supplement increases the birth size of infants of primiparous women in Ghana. *Amer J Clin Nutr* 2015;101:835-46.
34. Ashorn P., Alho L., Ashorn U., Cheung Y.B., Dewey K.G., Harjunmaa U., et al. The impact of lipid-based nutrient supplement provision to pregnant women on newborn size in rural Malawi: A randomized controlled trial. *Amer J Clin Nutr* 2015;101:387-97.
35. Hambidge K.M., Westcott J.E., Garces A., Figueroa L., Goudar S.S., Dhaded S.M., et al. A multicountry randomized controlled trial of comprehensive maternal nutrition supplementation initiated before conception: The Women First trial. *Amer J Clin Nutr* 2019;109:457-69.
36. Kaestel P., Michaelsen K.F., Aaby P., Friis H. Effects of prenatal multimicronutrient supplements on birth weight and perinatal mortality: a randomised, controlled trial in Guinea-Bissau. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2005;59:1081-9.
37. The Multiple Micronutrient Supplement Technical Advisory Group (MMS-TAG), The Micronutrient Forum (MNF). Expert consensus on an open-access United Nations International Multiple Micronutrient Antenatal Preparation - multiple micronutrient supplement product specification. *Annals New York Acad Sci* 2020;1470:3-13.
38. Keats E.C., Haider B.A., Tam E., Bhutta Z.A. Multiple-micronutrient supplementation for women during pregnancy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2019;3:CD004905.
39. Wessells K.R., Arnold C.D., Stewart C.P., Prado E.L., Abbeddou S., Adu-Afarwuah S., et al. Characteristics that modify the effect of small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplementation on child anemia and micronutrient status: an individual participant data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Amer J Clin Nutr* 2021;114:68S-94S.
40. Moore S.E. Sex differences in growth and neurocognitive development in infancy and early childhood. *Proc Nutr Soc* 2024:1-8.
41. Wells J.C. Natural selection and sex differences in morbidity and mortality in early life. *J Theor Biol* 2000;202:65-76.
42. Sauder M.W., Lee S.E., Schulze K.J., Christian P., Wu L.S.F., Khattry S.K., et al. Inflammation throughout pregnancy and fetal growth restriction in rural Nepal. *Epidemiol Infect* 2019;147:e258.

43. Desai M., ter Kuile F.O., Nosten F., McGready R., Asamoia K., Brabin B., Newman R.D. Epidemiology and burden of malaria in pregnancy. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2007;7:93-104.
44. Adu-Afarwuah S., Lartey A., Okronipa H., Ashorn P., Zeilani M., Baldiviez L.M., et al. Impact of small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement on hemoglobin, iron status and biomarkers of inflammation in pregnant Ghanaian women. *Matern Child Nutr* 2017;13.
45. Jorgensen J.M., Ashorn P., Ashorn U., Baldiviez L.M., Gondwe A., Maleta K., et al. Effects of lipid-based nutrient supplements or multiple micronutrient supplements compared with iron and folic acid supplements during pregnancy on maternal haemoglobin and iron status. *Matern Child Nutr* 2018;14:e12640.
46. Matias S.L., Mridha M.K., Young R.T., Hussain S., Dewey K.G. Daily maternal lipid-based nutrient supplementation with 20 mg iron, compared with iron and folic acid with 60 mg iron, resulted in lower iron status in late pregnancy but not at 6 months postpartum in either the mothers or their infants in Bangladesh. *J Nutr* 2018;148:1615-24.
47. Oaks B.M., Jorgensen J.M., Baldiviez L.M., Adu-Afarwuah S., Maleta K., Okronipa H., et al. Prenatal Iron Deficiency and Replete Iron Status Are Associated with Adverse Birth Outcomes, but Associations Differ in Ghana and Malawi. *J Nutr* 2019;149:513-21.
48. Martinat M., Rossitto M., Di Miceli M., Laye S. Perinatal Dietary Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids in Brain Development, Role in Neurodevelopmental Disorders. *Nutrients* 2021;13.
49. Devakumar D., Fall C.H., Sachdev H.S., Margetts B.M., Osmond C., Wells J.C., et al. Maternal antenatal multiple micronutrient supplementation for long-term health benefits in children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Med* 2016;14:90.
50. Mertens A., Benjamin-Chung J., Colford J.M., Jr., Coyle J., van der Laan M.J., Hubbard A.E., et al. Causes and consequences of child growth faltering in low-resource settings. *Nature* 2023;621:568-76.
51. Mahmud I., Guesdon B., Kerac M., Grijalva-Eternod C.S. Mortality risk in infants receiving therapeutic care for malnutrition: A secondary analysis. *Matern Child Nutr* 2024:e13635.
52. McDonald C.M., Olofin I., Flaxman S., Fawzi W.W., Spiegelman D., Caulfield L.E., et al. The effect of multiple anthropometric deficits on child mortality: meta-analysis of individual data in 10 prospective studies from developing countries. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2013;97:896-901.
53. Verney A.M.J., Busch-Hallen J.F., Walters D.D., Rowe S.N., Kurzawa Z.A., Arabi M. Multiple micronutrient supplementation cost-benefit tool for informing maternal nutrition policy and investment decisions. *Matern Child Nutr* 2023;19:e13523.
54. Healthy Mothers Healthy Babies. Multiple Micronutrient Supplementation. Available at: <https://hmhbconsortium.org/mms/>. Accessed on: 18 March 2024.
55. Kumordzie S.M., Adu-Afarwuah S., Arimond M., Young R.R., Adom T., Boatman R., et al. Maternal and infant lipid-based nutritional supplementation increases height of Ghanaian children at 4-6 years only if the mother was not overweight before conception. *J Nutr* 2019;149:847-55.
56. Bentil H.J., Adu-Afarwuah S., Prado E.L., Arnold C.D., Hastings P.D., Guyer A.E., et al. Sustained effects of small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements provided during the first 1000 days on child growth at 9-11 y in a randomized controlled trial in Ghana. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2024;119:425-32.
57. WHO. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience. Geneva, 2016.

