

Supplemental Table 1: Description of each study included in the analysis, outcomes assessed, and the analytic contrasts in which they were included

Country	Author	Trial Name	Years of trial	Intervention Groups	Trial design	Infant Supplementation		Selection of Developmental Sub-sample	Developmental Assessment Tools Used				Analysis Contrasts					
						Age at start	Duration		Language	Social-Emotional	Motor	Executive Function	All-trials analysis	Child-only-LNS analysis	Separation of multi-component interventions LNS	Exclusion of passive control LNS		
Bangladesh	Christian 2015 (21)	JiVITA-4	2012-2014	Plumpy'Doz <sup>2</sup> + IYCF counseling	cluster RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6 mo	12 mo	Full sample	BSID-III	BSID-III	LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS				
				Chickpea based LNS + IYCF counseling							LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS				
				Rice-lentil LNS + IYCF counseling							LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS				
				Wheat-soy blend (+++) + IYCF counseling							control	control	control	control				
				IYCF counseling only (Control)														
Bangladesh	Dewey 2017 (22, 37)	RDNS	2011-2015	LNS-LNS: maternal SQ-LNS during pregnancy and 6 mo post-partum, child SQ-LNS 6-24 mo	cluster RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6 mo	18 mo	Full sample	CDI	DMC	DMC	A not B task	LNS	control	control	control		
				IFA-LNS: maternal IFA during pregnancy and 3 mo post-partum, child SQ-LNS 6-24 mo									LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS		
				IFA-MNP: maternal IFA during pregnancy and 3 mo post-partum, child MNP 6-24 mo									control	control	control	control		
				IFA-Control: maternal IFA during pregnancy and 3 mo post-partum, no child supplementation														
Bangladesh	Luby 2018 (23, 38)	WASH-B	2012-2015	Nutrition: SQ-LNS + IYCF counseling	cluster RCT; cross-sectional surveys	6 mo	18 mo	Full sample	CDI	EASQ	EASQ	A not B task	LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS		
				Water: family received chlorine for drinking water									control	control	control	control		
				Sanitation: family received upgraded latrine, sani-scoop and child potty									control	control	control	control		
				Handwashing: family received handwashing stations with soap									control	control	control	control		
				WASH: family received all water, sanitation and hygiene interventions									control	control	control	control		
				WASH + nutrition: all water, sanitation, hygiene and nutrition interventions														
				Passive control (no intervention)														
Burkina Faso	Hess 2015 (24, 39)	ILINS-Zinc	2010-2012	LNS-Zn0: SQ-LNS containing 0 mg/d Zn and placebo tablet <sup>3</sup>	cluster RCT; longitudinal follow-up	9 mo	9 mo	A subsample of 446 children from the passive control group and 980 children from 3 of the 4 SQ-LNS groups (LNS-Zn0, LNS-Zn10, and LNS-TabZn5) were randomly selected for motor, language, and personal-social assessment at 18 mo of age. This selection was accomplished through a specialized SAS program (SAS Institute), which randomly assigned children to be assessed or not assessed within treatment group and time block. Children from 3 of 4 SQ-LNS groups were chosen because constraints on personnel resources precluded the assessment of all children. Thus, we targeted the minimum dose of zinc (LNS-Zn0), the maximum dose of zinc (LNS-Zn10), the positive control group (LNS-TabZn5), and the passive control group. The middle dose of zinc (LNS-Zn5) was not included in the developmental assessment subsample (DS).	DMC	DMC	DMC	LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS	control		
				LNS-Zn5: SQ-LNS containing 5 mg/d Zn and placebo tablet									LNS	LNS	LNS	control		
				LNS-Zn10: SQ-LNS containing 10 mg/d Zn and placebo tablet									LNS	LNS	LNS	control		
				LNS-TabZn5: SQ-LNS containing 0 mg/d Zn and Zn tablet containing 5 mg/d Zn									LNS	LNS	LNS	control		
				Passive control (no intervention)														
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2007 (25)		2004-2005	SQ-LNS	RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6 mo	6 mo	Full sample					LNS	LNS	LNS	control		
				MNF									control	control	control	control		
				Nutritabs (MMN)									control	control	control	control		
				Passive control (no intervention)									control	control	control	control		
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2016 (26, 40)	ILINS-DYAD	2009-2014	LNS: maternal SQ-LNS during pregnancy and 6 mo post-partum, child SQ-LNS 6-18 mo	RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6 mo	12 mo	Full sample	CDI	PSED	KDI	A not B task	LNS	control	control	control		
				MMN: maternal MMN during pregnancy and 6 mo post-partum, no child supplementation									control	control	control	control		
				IFA: maternal IFA during pregnancy and placebo for 6 mo post-partum, no child supplementation									control	control	control	control		
Haiti	Iannotti 2014 <sup>4</sup> (27, 41)		2011-2012	SQ-LNS for 6 mo	RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6 mo	11 mo	Full sample	Total vowel and consonant sounds				LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS		
				Active control (standard of care)									control	control	control	control		
Kenya	Null 2018 (28, 42)	WASH-B	2012-2016	Nutrition: SQ-LNS + IYCF counseling	cluster RCT; cross-sectional surveys	6 mo	18 mo	Full sample	EASQ	EASQ	EASQ		LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS		
				Water: family received chlorine for drinking water									control	control	control	control		
				Sanitation: family received upgraded latrine, sani-scoop and child potty									control	control	control	control		
				Handwashing: family received handwashing stations with soap									control	control	control	control		
				WASH: family received all water, sanitation and hygiene interventions									control	control	control	control		