58. McDonald C.M., Wessells K.R., Stewart C.P., Dewey K.G., de Pee S., Rana R., et al.
Antenatal interevent strategies providing food or cash with micronutrients to pregnant and breastfeeding women in low- and middle-income countries: a scoping review. *Matern Child Nutr* 2024, in submission.
59. International Classification of Disease 10th Revision (ICD-10). 2010. Available online at: http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/ICD10Volume2_en_2010.pdf?ua=1. Accessed on: 14 June 2021.
60. WHO, UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme. Sanitation. Available at <http://washdata.org/monitoring/sanitation>. Accessed on: 26 August 2019.

Box 1: Outcome variables¹

Continuous outcomes	Categorical outcomes
Birth size and duration of gestation	
Birth weight (g), weight-for-age z score (WAZ)	Low birth weight (LBW) < 2500 g (59), Birth weight < 2000 g
Weight-for-gestational age z-score (WGAZ)	Small-for-gestational age (SGA) < 10 th percentile (24)
	Large-for-gestational age (LGA) > 90 th percentile (24)
Birth length (cm), length-for-age z score (LAZ)	Newborn stunting, LAZ < -2 SD (22)
Length-for-gestational age z-score (LGAZ)	Low LGAZ (LGAZ < -2 SD) (24)
BMI-for-age z-score (BMIZ) ²	Newborn wasting, BMIZ < -2 SD (22)
Birth head circumference (cm), head circumference-for-age z score (HCZ)	Small head circumference, HCZ < -2 SD (23)
Head circumference-for-gestational age z score (HCGAZ)	Low HCGAZ, HCGAZ < -2 SD (2)
Mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC, cm)	
Duration of gestation (wk)	Preterm birth (duration of gestation < 37 wk)
Anthropometric outcomes at 6 months of age	
Weight-for-age Z score (WAZ)	Underweight, WAZ < -2 SD (22)
Length-for-age Z score (LAZ)	Stunting, LAZ < -2 SD (22)
Weight-for-length Z score (WLZ)	Wasting, WLZ < -2 SD (22)
Head circumference-for-age Z score (HCZ)	Small head circumference, HCZ < -2 SD (23)
MUAC-for-age Z score (MUACZ)	Low MUAC, MUACZ < -2 SD or MUAC < 125 mm (23)
	Acute malnutrition, WLZ < -2 SD or MUAC < 125 mm (22)
Adverse outcomes	
	Cesarian-section
	Miscarriage, embryo or fetal death < 28 weeks (59)
	Stillbirth, fetal death ≥ 28 weeks gestation (59)
	Early neonatal mortality ≤ 7 days (59)
	Neonatal mortality ≤ 28 days (59)
	Infant mortality < 6 months

¹ BMIZ, BMI-for-age z-score; HCGAZ, head circumference-for-gestational age z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; LBW, low birth weight; LGA, large-for-gestational age; LGAZ, length-for-gestational age z-score; MUAC, mid-upper arm circumference; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference-for-age z-score; SGA, small-for-gestational age; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; WGAZ, weight-for-gestational age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score

² BMIZ is used as a proxy for weight-for-length z-score because the latter is not calculated for children with lengths < 45 cm (22).

Box 2: Potential effect modifiers¹

Individual-level child, maternal and household effect modifiers
Child <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sex (female vs. male)• Birth order (first born vs. later born)
Maternal <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maternal height (< 150.1 cm vs. \geq 150.1 cm)²• Maternal BMI (< 20 kg/m² vs. \geq 20 kg/m²)³• Maternal age (< 25 y vs. \geq 25 y)• Maternal education (no formal or incomplete primary vs. complete primary or greater)• Baseline anemia status (Hb \geq 110 g/L vs. < 110 g/L)• Baseline inflammation status (CRP \leq 5 mg/L and AGP \leq 1 g/L vs. not)• Baseline malaria status (positive rapid test for malaria vs. negative test)• Gestational age at start of supplementation (< 14 wk vs. \geq 14 wk)• Compliance with supplementation (\geq 4 d/wk vs. < 4 d/wk)⁴
Household <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Household socio-economic status (< study median vs. \geq study median)⁵• Household food security (moderate to severe food insecurity vs. mild to secure)• Sanitation (unimproved vs. improved)⁶

¹ Comparisons follow the format nonreference vs. reference category. AGP, α -1-acid glycoprotein; CRP, C-reactive protein; Hb, hemoglobin. Some potential effect modifiers that were listed in the statistical analysis plan were not included: maternal marital status was dropped because of insufficient variation; maternal depression was dropped because it was evaluated only at 6 mo postpartum; source water quality was not included because there was little variation in two of the eligible trials; season at time of conception was not included because the seasonal factors that may influence pregnancy outcomes (rainy/dry, harvest/hungry, heat stress) do not always coincide and a 9-month pregnancy involves exposure to several seasons at different stages of pregnancy.

² Cutoff is -2 SD for height at 19 years of age: https://www.who.int/growthref/hfa_girls_5_19years_z.pdf?ua=1

³ When a pre-pregnancy weight measurement was not available, we estimated weight back to the 9th week of gestation using a restricted cubic spline model regressing baseline weight on gestational age at enrollment with 4 knots based on quintiles in the study's full dataset.

⁴ Cutoff of > 4 d/wk chosen to accommodate the categorical variable for compliance used in the Bangladesh trial (32), which had only these choices: “did not take at all,” “used to take sometimes (1–3 d/wk),” “used to take almost every day (4–6 d/wk),” “used to take regularly every day,” and “other.”

⁵ Based on a study-defined, study-specific assets index

⁶ Improved sanitation includes flush/pour flush to piped sewer system, septic tanks or pit latrines; ventilated improved pit latrines, composting toilets or pit latrines with slabs (60); see Supplemental Table 2, based on baseline data

Table 1. Characteristics of trials included in the individual participant data analysis¹

Country, years of study, study name, N, trial design, (author date)	Maternal Intervention Groups	Comparisons		Maternal Characteristics at enrollment				
		SQ-LNS vs. control	SQ-LNS vs. MMS	Gestational age (wk)	Maternal age (y)	Maternal pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	Nulliparous (%)	Moderately or severely food insecure (%)
Bangladesh, 2011-2015, RDNS, N=4011, cluster RCT; longitudinal follow-up (Mridha 2016) (32)	SQ-LNS from < 20 weeks gestation to 6 mo post-partum	✓		13.1 (3.8)	22.0 (5.0)	20.1 (2.7)	39.7	38.2
	IFA from < 20 weeks gestation to 3 mo post-partum ²	✓						
Ghana, 2009-2014, iLiNS-DYAD-G, N=1320, RCT; longitudinal follow-up (Adu-Afarwuah 2015) (33)	SQ-LNS from < 20 weeks gestation to 6 mo post-partum	✓	✓	16.2 (3.3)	26.5 (5.3)	23.9 (4.3)	36.8	29.7
	IFA from < 20 weeks gestation to delivery, low-dose Ca from delivery to 6 mo post-partum	✓						
	MMS from < 20 weeks gestation to 6 mo post-partum		✓					
Malawi, 2011-2014, iLiNS-DYAD-M, N= 1391 ³ , RCT, longitudinal follow-up (Ashorn 2015) (34)	SQ-LNS from < 20 weeks gestation to 6 mo post-partum ⁴	✓	✓	16.8 (2.1)	25.1 (6.2)	20.5 (2.7)	20.6	66.2
	IFA from < 20 weeks gestation to delivery, low-dose Ca from delivery to 6 mo post-partum ⁴	✓						
	MMS from < 20 weeks gestation to 6 mo post-partum ⁴		✓					
Guatemala, 2013 - 2017 Women First ⁵ , N = 1808 ⁶ RCT, longitudinal follow-up (Hambidge 2019) (35)	SQ-LNS from ≥ 3 months pre-conception to delivery	(✓) ⁷		11.9 (2.0)	24.4 (4.3)	25.4 (4.1)	6.3	-
	SQ-LNS from start of 2 nd trimester (12-14 weeks) to delivery	✓						
	standard of care (SOC)	✓						

¹IFA, iron and folic acid supplements; LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement; RCT, randomized controlled trial

²In 3 study arms of the RDNS trial, women received IFA during pregnancy and for 3 months post-partum (these study arms differed in that index children received one of 3 different child supplements from 6-24 months); for the purpose of these analyses, these study arms were combined and compared with the maternal SQ-LNS arm.