				WASH + nutrition: all water, sanitation, hygiene and nutrition interventions Passive control (no intervention)							LNS	LNS	LNS-WSH	LNS	
				Active control (visits to measure MUAC)							control	control	control	control	
Madagascar	Galasso 2019 (29)	MAHAY	2014-2016	T4: early child stimulation + IYCF counseling  T3: maternal SQ-LNS during pregnancy and 6 mo post-partum, child SQ-LNS 6-18 mo + IYCF counseling  T2: child SQ-LNS 6-18 mo + IYCF counseling  T1: IYCF counseling  T0: Control (standard of care)	cluster RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6-11 mo	6-12 mo	Full sample	ASQI	ASQI	ASQI	-----	-----	-----	-----
											LNS	-----	-----	-----	
											LNS	LNS	LNS	LNS	
											control	control	control	control	
											control	control	control	control	
Malawi	Ashorn 2015 (30, 43)	ILINS-DYAD	2011-2014	LNS: maternal SQ-LNS during pregnancy and 6 mo post-partum, child SQ-LNS 6-18 mo MMN: maternal MMN during pregnancy and 6 mo post-partum, no child supplementation IFA: maternal IFA during pregnancy and placebo for 6 mo post-partum, no child supplementation	RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6 mo	12 mo	Full sample	CDI	PSED	KDI	A not B task	LNS	-----	-----
													control	-----	-----
													control	-----	-----
Malawi	Maleta 2015 <sup>5</sup> (31, 44)	ILINS-DOSE	2009-2012	SQ-LNS containing milk (10 g/d)  SQ-LNS containing milk (20 g/d)  SQ-LNS without milk (20 g/d)  MQ-LNS containing milk (40 g/d)  MQ-LNS without milk (40 g/d)  Active control	RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6 mo	12 mo	Full sample	CDI	PSED	KDI	A not B task	LNS	LNS	LNS
													LNS	LNS	LNS
													LNS	LNS	LNS
													-----	-----	-----
													-----	-----	-----
													control	control	control
Mali	Huybregts 2019 (32)	PROMIS	2015-2017	SQ-LNS + IYCF counseling  Active control (standard of care) + IYCF counseling	cluster RCT; longitudinal follow-up and cross-sectional surveys	6 mo	18 mo	Full sample (Cross-sectional survey only)	DMC	DMC	DMC		LNS	LNS	LNS
													control	control	control
Zimbabwe	Humphrey 2019 (33, 45)  Prendergast 2019 (34, 46)	SHINE <sup>6</sup>	2013-2017	IYCF: child SQ-LNS + IYCF counseling  WASH: family received ventilated improved pit latrine, handwashing stations, soap, chlorine, child play space WASH and IYCF: child SQ-LNS + IYCF counseling, family received ventilated improved pit latrine, handwashing stations, soap, chlorine, child play space Active control (standard of care)	cluster RCT; longitudinal follow-up	6 mo	12 mo	Children were eligible for the ECD substudy if they had the trial primary outcomes (linear growth and hemoglobin) measured at 18 months of age, and turned 2 years of age (allowable range 102–112 weeks) between March 2016 and April 30, 2017.	CDI	MDAT	MDAT	A not B task	LNS	LNS	LNS
													control	control	control-WSH
													LNS	LNS	LNS-WSH
													control	control	control

<sup>1</sup>IFA, iron-folic acid; IYCF: infant and young child feeding; LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplement; MMN: multiple micronutrients; MNP: multiple micronutrient powder; ORS, oral rehydration solution; RUCF, ready-to-use complementary food; SQ-LNS, small quantity lipid-based nutrient supplement; WASH, water sanitation and hygiene; WSB, wheat soy blend; RCT: randomized controlled trial; BSID: Bayley Scales of Infant Development; CDI: MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory; DMC: Developmental Milestones Checklist; EASQ: Extended Ages and Stages Questionnaire; ASQI: Ages and Stages Questionnaire Inventory; KDI: Kilifi Developmental Inventory; MDAT: Malawi Developmental Assessment Tool; PSED: Profile of Social and Emotional Development. Minimal IYCF defined as providing minimal counseling on IYCF other than reinforcing the normal IYCF messages already promoted in that setting. Expanded IYCF defined as providing expanded counseling on IYCF that went beyond the usual messaging.

<sup>2</sup>All supplements were isocaloric, children 6-12 mo received 125 kcal/d, 12-18 mo received 250 kcal/d

<sup>3</sup>All children in the four intervention groups received ORS for diarrhea and treatment for malaria

<sup>4</sup>Trial also included a 3 mo duration intervention arm which is excluded from these analyses as there is no comparable control arm available

<sup>5</sup>Trial is cited as Kumwenda 2014 in Das et al. (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2019)

<sup>6</sup>Trial was designed *a priori* to present results separately for HIV exposed and un-exposed children; thus considered as two comparisons in all analyses and the presentation of results

**Supplemental Table 2. Amount of LNS provided (g/day) and nutrient value (per daily ration)**

	Nutributter <sup>1</sup>	iLiNS Project formulation <sup>2,3</sup>	Revised iLiNS Project formulation <sup>4</sup>	Plumpy'Doz (6-11 mo) <sup>5</sup>	Plumpy'Doz (12-18 mo) <sup>5</sup>	Rice-lentil LNS (6-11 mo) <sup>5</sup>	Rice-lentil LNS (12-18 mo) <sup>5</sup>	Chickpea LNS (6-11 mo) <sup>5</sup>	Chickpea LNS (12-18 mo) <sup>5</sup>
Ration (g/day)	20	20	20	23.2	46.4	25.7	51.4	23.6	47.2
Total energy (kcal)	108	118	118	123.4	246.8	133.9	267.8	128.6	257.2
Protein (g)	2.56	2.6	2.6	2.9	5.9	2.8	5.7	3.5	7.1
Fat (g)	7.08	9.6	9.6	7.9	15.8	6.9	13.9	6.6	13.2
Linoleic acid (g)	1.29	4.46	4.46						
$\alpha$ -Linolenic acid (g)	0.29	0.58	0.58						
Vitamin A ( $\mu$ g RE)	400	400	400	200	400	117.7	235.4	118.5	236.9
Vitamin C (mg)	30	30	30						
Vitamin B1 (mg)	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6
Vitamin B2 (mg)	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.5
Niacin (mg)	4	4	6	2.8	5.6	2.6	5.1	2.4	4.7
Folic acid ( $\mu$ g)	80	80	150	80	160.1	100	199.9	118.2	236.5
Pantothenic acid (mg)	1.8	1.8	2	1	2	1.1	2.2	1	2
Vitamin B6 (mg)	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6
Vitamin B12 ( $\mu$ g)	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.9
Vitamin D (IU) 1 IU = 0.025 $\mu$ g	0	200	200			226.2	452.3	226.6	453.1
Vitamin E (mg)	0	6	6	3	6	4.9	9.8	4.7	9.4
Vitamin K ( $\mu$ g)	0	30	30			11.3	22.6	11.3	22.7
Iron (mg)	9	6	9	4.5	9	3.3	6.7	3.5	7.1
Zinc (mg)	4	8	8	2	4	2.4	4.8	2.5	5.1
Copper (mg)	0.2	0.34	0.34	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.5
Calcium (mg)	100	280	280	193.5	387	208.2	416.3	219.5	439
Phosphorus (mg)	82	190	190	137.6	275.2	61.7	123.4	72.9	145.8
Potassium (mg)	152	200	200	155	310	206.6	413.3	220.7	441.3
Magnesium (mg)	16	40	40	29.9	59.9	41.6	83.3	47.7	95.3
Selenium ( $\mu$ g)	10	20	20	8.6	17.2	7.5	14.9	7.6	15.1
Iodine ( $\mu$ g)	90	90	90	27.6	55.2	33.7	67.3	33.7	67.5
Manganese (mg)	0.08	1.2	1.2	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.9

<sup>1</sup>Provided by Adu-Afarwuah 2007 (26), Iannotti 2014 (27)

<sup>2</sup>Provided by Hess 2015 (24), Adu-Afarwuah 2016 (26), Galasso 2019 (29), Ashorn 2015 (30), Maleta 2015 (31), Huybregts 2019 (32), Humphrey 2019 (33), Prendergast 2019 (34). iLiNS (International Lipid-based Nutrient Supplements) Project formulation described in Arimond et al. 2013.