³Total number enrolled in Malawi was 1391. 869 women were assigned to the complete intervention and 18-month follow-up. 522 women were assigned to pregnancy supplementation only, with simplified follow-up.

⁴Interventions noted in the table were provided to women assigned to the complete intervention cohort. Women in the simplified follow-up received supplements (SQ-LNS, IFA or MMS) from ≤ 20 weeks of gestation to delivery only.

⁵The Women First trial provided a protein-energy supplement (in addition to SQ-LNS) to enrolled women who were either underweight or who had inadequate gestational weight gain. In 3 of the 4 study sites (Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, and Pakistan), >90% of enrolled women received this supplement in addition to SQ-LNS. Therefore, only the Guatemala site is included in these analyses (where < 10% of enrolled women received a protein-energy supplement in addition to SQ-LNS).

⁶Total number enrolled (prior to conception) was 1808 in Guatemala; the number of live births for data analysis was 651 (193 in the preconception arm, 229 in the pregnancy arm, 229 in the SOC arm).

⁷The study arm that provided pre-conception SQ-LNS was excluded from the primary comparisons; results including this arm are presented in supplemental materials.

Table 2. Main effects of maternal SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC on birth outcomes¹

Birth outcome	Number of participants (trials)	SQ-LNS events per 1000	IFA/SOC events per 1000	MD or RR plus difference in events per 1000 (95% CI)²	P value³	Heterogeneity <i>I</i>²	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)
Birth weight (g)	5273 (4)	-	-	48.7 (26.1, 71.2)	<0.001	0.00	Moderate
Weight-for-age z score (WAZ)	5273 (4)	-	-	0.12 (0.06, 0.17)	<0.001	0.00	Moderate
Weight-for-gestational age z-score (WGAZ) ⁴	1717 (3)	-	-	0.13 (0.05, 0.21)	0.001	0.31	Moderate
Low birth weight (LBW)	5273 (4)	168	198	0.89 (0.80, 0.99) -28.6 (-51.3, -5.9)	0.033 0.013	0.00 0.00	Moderate
Birth weight < 2 kg	5273 (4)	25	35	0.78 (0.60, 1.01) -9.1 (-18.5, 0.2)	0.062 0.054	0.00 0.00	Moderate
Small-for-gestational age (SGA)	5181 (4)	303	335	0.96 (0.92, 1.01) -23.0 (-46.7, 0.7)	0.133 0.057	0.00 0.00	Moderate
Large-for-gestational age (LGA)	4834 (3)	20	23	1.00 (0.61, 1.65) 1.1 (-3.1, 5.3)	0.984 0.611	0.00 0.00	Moderate
Birth length (cm)	5014 (4)	-	-	0.20 (0.09, 0.31)	<0.001	0.00	Moderate
Length-for-age z score (LAZ)	5014 (4)	-	-	0.11 (0.06, 0.17)	<0.001	0.00	Moderate
Length-for-gestational age z-score (LGAZ) ⁴	1460 (3)	-	-	0.13 (0.05, 0.21)	0.002	0.00	Moderate
Newborn stunting	5014 (4)	138	164	0.83 (0.74, 0.93) -32.2 (-51.5, -12.9)	0.001 0.001	0.00 0.00	Moderate
Low LGAZ	4922 (4)	118	127	0.90 (0.80, 1.01) -12.0 (-29.6, 5.6)	0.082 0.182	0.00 0.00	Moderate
BMI-for-age z-score (BMIZ)	5002 (4)	-	-	0.10 (0.04, 0.16)	0.002	0.00	Moderate
Low BMIZ	5002 (4)	123	145	0.89 (0.81, 0.98) -23.6 (-42.7, -4.5)	0.022 0.015	0.26 0.20	Moderate
Head circumference (cm)	5016 (4)	-	-	0.11 (0.04, 0.18)	0.002	0.00	Moderate
Head circumference-for-age z-score (HCZ)	5016 (4)	-	-	0.10 (0.04, 0.16)	0.001	0.00	Moderate
Head circumference-for-gestational age z-score (HCGAZ) ⁴	1461 (3)	-	-	0.11 (0.02, 0.20)	0.019	0.00	Moderate
Low HCZ	5016 (4)	100	118	0.85 (0.75, 0.96) -22.1 (-40.5, -3.7)	0.009 0.019	0.00 0.00	Moderate

Low HCGAZ	4924 (4)	54	64	0.88 (0.76, 1.01) -6.4 (-18.4, 5.5)	0.072 0.291	0.00 0.32	Moderate
Mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) (cm)	4581 (3)	-	-	0.08 (0.02, 0.14)	0.009	0.00	Moderate
Duration of gestation (wk)	5348 (4)	-	-	0.12 (0.01, 0.24)	0.040	0.00	Moderate
Preterm birth	5348 (4)	106	111	0.94 (0.80, 1.10) -7.1 (-25.8, 11.5)	0.445 0.454	0.00 0.00	Moderate

¹BMIZ, BMI-for-age z-score; GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; HCGAZ, head circumference-for-gestational age z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score; IFA, iron and folic acid supplement; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; LBW, low birth weight; LGA, large-for-gestational age; LGAZ, length-for-gestational age z-score; MD, mean difference; MUAC, mid-upper arm circumference; RR, relative risk; SGA, small-for-gestational age; SOC, standard of care; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; WGAZ, weight-for-gestational age z-score

²For continuous outcomes, values are MDs: LNS – IFA/SOC (95% CIs). For binary outcomes, values are RRs: LNS compared with IFA/SOC (95% CIs). Difference in events per 1000 was calculated using the prevalence difference (95% CI) and multiplying by 1000.

³The P value column corresponds to the pooled main effect 2-sided superiority testing of the intervention effect estimate and 95% CI presented in the preceding column. I^2 describes the percentage of variability in effect estimates that may be due to heterogeneity rather than chance. Roughly, 0.3 – 0.6 may be considered moderate heterogeneity.

⁴ For continuous outcomes based on INTERGROWTH-21st standards, we excluded participants without ultrasound data for calculation of gestational age. For the corresponding binary outcomes (SGA, LGA, Low LGAZ, Low HCGAZ), we retained participants without ultrasound dating but conducted a sensitivity analysis in which they were excluded.

Table 3. Main effects of maternal SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC on infant anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo of age¹

Infant anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo	Number of participants (trials)	SQ-LNS events per 1000	IFA/SOC events per 1000	MD or PR plus difference in events per 1000 (95% CI) ²	P value ³	Heterogeneity <i>I</i> ²	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)
Weight-for-age z-score (WAZ)	5029 (4)	-	-	0.05 (-0.02, 0.13)	0.173	0.00	Moderate
Underweight	5029 (4)	114	132	0.85 (0.73, 0.99) -22.1 (-41.8, -2.5)	0.041 0.027	0.41 0.37	Moderate
Length-for-age z-score (LAZ)	5032 (4)	-	-	0.06 (-0.01, 0.13)	0.080	0.02	Moderate
Stunted	5032 (4)	198	219	0.90 (0.80, 1.02) -17.4 (-43.3, 8.5)	0.102 0.187	0.00 0.00	Moderate
Weight-for-length z-score (WLZ)	5028 (4)	-	-	0.00 (-0.07, 0.07)	0.969	0.00	Moderate
Wasted	5028 (4)	24	32	0.91 (0.66, 1.25) -6.3 (-15.8, 3.1)	0.558 0.191	0.39 0.36	Moderate
Head circumference-for-age z-score (HCZ)	5028 (4)	-	-	0.01 (-0.05, 0.07)	0.679	0.00	Moderate
Low HCZ	5028 (4)	110	125	0.90 (0.80, 1.02) -13.2 (-31.9, 5.4)	0.098 0.164	0.00 0.00	Moderate
MUAC-for-age z-score (MUACZ)	4600 (3)	-	-	0.00 (-0.07, 0.08)	0.949	0.00	Moderate
Low MUAC [MUACZ < -2 SD or MUAC < 125 mm]	4600 (3)	68	64	1.00 (0.78, 1.29) -0.1 (-17.9, 17.7)	0.970 0.993	0.00 0.00	Moderate
Acute malnutrition [WLZ < -2 SD or MUAC < 125 mm]	4595 (3)	80	82	1.00 (0.79, 1.25) -0.7 (-19.4, 17.9)	0.970 0.938	0.00 0.00	Moderate

¹GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score; IFA, iron and folic acid supplement; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; MD, mean difference; MUAC, mid-upper arm circumference; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference-for-age z-score; PR, prevalence ratio; SOC, standard of care; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score²For continuous outcomes, values are MDs: LNS – IFA/SOC (95% CIs). For binary outcomes, values are PRs: LNS compared with IFA/SOC (95% CIs). Difference in events per 1000 was calculated using the prevalence difference (95% CI) and multiplying by 1000.

³The P value column corresponds to the pooled main effect 2-sided superiority testing of the intervention effect estimate and 95% CI presented in the preceding column. *I*² describes the percentage of variability in effect estimates that may be due to heterogeneity rather than chance. Roughly, 0.3 – 0.6 may be considered moderate heterogeneity.