<sup>3</sup>Hess 2015 (24) provided 0-10 mg zinc/d in the SQ-LNS product, plus a 5 mg/d zinc supplement in one intervention arm. Maleta 2015 provided 10-40 g/d of LNS, with and without milk powder, varying by intervention arm (the 40 g arms were not included in this IPD analysis); the micronutrient composition of the LNS was identical across intervention arms, but there were differences in total kcal, protein, fat, linoleic acid and  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid.

<sup>4</sup>Provided by Dewey 2017 (22), Luby 2018 (23), Null 2018 (28).

<sup>5</sup>Provided by Christian 2015 (21). Product and quantities differed by intervention arm and age.

**Supplemental Table 3:** Descriptive information on potential study-level effect modifiers, by trial

Country	Author	Region	Stunting prevalence at 18 mo (control) (%)	Malaria Prevalence (%)	Anemia Prevalence (%)	Water quality (% improved)	Sanitation (% improved)	Duration of supplementation	Intensity of visitation	Average SQ-LNS compliance (%)	Compliance definition (in the SQ-LNS group)
Bangladesh	Christian 2015 (21)	SEAR	44.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	51.3 <sup>a</sup>	100.0 <sup>a</sup>	77.0 <sup>a</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	93.0 <sup>a</sup>	% of total intended SQ-LNS consumed (quantity * day)
Bangladesh	Dewey 2017 (22)	SEAR	35.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.2 <sup>a</sup>	51.3 <sup>a</sup>	100.0 <sup>a</sup>	71.1 <sup>a</sup>	> 12 mo	Monthly	97.4 <sup>a</sup>	% reporting "high adherence" (≥ 4 days/week)
Bangladesh	Luby 2018 (23)	SEAR	43.4 <sup>b</sup>	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	51.3 <sup>a</sup>	88.5 <sup>a</sup>	94.7 <sup>a</sup>	> 12 mo	Weekly	93.0 <sup>a</sup>	Number of sachets consumed in 14 days prior to annual survey/14
Burkina Faso	Hess 2015 (24)	AFR	39.4 <sup>b</sup>	59.1 <sup>b</sup>	87.8 <sup>b</sup>	26.7 <sup>b</sup>	2.3 <sup>b</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	96.8 <sup>a</sup>	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2007 (25)	AFR	7.3 <sup>a</sup>	37.4 <sup>b</sup>	76.1 <sup>b</sup>	91.9 <sup>a</sup>	91.5 <sup>a</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	88.2 <sup>a</sup>	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2016 (26)	AFR	13.0 <sup>a</sup>	36.8 <sup>b</sup>	57.0 <sup>b</sup>	98.4 <sup>a</sup>	97.3 <sup>a</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	73.5 <sup>b</sup>	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed
Haiti	Iannotti 2014 (27)	AMR	13.4 <sup>a</sup>	0.9 <sup>a</sup>	65.0 <sup>b</sup>	98.7 <sup>a</sup>	94.0 <sup>a</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Monthly	97.0 <sup>a</sup>	Reported consuming all of the monthly supply of the SQ-LNS during the supplementation period
Kenya	Null 2018 (28)	AFR	32.2 <sup>a</sup>	8.5 <sup>a</sup>	36.3 <sup>a</sup>	68.0 <sup>b</sup>	15.8 <sup>b</sup>	> 12 mo	Monthly	115.0 <sup>a</sup>	Number of sachets consumed in 14 days prior to annual survey/14
Madagascar	Galasso 2019 (29)	AFR	63.0 <sup>b</sup>	5.5 <sup>a</sup>	51.0 <sup>b</sup>	26.9 <sup>b</sup>	0.0 <sup>b</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Monthly	-	Data unavailable.
Malawi	Ashorn 2015 (30)	AFR	34.7 <sup>a</sup>	26.8 <sup>b</sup>	62.5 <sup>b</sup>	91.7 <sup>a</sup>	9.2 <sup>b</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	77.1 <sup>b</sup>	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed
Malawi	Maleta 2015 (31)	AFR	46.5 <sup>b</sup>	30.3 <sup>b</sup>	62.5 <sup>b</sup>	91.6 <sup>a</sup>	2.9 <sup>b</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Weekly	71.6 <sup>b</sup>	% of days SQ-LNS reported consumed (considering missed delivery visits)
Mali	Huybregts 2019 <sup>1</sup> (33)	AFR	36.4 <sup>b</sup>	39.1 <sup>b</sup>	81.8 <sup>b</sup>	50.8 <sup>a</sup>	75.3 <sup>a</sup>	> 12 mo	Monthly	47.0 <sup>b</sup>	caregiver reported receiving SQ-LNS in the previous month received > 11 (80% of expected) deliveries * consumed SQ-LNS in past 24 h (at 12 month visit)
Zimbabwe	Humphrey 2019 (33); Prendergast 20	AFR	37.2 <sup>b</sup>	9.0 <sup>a</sup>	36.8 <sup>a</sup>	63.6 <sup>b</sup>	34.0 <sup>b</sup>	≤ 12 mo	Monthly	73.5 <sup>b</sup>	

<sup>1</sup>Study-level effect modifier categorization based on longitudinal cohort to be consistent with the analyses on growth outcomes

<sup>2</sup>Study-level effect modifier categorization was the same for both HIV exposed and un-exposed children  
Superscripts a and b designate the two categories, as described in Notes below.

**Abbreviations:** SQ-LNS, small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements

**Notes:**

Geographic region based on WHO regions

Stunting was defined as length-for-age Z score < -2 SD. Stunting prevalence was based on study-specific data at 18 months (when available) in the control arms. Stunting was assessed at 12 months for Adu-Afarwuah 2007 and Iannotti 2014, and at ~25 months of age for Null 2018. These 3 studies were then categorized based on expected changes in stunting prevalence with age. Trials were categorized as (a) low/moderate burden when stunting was < 35% and (b) high burden when stunting was >35% .

Malaria prevalence: Data extracted from Annex, Data table F: Population at risk and restimulated malaria cases and deaths, 2010-2017 (wmr2018-annex-table-f.xls); Point estimate (presumed and confirmed malaria cases), divided by population at risk, per 100 persons. Trials were categorized as (a) low burden when malaria was < 10% and (b) high burden when malaria was >10%.

Anemia prevalence: Data extracted from DHS and MICS. Trials were categorized as (a) moderate when anemia was below 60% prevalence and (b) high when anemia was above 60% prevalence.

Water quality: Data based on sample prevalences of improved source water quality. Study-level water quality was considered improved if the main source of drinking water for > 75% of participants was improved; study-level water quality was considered unimproved if the main source of drinking water for < 75% of participants was improved. "Improved water sources are those that have the potential to deliver safe water by nature of their design and construction, and include: piped water, boreholes or tubewells, protected dug wells, protected springs, rainwater and packaged or delivered water". Unimproved water sources include: water from an unprotected dug well or unprotected spring, or surface water (e.g., river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal or irrigation canal). (washdata.org/monitoring/drinking-water).

Sanitation: Data based on sample prevalences of improved sanitation. Study-level sanitation was considered improved if sanitation services for > 50% of participants were improved; study-level sanitation was considered unimproved if sanitation services for < 50% of participants were improved. "Improved sanitation facilities are those designed to hygienically separate excreta from human contact, and include: flush/pour flush to piped sewer system, septic tanks or pit latrines; ventilated improved pit latrines, composting toilets or pit latrines with slabs". Unimproved sanitation services include: use of pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines or bucket latrines, or open defecation. (https://washdata.org/monitoring/sanitation)

Compliance: Data extracted from publication; study-specific definitions of compliance are noted in the table. Trials were categorized as (a) high compliance when compliance was > 80% or (b) low compliance when compliance was < 80% compliance.

**References**

World Malaria Report 2018. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018. Available at: <https://www.who.int/malaria/publications/world-malaria-report-2018/report/en/> Accessed on: 26 August 2019

Supplementary Table 4: Descriptive information on potential individual-level effect modifiers, by trial

Country	Author	Maternal height < 150.1 cm (%)	Maternal BMI < 20 kg/m <sup>2</sup> (%)	Maternal age < 25 y (%)	Maternal education, completed primary (%)	Maternal depression, below 75th (%)	Child sex, male (%)	Child birth order, first born (%)	Child baseline LAZ < - 2 (%)	Child baseline acute malnutrition, WLZ < - 2 or MUAC < 125 mm (%)	Child baseline anemia, hb < 110 g/L (%)	Moderate to severe food insecurity (%)	SES index, below median (%)	Improved source water quality (%)	Improved sanitation access (%)	Home environment, below median (%)	Season at endline, dry (%)
Bangladesh	Christian 2015 (21)			57.4	63.4		50.0	79.0*	24.6	19.2		29.9 <sup>a</sup>	49.7	100.0	77.0		54.4
Bangladesh	Dewey 2017 (22)	45.5	55.5	73.0	74.2	66.1 <sup>a</sup>	50.2	40.4	22.9	7.5	60.5	37.2 <sup>b</sup>	49.7	100.0	71.0	28.3 <sup>b</sup>	44.4
Bangladesh	Luby 2018 (23)	45.6	54.2	56.1	71.2	74.7 <sup>d</sup>	49.9	33.6				21.9 <sup>b</sup>	49.4	88.4	94.9	48.9 <sup>b</sup>	55.2
Burkina Faso	Hess 2015 (24)	2.3	36.8	41.4	3.9		50.3	21.9	22.6	26.6	91.7	50.4 <sup>b</sup>	44.5	27.0	2.4	39.9 <sup>d</sup>	70.8
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2007 (25)	4.3	9.2	29.0	88.3		52.1	40.0					46.3	91.9	91.5		57.7
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2016 (26)	5.3	15.4	38.3	78.7	70.1 <sup>a</sup>	48.5	33.2	9.9	8.5	35.2	31.0 <sup>b</sup>	49.9	98.4	97.3	37.3 <sup>a</sup>	58.8
Haiti	Iannotti 2014 (27)			30.0	84.8		43.5	37.0*	10.0	2.2			49.5	98.7	94.0		
Kenya	Null 2018 (28)	4.0	21.8	44.5	47.6	74.0 <sup>d</sup>	48.2	21.4				10.3 <sup>b</sup>	43.4	68.0	15.8	43.0 <sup>b</sup>	22.5
Madagascar	Galasso 2019 (29)	36.0		45.5	23.5	71.5 <sup>d</sup>	49.2	28.3				28.4 <sup>b</sup>	49.4	26.9	0.0	47.7 <sup>d</sup>	99.9
Malawi	Ashorn 2015 (30)	13.4	39.9	50.1	15.8	74.2 <sup>d</sup>	47.2	20.4	23.4	8.3	65.8	71.0 <sup>b</sup>	46.3	91.7	9.2	34.7 <sup>a</sup>	71.1
Malawi	Maleta 2015 (31)	17.0	25.7	45.5	23.7		50.9	23.6	30.4	5.9	63.7	73.9 <sup>b</sup>	49.0	91.7	2.7	41.3 <sup>a</sup>	59.2
Mali	Huybregts 2019 (cross-sectional) (32)	3.1	27.4	47.4	10.5		52.2	14.3					49.8	59.7	74.9		
Zimbabwe	Humphrey 2019 (HIV-) (33)	3.5	14.2	44.2	96.5	75.2 <sup>c</sup>	49.5	25.1*	18.2	5.6		19.5 <sup>c</sup>	50.5	63.9	34.4		99.8
Zimbabwe	Prendergast 2019 (HIV+) (34)	5.1	16.8	18.8	94.3	78.8 <sup>c</sup>	50.8	15.0*	24.4	8.1		25.8 <sup>c</sup>	45.5	60.9	32.8		100.0

Abbreviations: BMI, body-mass index; LAZ, length-for-age z-score; WLZ, weight-for-length z-score; MUACZ, mid-upper arm circumference z-score; WAZ, weight-for-age z-score; HCZ, head circumference z-score; SES, socio-economic status.

Notes:

Maternal depression scales used: a) Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) at 6 mo postpartum; b) EPDS at 2 mo postpartum; c) EPDS during pregnancy at enrollment; d) Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression (CESD) Scale at 12 mo postpartum; e) Patient Health Questionnaire (modified) at 24 mo postpartum; f) CESD Scale during pregnancy at enrollment  
 Baseline anthropometry is measured at enrollment into the study or start of supplementation if supplementation did not begin at enrollment.