Table 4. Main effects of maternal SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC on adverse outcomes¹

Adverse outcomes	Number of participants (trials)	SQ-LNS events per 1000	IFA/SOC events per 1000	RR and difference in events per 1000 (95% CI) ²	P value ³	Heterogeneity <i>I</i> ²	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)
Cesarian-Section	5693 (4)	167	156	1.04 (0.90, 1.19) 18.6 (-3.6, 40.9)	0.595 0.101	0.42 0.01	Moderate
Miscarriage	6102 (4)	49	59	0.87 (0.70, 1.08) 0.7 (-7.1, 8.6)	0.213 0.852	0.00 0.27	Moderate
Stillbirth	6102 (4)	24	18	1.31 (0.90, 1.91) 7.1 (-1.7, 15.9)	0.153 0.116	0.49 0.53	Moderate
Miscarriage or stillbirth	6102 (4)	75	77	0.98 (0.81, 1.19) 1.4 (-12.3, 15.1)	0.870 0.844	0.39 0.40	Moderate
Early neonatal mortality	5506 (4)	14	20	0.74 (0.46, 1.19) -4.8 (-13.2, 3.7)	0.208 0.272	0.04 0.22	Moderate
Miscarriage or stillbirth or early neonatal mortality	6102 (4)	89	97	0.93 (0.77, 1.12) -6.6 (-23.4, 10.3)	0.452 0.444	0.00 0.00	Moderate
Neonatal mortality	5528 (4)	21	25	0.83 (0.56, 1.24) -2.9 (-12.3, 6.6)	0.360 0.551	0.00 0.10	Moderate
Mortality 0-6 mo	5566 (4)	30	32	0.95 (0.69, 1.30) -0.6 (-11.0, 9.8)	0.739 0.913	0.00 0.00	Moderate

¹GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; IFA, iron and folic acid supplement; RR, relative risk; SOC, standard of care; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement

²Values are RRs: LNS compared with IFA/SOC (95% CIs). Difference in events per 1000 was calculated using the prevalence difference (95% CI) and multiplying by 1000.

³The P value column corresponds to the pooled main effect 2-sided superiority testing of the intervention effect estimate and 95% CI presented in the preceding column. *I*² describes the percentage of variability in effect estimates that may be due to heterogeneity rather than chance. Roughly, 0.3 – 0.6 may be considered moderate heterogeneity.

Table 5. Main effects of maternal SQ-LNS vs MMS on birth outcomes¹

Birth outcome	Number of participants (trials)	SQ-LNS events per 1000	MMS events per 1000	MD or RR plus difference in events per 1000 (95% CI)²	P value³	Heterogeneity <i>I</i>²	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)
Birth weight (g)	1391 (2)	-	-	27.8 (-19.1, 74.6)	0.245	0.00	Low
Weight-for-age z score (WAZ)	1391 (2)	-	-	0.06 (-0.05, 0.17)	0.263	0.00	Low
Weight-for-gestational age z-score (WGAZ)	1377 (2)	-	-	0.06 (-0.05, 0.16)	0.294	0.00	Low
Low birth weight (LBW)	1391 (2)	105	119	0.88 (0.66, 1.18) -14.2 (-47.3, 18.8)	0.397 0.399	0.00 0.00	Low
Birth weight < 2 kg	1391 (2)	19	19	1.07 (0.52, 2.23) -1.1 (-15.1, 12.9)	0.850 0.877	0.00 0.00	Low
Small-for-gestational age (SGA)	1391 (2)	214	224	0.96 (0.79, 1.17) -9.3 (-52.7, 34.2)	0.717 0.677	0.00 0.00	Low
Large-for-gestational age (LGA)	1391 (2)	32	28	1.16 (0.64, 2.10) 5.2 (-12.6, 23.1)	0.622 0.564	0.00 0.00	Low
Birth length (cm)	1137 (2)	-	-	0.16 (-0.09, 0.40)	0.209	0.00	Low
Length-for-age z score (LAZ)	1137 (2)	-	-	0.07 (-0.05, 0.20)	0.247	0.00	Low
Length-for-gestational age z-score (LGAZ)	1123 (2)	-	-	0.08 (-0.04, 0.20)	0.214	0.00	Low
Newborn stunting	1137 (2)	118	110	1.06 (0.77, 1.47) 5.5 (-31.3, 42.3)	0.710 0.770	0.00 0.00	Low
Low LGAZ	1137 (2)	109	88	1.22 (0.85, 1.74) 11.8 (-19.6, 43.2)	0.276 0.463	0.00 0.01	Low
BMI-for-age z-score (BMIZ)	1121 (2)	-	-	0.01 (-0.12, 0.14)	0.830	0.00	Low
Low BMIZ	1121 (2)	67	68	0.99 (0.64, 1.53) -1.2 (-30.8, 28.5)	0.964 0.939	0.30 0.30	Low
Head circumference (cm)	1138 (2)	-	-	0.14 (-0.02, 0.31)	0.088	0.08	Low
Head circumference-for-age z-score (HCZ)	1138 (2)	-	-	0.11 (-0.02, 0.24)	0.109	0.00	Low
Head circumference-for-gestational age z-score (HCGAZ)	1124 (2)	-	-	0.11 (-0.01, 0.23)	0.066	0.00	Low
Low HCZ	1138 (2)	56	43	1.27 (0.77, 2.10) 12.3 (-13.0, 37.6)	0.352 0.341	0.00 0.00	Low
Low HCGAZ	1138 (2)	16	17	0.85 (0.35, 2.05) -1.6 (-16.6, 13.4)	0.711 0.831	0.00 0.00	Low
Mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) (cm)	1142 (2)	-	-	0.08 (-0.02, 0.18)	0.127	0.00	Low
Duration of gestation (wk)	1539 (2)	-	-	-0.04 (-0.27, 0.20)	0.771	0.00	Low

Preterm birth	1539 (2)	99	79	1.21 (0.88, 1.66) 18.4 (-10.2, 47.0)	0.244 0.206	0.00 0.00	Low
---------------	----------	----	----	---	----------------	--------------	-----

¹BMIZ, BMI-for-age z-score; GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; HCGAZ, head circumference-for-gestational age z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; LBW, low birth weight; LGA, large-for-gestational age; LGAZ, length-for-gestational age z-score; MD, mean difference; MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; MUAC, mid-upper arm circumference; RR, relative risk; SGA, small-for-gestational age; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; WGAZ, weight-for-gestational age z-score

²For continuous outcomes, values are MDs: LNS – MMS (95% CIs). For binary outcomes, values are RRs: LNS compared with MMS (95% CIs). Difference in events per 1000 was calculated using the prevalence difference (95% CI) and multiplying by 1000.

³The P value column corresponds to the pooled main effect 2-sided superiority testing of the intervention effect estimate and 95% CI presented in the preceding column. I^2 describes the percentage of variability in effect estimates that may be due to heterogeneity rather than chance. Roughly, 0.3 – 0.6 may be considered moderate heterogeneity.

Table 6. Main effects of maternal SQ-LNS vs MMS on infant anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo of age¹

Infant anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo	Number of participants (trials)	SQ-LNS events per 1000	MMS events per 1000	MD or PR plus difference in events per 1000 (95% CI) ²	P value ³	Heterogeneity <i>I</i> ²	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)
Weight-for-age z-score (WAZ)	1292 (2)	-	-	-0.01 (-0.14, 0.11)	0.827	0.00	Low
Underweight	1292 (2)	85	75	1.13 (0.78, 1.64) 9.5 (-20.2, 39.2)	0.510 0.531	0.00 0.00	Low
Length-for-age z-score (LAZ)	1289 (2)	-	-	0.02 (-0.10, 0.13)	0.792	0.00	Low
Stunted	1289 (2)	166	155	1.05 (0.83, 1.34) 13.7 (-25.0, 52.5)	0.673 0.487	0.00 0.00	Low
Weight-for-length z-score (WLZ)	1288 (2)	-	-	-0.04 (-0.16, 0.09)	0.551	0.00	Low
Wasted	1288 (2)	24	23	0.97 (0.48, 1.97) 0.2 (-16.4, 16.9)	0.943 0.977	0.00 0.00	Low
Head circumference-for-age z-score (HCZ)	1293 (2)	-	-	-0.03 (-0.13, 0.08)	0.636	0.00	Low
Low HCZ	1293 (2)	63	81	0.77 (0.52, 1.15) -18.0 (-46.2, 10.2)	0.203 0.211	0.00 0.00	Low
MUAC-for-age z-score (MUACZ)	1293 (2)	-	-	-0.02 (-0.14, 0.10)	0.727	0.00	Low
Low MUACZ [MUACZ < -2 SD or MUAC < 125 mm]	1293 (2)	66	74	0.92 (0.62, 1.36) -6.8 (-34.6, 21.1)	0.672 0.633	0.00 0.00	Low
Acute malnutrition [WLZ < -2 SD or MUAC < 125 mm]	1288 (2)	75	77	0.98 (0.67, 1.43) -1.9 (-31.0, 27.2)	0.918 0.899	0.00 0.00	Low

¹GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; MD, mean difference; MUAC, mid-upper arm circumference; MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference-for-age z-score; PR, prevalence ratio; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score

²For continuous outcomes, values are MDs: LNS – MMS (95% CIs). For binary outcomes, values are PRs: LNS compared with MMS (95% CIs). Difference in events per 1000 was calculated using the prevalence difference (95% CI) and multiplying by 1000.

³The P value column corresponds to the pooled main effect 2-sided superiority testing of the intervention effect estimate and 95% CI presented in the preceding column. *I*² describes the percentage of variability in effect estimates that may be due to heterogeneity rather than chance. Roughly, 0.3 – 0.6 may be considered moderate heterogeneity.