Food security scales used: a) Food Access Survey Tool; b) Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFAIS); c) Coping Strategy Index

Water and sanitation references - as for study-level effect modifiers

Home environment assessed by the Family Care Indicators tool at: a) 18 mo of age; b) 24 mo of age; c) endline survey

Season is defined at time of outcome assessment as a dichotomous "Rainy" vs "Dry" category based on child-specific average rainfall during the month of measurement and 2 months prior.

\*Data on birth order were not available for all children. Consequently, first-born vs later-born status was estimated based on the number of children under 5 years old in the household.

**Supplemental Table 5:** Prevalence of milestone attainment at 12 and 18 months by trial among control arms

Country	Author	12-month milestones assessed					18-month milestones assessed				
		Walk without support	Walk with support	Stand without support	Stand with support	Crawl	Walk without support	Walk with support	Stand without support	Stand with support	Crawl
Bangladesh	Christian 2015 (21)	736/1363 (54.0)	1408/1418 (99.3)	1120/1384 (80.9)	1396/1409 (99.1)	1357/1369 (99.1)					
Bangladesh	Dewey 2017 (22)	202/790 (25.6)	579/746 (77.6)	351/767 (45.8)	764/783 (97.6)	507/742 (68.3)	796/816 (97.5)	811/816 (99.4)	802/816 (98.3)	813/816 (99.6)	766/771 (99.4)
Bangladesh	Luby 2018 (23)	375/1474 (25.4)	1183/1470 (80.5)	709/1474 (48.1)	1391/1472 (94.5)	1117/1480 (75.5)					
Burkina Faso	Hess 2015 (24)						304/342 (88.9)	339/342 (99.1)	328/342 (95.9)	341/342 (99.7)	339/342 (99.1)
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2007 (25)	22/87 (25.3)	59/87 (67.8)	43/87 (49.4)	80/87 (92.0)						
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2016 (26)	311/663 (46.9)	654/662 (98.8)	499/654 (76.3)	669/670 (99.9)	654/665 (98.3)	688/693 (99.3)	694/694 (100.0)	690/693 (99.6)	694/694 (100)	694/694 (100)
Haiti	Iannotti 2014 (27)	29/79 (36.7)		67/108 (62.0)		71/79 (89.9)	59/60 (98.3)	59/60 (98.3)	59/60 (98.3)	59/60 (98.3)	59/60 (98.3)
Kenya	Null 2018 (28)	646/1604 (40.3)	1455/1604 (90.7)	1168/1604 (72.8)	1498/1604 (93.4)	1555/1604 (96.9)					
Madagascar	Galasso 2019 (29)										
Malawi	Ashorn 2015 (30)	208/426 (48.8)	385/426 (90.4)	353/426 (82.9)	411/426 (96.5)	420/426 (98.6)	423/441 (95.9)	431/441 (97.7)	434/441 (98.4)	430/441 (97.5)	435/441 (98.6)
Malawi	Maleta 2015 (31)	69/200 (34.5)	139/200 (69.5)	151/200 (75.5)	192/200 (96.0)	189/200 (94.5)	207/222 (93.2)	219/222 (98.6)	218/222 (98.2)	220/222 (99.1)	222/222 (100.0)
Mali	Huybregts 2019 (cross-sectional) (32)	51/151 (33.8)	112/151 (74.2)	94/151 (62.3)	136/151 (90.1)	142/151 (94.0)	90/106 (84.9)	105/106 (99.1)	101/106 (95.3)	104/106 (98.1)	104/106 (98.1)
Zimbabwe	Humphrey 2019 (HIV-) (33)										
Zimbabwe	Prendergast 2019 (HIV+) (34)										

**Notes:**

Values are n/total (%)

IPD development

Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6A: Risk of bias assessment in each trial

Country	Author	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding participants	Outcome assessment <sup>1</sup>	Incomplete outcome	Selective reporting	Other
Bangladesh	Christian 2015 (21)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Bangladesh	Dewey 2017 (22, 37)	low	low	high	high (language, SE) low (motor, EF)	low	low	low
Bangladesh	Luby 2018 (23,38)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Burkina Faso	Hess 2015 (24, 39)	low	low	high	high	high	low	low
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2007 (25)	low	low	high	low	low	low	low
Ghana	Adu Afarwuah 2016 (26, 40)	low	low	high	high (language, SE) low (motor, EF)	low	low	low
Haiti	Iannotti 2014 (27, 41)	unclear	low	high	high	low	low	low
Kenya	Null 2018 (28, 42)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Madagascar	Galasso 2019 (29)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Malawi	Ashorn 2015 (30, 43)	low	low	high	high (language, SE) low (motor, EF)	low	low	low
Malawi	Maleta 2015 (31, 44)	low	low	high	high (language, SE) low (motor, EF)	low	low	low
Mali	Huybregts 2019 (32)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Zimbabwe	Humphrey 2019 (33, 45)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low
Zimbabwe	Prendergast 2019 (34, 46)	low	low	high	high	low	low	low

1. Due to the nature of the intervention, blinding of participants was not possible. We considered developmental outcome assessment to be at low risk of bias only when it was clearly specified that data collectors who performed the developmental assessments were not aware of group allocation, and it would be unlikely that they could easily become aware of group allocation (i.e. observation of interventions materials in study communities, non-intervention passive control arms, etc.). We considered all parent-report assessments to be high risk due to lack of participant blinding in all trials. EF: executive function. SE: social-emotional.

IPD development  
Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6B. Risk of bias assessment in Adu-Afarwuah 2007

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "we randomly selected ~75% of the total number of eligible infants to enter the intervention trial. This was done on a weekly basis, when infants were 5 mo of age, by entering the identification numbers of the eligible infants in a dataset, and using an SAS data step (ranuni [1] le 0.75) to select those for the intervention...the NI infants were randomly selected from the pool of initially eligible infants" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "the infants were randomly assigned (with the use of opaque envelopes with group designation) to receive SP, NT, or NB until 12 mo of age" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "NT was provided to the mothers in plastic bags, and the NB (20 g/d) was provided in foil packs with screw caps" <b>Comment:</b> not adequate
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> " A fieldworker who had previously been trained for the World Health Organization (WHO) Multicenter Growth Reference Study (MGRS) completed head circumference, weight, and length measurements at 6, 9, and 12 mo and assessed 4 gross motor milestones (standing with assistance, walking with assistance, standing independently, and walking independently) at 12 mo using protocols described for the MGRS" <b>Personal communication with investigator (SAA):</b> "All anthropometric measurements were carried out by dedicated anthropometrists separate from the field workers who delivered the supplements in the homes, and the anthropometrists had no knowledge of the group assignments. At both 6 and 12 months of age, all children were brought to the laboratory where the anthropometric measurements were conducted; in this case, it was neither possible for the anthropometrists to determine group assignments within the intervention groups, nor was it likely that the anthropometrists could remember or know which children belonged to the intervention versus non-intervention groups." <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<b>Attrition:</b> NB group = 90/103; Control group = 87/97 <b>Comment:</b> Minimal attrition and reasons given for loss to follow-up
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT00379158); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported



IPD development  
Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6C. Risk of bias assessment in Adu-Afarwuah 2016

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "The study statistician at University of California, Davis developed group allocations with the use of a computer generated (SAS version 9.3; SAS Institute) randomization scheme in blocks of 9" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "At each enrollment, the study nurse offered sealed, opaque envelopes bearing group allocations, 9 envelopes at a time, and the woman picked one to reveal the allocation" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "It was not possible to blind study workers and participants to the capsules (IFA and MMN supplements) compared with the LNS supplements because of their different appearances"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Language: High risk Social-emotional: High risk Motor: Low risk Executive function: Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> " Strengths of the study were that participants were allocated randomly to intervention groups, data collectors and analysts were blind to intervention group, there was a low rate of attrition, the developmental assessment tools had been developed in Africa and were suitable for the local context, and data collectors were rigorously trained and demonstrated high inter-rater agreement and inter-tester reliability." <b>Comment:</b> parent-report assessments high risk, direct child assessments low risk
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<b>Attrition:</b> LNS group = 358/397, Control group = 731/800 <b>Comment:</b> Minimal attrition and reasons given for loss to follow-up
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT00970866); SAP available online; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported

IPD development  
Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6D. Risk of bias assessment in Ashorn 2015

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "Researcher not involved with the trial created individual randomisation slips (in blocks of 9)" <b>Comment:</b> Additional details on randomization provided in Ashorn <i>et al.</i> AJCN 2015.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "...packed them in sealed, numbered, opaque randomization envelopes that were stored in numerical order...Eligible pregnant women were requested to choose 1 of the top 6 envelopes in the stack, and the contents of the envelope indicated her participant number and group allocation"" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "The IFA and MMN interventions were provided with double-masked procedures...For the LNS group, we used single-masked procedures; that is field workers who delivered the supplements knew which mothers were receiving LNS, and the participants were advised not to disclose information about their supplements to anyone other than an iLiNS team member" <b>Comment:</b> not done
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Language: High risk Social-emotional: High risk Motor: Low risk Executive function: Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "data collectors who conducted observational developmental assessments were blind to intervention groups, the developmental assessment tools had been developed in Africa and were suitable for the local context, and data collectors were rigorously trained and demonstrated high inter-rater agreement and inter-tester reliability." <b>Comment:</b> parent-report assessments high risk, direct child assessments low risk
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<b>Attrition:</b> LNS group = 221/222, Control 451/456 <b>Comment:</b> Minimal attrition and reasons given for loss to follow-up
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov ( NCT01239693 ); SAP available online; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported

IPD development  
Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6E. Risk of bias assessment in Dewey 2007

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "For the randomization, the study statistician at UCD first stratified all 64 clusters in the 11 unions by subdistrict and union and then randomly assigned each cluster to 1 of the 4 arms (each containing 16 clusters)" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "For the randomization, the study statistician at UCD first stratified all 64 clusters in the 11 unions by subdistrict and union and then randomly assigned each cluster to 1 of the 4 arms (each containing 16 clusters)" <b>Comment:</b> central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Comment:</b> participant blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention (LNS, MNP, Control)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Language: High risk Social-emotional: High risk Motor: Low risk Executive function: Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "The trial was a researcher-blind, longitudinal, cluster randomized effectiveness trial" <b>Comment:</b> parent-report assessments high risk, direct child assessments low risk
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<b>Attrition:</b> LNS = 1712/1804; Control = 839/899 <b>Comment:</b> reasons given for loss to follow-up; missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention groups
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> The trial was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov ( NCT01715038 ); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported

IPD development  
Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6F. Risk of bias assessment in Hess 2015

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "computer-generated an assignment within strata to participate in the intervention cohort ... The same statistician, who was blinded to the intervention, generated a random allocation sequence at the level of the concession for the enrollment of eligible infants in the IC" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "The same statistician, who was blinded to the intervention, generated a random allocation sequence at the level of the concession for the enrollment of eligible infants in the IC" <b>Comment:</b> central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "The trial was partially masked, as all participants, field staff and researchers remained blinded to the four intervention groups until data analyses were completed, but were aware which communities were assigned to IC and NIC" <b>Comment:</b> IC and NIC non-blinded
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "The trial was partially masked, as all participants, field staff and researchers remained blinded to the four intervention groups until data analyses were completed, but were aware which communities were assigned to IC and NIC." <b>Comment:</b> IC and NIC non-blinded, all developmental assessments parent-report
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	<b>Attrition:</b> LNS group = 746/980; NIC group = 375/446 <b>Comment:</b> Differential loss to follow-up because participants in the LNS group were excluded if they were absent for more than 3 weeks during the intervention period.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> Protocol attached as a supplement in the study paper; registered at ClinicalTrials.gov as NCT 00944281; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported

IPD development

Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6G. Risk of bias assessment in Humphrey 2019 and Prendergast 2019

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "clusters were allocated (1:1:1:1) to one of four treatment groups"; "the study's statistician used a constrained randomization technique to identify 500 allocation schemes...From these, 10 allocations were randomly selected. The final allocation was selected at a public randomization event attended by elected representatives" <b>Comments:</b> Additional details available in Supplementary Materials (Appendix) and at <a href="https://osf.io/w93hy">https://osf.io/w93hy</a> and in (SHINE Trial Team, Clin Infect Dis, 2015).
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "the study's statistician used a constrained randomization technique to identify 500 allocation schemes...From these, 10 allocations were randomly selected. The final allocation was selected at a public randomization event attended by elected representatives" <b>Comments:</b> Additional details available at <a href="https://osf.io/w93hy">https://osf.io/w93hy</a> and in (SHINE Trial Team, Clin Infect Dis, 2015).
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "masking of participants and fieldworkers was not possible because of the obvious visual differences between interventions" <b>Comment:</b> not done
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "masking of participants and fieldworkers was not possible because of the obvious visual differences between interventions, but investigators were blinded to treatment groups until the final analysis of each pre-specified outcome." <b>Comment:</b> not done
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<b>Attrition:</b> LNS group = 1011/2400; Control group = 950/2327 <b>Comment:</b> Subsample selected for developmental assessment; attrition similar across all arms with reasons given
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> trial registered as NCT01824940 at ClinicalTrials.gov, published protocol (SHINE Trial Team, Clin Infect Dis 2015), research and statistical analysis plan available at <a href="https://osf.io/w93hy">https://osf.io/w93hy</a> ; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported

IPD development

Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6H. Risk of bias assessment in Huybregts 2019

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "we applied stratified random allocation of the HC catchment areas to control and intervention study groups"; "we first stratified the [health centers] by hierarchical clustering"; "random allocation to control or intervention groups was conducted within each stratum during a community ceremony...forty-eight identical pieces of paper with either 'control' or 'intervention' were mixed in a bag...each [health center] director drew one piece of paper" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"random allocation to control or intervention groups was conducted within each stratum during a community ceremony...forty-eight identical pieces of paper with either 'control' or 'intervention' were mixed in a bag...each [health center] director drew one piece of paper" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "non-masked, community-based, trial" <b>Comment:</b> blinding of participants who received no intervention was not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "We used a two-arm, cluster-randomized, non-blinded effectiveness trial" <b>Comment:</b> not done, cluster randomized trial at level of HC
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<b>Attrition:</b> LNS group = 942/1156; Control group = 956/1161 <sup>1</sup> <b>Comment:</b> reasons provided for loss to follow-up; missing outcome data balanced in numbers across intervention groups
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> trial registered as NCT02323815 at ClinicalTrials.gov, published protocol (Huybregts BMC Public Health 2017); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section; data made available to IPD investigators.
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported

<sup>1</sup>The developmental outcomes for this trial are not yet published, therefore we used the denominator from the published paper reporting the growth outcomes and the numerator based on the developmental data provided to us for the IPD meta-analysis.

IPD development

Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6I. Risk of bias assessment in Iannotti 2014

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<b>Quote:</b> "Random assignment was carried out through an allocation-concealment mechanism whereby sealed paper forms that masked group assignments were drawn from a container by mothers by using a simple random assignment ratio of 1:1:1 for group assignments" <b>Comment:</b> randomization procedure not specified
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "Random assignment was carried out through an allocation-concealment mechanism whereby sealed paper forms that masked group assignments were drawn from a container by mothers by using a simple random assignment ratio of 1:1:1 for group assignments" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Comment:</b> participant blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention (LNS, Control)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	<b>Quote:</b> "The study team was comprised of one study coordinator and 3 enumerators who participated in a 1-wk training session at the beginning of the trial and another refresher training midway through covering the protocol of anthropometric measures, survey administration, and ethics." <b>Comment:</b> same enumerators conducting anthropometric assessments as providing supplements
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<b>Attrition:</b> control group = 150/191; 6-month LNS group = 153/202 <b>Comment:</b> reasons for loss-to-follow-up mentioned
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> Trial registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01552512); outcomes described in the methodology section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported

IPD development

Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6J. Risk of bias assessment in Luby 2018

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> Clusters were randomly allocated to treatment using a random number generator by a coinvestigator at University of California, Berkeley (BFA). Each of the eight geographically adjacent clusters was block randomized to the double-sized control arm or one of the six interventions...Geographical matching ensured that arms were balanced across locations and time of measurement.”</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> adequately done</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Quote</b> “Clusters were randomly allocated to treatment using a random number generator by a coinvestigator at University of California, Berkeley (BFA).”</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<p><b>Comment:</b> Not done due to the nature of the intervention</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> “Interventions included distinct visible components so neither participants nor data collectors were masked to intervention assignment, although the data collection and intervention teams were different individuals”. “Outcome and adherence was assessed by a team of university graduates who were not involved in the delivery or promotion of interventions.”</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> passive control arm; blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention</p>
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Attrition:</b> LNS group = 1141/1395; Control group = 3431/4187</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> attrition similar across all arms with reasons given</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Comment</b> The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT 01590095); SAP and trial protocol available, and published (Arnold BMJ Open 2013); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section</p>
Other bias	Low risk	<p><b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported</p>



IPD development  
Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6K. Risk of bias assessment in Maleta 2015

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "We used block randomization and a set of opaque envelopes to assign participants to the intervention groups. The randomization list and envelopes were prepared by a study statistician not involved in trial implementation" <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "We used block randomization and a set of opaque envelopes to assign participants to the intervention groups." <b>Comment:</b> adequately done
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<b>Comment:</b> participant blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention (LNS, Control)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Language: High risk Social-emotional: High risk Motor: Low risk Executive function: Low risk	<b>Quote:</b> "...and the code was not disclosed to the researchers or to those assessing the outcomes until all data had been entered and verified in a database." "For the LNS group, we used single-masked procedures (i.e., fieldworkers who delivered the supplements knew which children were receiving LNSs, but those who performed the anthropometric measurements or assessed other outcomes were not aware of group allocation)." <b>Comment:</b> parent-report assessments high risk, direct child assessments low risk
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<b>Attrition:</b> LNS = 1231/1612; control group = 248/320 <b>Comment:</b> similar levels of attrition across groups, reasons for dropout provided
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov ( NCT00945698); SAP and trial protocol available online; outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section
Other bias	Low risk	<b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported

IPD development

Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6L. Risk of bias assessment in Null 2018

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "Clusters were randomly allocated to treatment at the University of California, Berkeley using a random number generator with reproducible seed"</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> adequately done</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "Clusters were randomly allocated to treatment at the University of California, Berkeley using a random number generator with reproducible seed"</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "Masking participants was not possible"</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> blinding of participants was not possible due to the nature of the intervention</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "The health promoters and staff who delivered the interventions were not involved in data collection, but the data collection team could have inferred treatment status if they saw intervention materials in study communities."</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> blinding not possible due to the nature of the intervention</p>
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Comment:</b> attrition similar across all seven arms with reasons given</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Comment:</b> Trial registered as NCT01704105 at ClinicalTrials.gov. SAP and trial protocol available online, and published (Arnold BMJ Open 2013); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section</p>
Other bias	Low risk	<p><b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported</p>