Table 7. Main effects of maternal SQ-LNS vs MMS on adverse outcomes¹

Adverse outcomes	Number of participants (trials)	SQ-LNS events per 1000	MMS events per 1000	RR and difference in events per 1000 (95% CI) ²	P value ³	Heterogeneity <i>I</i> ²	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)
Cesarian-Section	1491 (2)	129	103	1.25 (0.94, 1.66) 27.0 (-2.1, 56.2)	0.125 0.069	0.00 0.00	Low
Miscarriage	1566 (2)	16	16	1.00 (0.47, 2.13) -0.1 (-11.3, 11.2)	0.994 0.991	0.00 0.00	Low
Stillbirth	1566 (2)	21	11	1.57 (0.61, 4.03) 9.9 (-2.9, 22.7)	0.344 0.129	0.85 0.87	Low
Miscarriage or stillbirth	1566 (2)	39	28	1.33 (0.76, 2.34) 14.7 (-2.9, 32.2)	0.320 0.102	0.79 0.73	Low
Early neonatal mortality	1470 (2)	19	17	0.96 (0.44, 2.09) 4.0 (-9.1, 17.2)	0.924 0.550	0.61 0.59	Low
Miscarriage or stillbirth or early neonatal mortality	1566 (2)	57	46	1.24 (0.81, 1.91) 11.3 (-10.7, 33.3)	0.321 0.313	0.00 0.00	Low
Neonatal mortality	1473 (2)	23	19	1.05 (0.52, 2.10) 4.5 (-9.9, 19.0)	0.896 0.537	0.47 0.38	Low
Mortality 0-6 mo	1483 (2)	30	28	1.00 (0.56, 1.78) 4.6 (-11.7, 20.9)	0.988 0.584	0.43 0.33	Low

¹GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; MMS, multiple micronutrient supplement; RR, relative risk; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement

²Values are RRs: LNS compared with MMS (95% CIs). Difference in events per 1000 was calculated using the prevalence difference (95% CI) and multiplying by 1000.

³The P value column corresponds to the pooled main effect 2-sided superiority testing of the intervention effect estimate and 95% CI presented in the preceding column. *I*² describes the percentage of variability in effect estimates that may be due to heterogeneity rather than chance. Roughly, 0.3 – 0.6 may be considered moderate heterogeneity.

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Study flow diagram. IFA, iron and folic acid supplements; IPD, individual participant data; MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; RCT, randomized controlled trial; SOC, standard of care; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements.


Figures 2A-F: Forest plots of effect of SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC on birth weight, LBW, newborn LAZ, newborn HCZ, newborn BMIZ and duration of gestation. BMIZ, body mass index z-score; HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score; IFA, iron and folic acid; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; LBW, low birthweight; MD, mean difference; RR, relative risk; SOC, standard of care; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements. Individual study estimates were generated from log-binomial regression for binary outcomes and linear regression for continuous outcomes controlling for baseline measure when available and using robust standard errors for cluster-randomized trials. Pooled estimates were generated using inverse-variance weighting with both fixed and random effects.

Figures 3A-J: Pooled effects of SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC on birth outcomes, stratified by selected effect modifiers. LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; P-for-interaction, p-value for the interaction indicating the difference in effects of SQ-LNS between the two levels of the effect modifier; PR, prevalence ratio; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements.

Individual study estimates (not shown) were generated from log-binomial regression for binary outcomes and linear regression for continuous outcomes controlling for baseline measure when available and using robust standard errors for cluster-randomized trials. Pooled estimates (shown here) were generated using inverse-variance weighting with fixed effects.


Figures 4A,B: Pooled effects of SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC on anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo of age, stratified by infant sex. LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; P-for-interaction, p-value for the interaction indicating the difference in effects of SQ-LNS between the two levels of the effect modifier; PR, prevalence ratio; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements. Individual study estimates (not shown) were generated from log-binomial regression for binary outcomes and linear regression for continuous outcomes controlling for baseline measure when available and using robust standard errors for cluster-randomized trials. Pooled estimates (shown here) were generated using inverse-variance weighting with fixed effects.

Figures 5A-C: Forest plots of effect of SQ-LNS vs MMS on birth weight, newborn LAZ, and newborn HCZ. HCZ, head circumference-for-age z-score; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; MD, mean difference; MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements. Individual study estimates were generated from log-binomial regression for binary outcomes and linear regression for continuous outcomes controlling for baseline measure when available and using robust standard errors for cluster-randomized trials. Pooled estimates were generated using inverse-variance weighting with both fixed and random effects.



A)


Birth weight



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.17.24307546>; this version posted May 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).


B)

Low birth weight




C)

Newborn LAZ




D)

Newborn HCZ




E)

Newborn BMIZ




F)

Pregnancy duration (weeks)




Birth outcomes stratified by selected effect modifiers, SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC


A) Sex




B) Sex




C) Maternal BMI




D) Maternal BMI




E) Maternal age




F) Maternal age




G) Maternal inflammation




H) Maternal inflammation



I) Food insecurity




J) Food insecurity




Anthropometric outcomes at 6 mo stratified by infant sex, SQ-LNS vs IFA/SOC

A)




B)



A)


Birth weight



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.17.24307546>; this version posted May 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

B)

Newborn LAZ



C)

Newborn HCZ