IPD development

Assessment of Risk of Bias

Supplemental Table 6M. Risk of bias assessment in Galasso 2019

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "a random generator was used to block-randomise five sites per intervention group per region" ... "An up-to-date registry of government-programme eligible women and children... was used as a sampling frame to select households eligible for enrolment in the trial. 30 households were randomly sampled per site, stratified by children's age at baseline"</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> adequately done</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Comment:</b> central randomization of a cluster-randomized trial</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "Due to the nature of the interventions, masking of participants and community health workers was not possible."</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> not done</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "Due to the nature of the interventions, masking of participants and community health workers was not possible. Data analysts were not blinded to intervention group assignment due to differences in survey information"</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> not done</p>
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "Mothers or children who died before the final assessment were not replaced. Children who had permanently moved outside the programme site catchment area before final assessment were replaced with a randomly drawn child from the site within the same age range. Children and their households who returned to the site between the baseline and final assessment were re-interviewed."</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> similar levels of attrition across groups, reasons for dropout provided</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p><b>Quote:</b> "This trial has been registered with the ISRCTN registry, number ISRCTN14393738."</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> published protocol (Fernald BMC Public Health 2016); outcomes described in the methods section reported in the results section</p>
Other bias	Low risk	<p><b>Comment:</b> no other potential sources of bias reported</p>

## IPD development

### Assessment of Risk of Bias

### References

21. Christian P, Shaikh S, Shamim AA, Mehra S, Wu L, Mitra M, Ali H, Merrill RD, Choudhury N, Parveen M, et al. Effect of fortified complementary food supplementation on child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster-randomized trial. *Int J Epidemiol* 2015;44(6):1862-76. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv155.
22. Dewey KG, Mridha MK, Matias SL, Arnold CD, Cummins JR, Khan MS, Maalouf-Manasseh Z, Siddiqui Z, Ullah MB, Vosti SA. Lipid-based nutrient supplementation in the first 1000 d improves child growth in Bangladesh: a cluster-randomized effectiveness trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2017;105(4):944-57. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.116.147942.
23. Luby SP, Rahman M, Arnold BF, Unicomb L, Ashraf S, Winch PJ, Stewart CP, Begum F, Hussain F, Benjamin-Chung J, et al. Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Bangladesh: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018;6(3):e302-e15. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30490-4.
24. Hess SY, Abbeddou S, Jimenez EY, Somé JW, Vosti SA, Ouédraogo ZP, Guissou RM, Ouédraogo J-B, Brown KH. Small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements, regardless of their zinc content, increase growth and reduce the prevalence of stunting and wasting in young Burkina children: a cluster-randomized trial. *PLoS One* 2015;10(3):e0122242. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0122242.
25. Adu-Afarwah S, Lartey A, Brown KH, Zlotkin S, Briend A, Dewey KG. Randomized comparison of 3 types of micronutrient supplements for home fortification of complementary foods in Ghana: effects on growth and motor development. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2007;86(2):412-20.
26. Adu-Afarwah S, Lartey A, Okronipa H, Ashorn P, Peerson JM, Arimond M, Ashorn U, Zeilani M, Vosti S, Dewey KG. Small-quantity, lipid-based nutrient supplements provided to women during pregnancy and 6 mo postpartum and to their infants from 6 mo of age increase the mean attained length of 18-mo-old children in semi-urban Ghana: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2016;104(3):797-808. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.116.134692.
27. Iannotti LL, Dulience SJ, Green J, Joseph S, Francois J, Antenor ML, Lesorogol C, Mounce J, Nickerson NM. Linear growth increased in young children in an urban slum of Haiti: a randomized controlled trial of a lipid-based nutrient supplement. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014;99(1):198-208. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.113.063883.
28. Null C, Stewart CP, Pickering AJ, Dentz HN, Arnold BF, Arnold CD, Benjamin-Chung J, Clasen T, Dewey KG, Fernald LCH, et al. Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on diarrhoea and child growth in rural Kenya: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018;6(3):e316-e29. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30005-6.
29. Galasso E, Weber AM, Stewart CP, Ratsifandrihamanana L, Fernald LCH. Effects of nutritional supplementation and home visiting on growth and development in young children in Madagascar: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2019;7(9):e1257-e68. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(19)30317-1.
30. Ashorn P, Alho L, Ashorn U, Cheung YB, Dewey KG, Gondwe A, Harjunmaa U, Lartey A, Phiri N, Phiri TE, et al. Supplementation of Maternal Diets during Pregnancy and for 6 Months Postpartum and Infant Diets Thereafter with Small-Quantity Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements Does Not Promote Child Growth by 18 Months of Age in Rural Malawi: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Nutr* 2015;145(6):1345-53. doi: 10.3945/jn.114.207225.
31. Maleta KM, Phuka J, Alho L, Cheung YB, Dewey KG, Ashorn U, Phiri N, Phiri TE, Vosti SA, Zeilani M, et al. Provision of 10-40 g/d Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements from 6 to 18 Months of Age Does Not Prevent Linear Growth Faltering in Malawi. *J Nutr* 2015;145(8):1909-15. doi: 10.3945/jn.114.208181.
32. Huybregts L, Le Port A, Becquey E, Zongrone A, Barba FM, Rawat R, Leroy JL, Ruel MT. Impact on child acute malnutrition of integrating small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements into community-level screening for acute malnutrition: A cluster-randomized controlled trial in Mali. *PLoS Med* 2019;16(8):e1002892. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002892.
33. Humphrey JH, Mbuya MNN, Ntozini R, Moulton LH, Stoltzfus RJ, Tavengwa NV, Mutasa K, Majo F, Mutasa B, Mangwadu G, et al. Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on child stunting and anaemia in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Glob Health* 2019;7(1):e132-e47. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30374-7.
34. Prendergast AJ, Chasekwa B, Evans C, Mutasa K, Mbuya MNN, Stoltzfus RJ, Smith LE, Majo FD, Tavengwa NV, Mutasa B, et al. Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene, and improved complementary feeding, on stunting and anaemia among HIV-exposed children in rural Zimbabwe: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health* 2019;3(2):77-90. doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30340-7.
35. Smuts CM, Matsungu TM, Malan L, Kruger HS, Rothman M, Kvalsvig JD, Covic N, Joosten K, Osendarp SJM, Bruins MJ, et al. Effect of small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements on growth, psychomotor development, iron status, and morbidity among 6- to 12-mo-old infants in South Africa: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2019;109(1):55-68. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqy282.
36. Hedges LV, Olkin I. *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1985.

## IPD development

### Assessment of Risk of Bias

37. Matias SL, Mridha MK, Tofail F, Arnold CD, Khan MS, Siddiqui Z, Ullah MB, Dewey KG. Home fortification during the first 1000 d improves child development in Bangladesh: a cluster-randomized effectiveness trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2017;105(4):958-69. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.116.150318.
38. Tofail F, Fernald LCH, Das KK, Rahman M, Ahmed T, Jannat KK, Unicomb L, Arnold BF, Ashraf S, Winch PJ, et al. Effect of water quality, sanitation, hand washing, and nutritional interventions on child development in rural Bangladesh (WASH Benefits Bangladesh): a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health* 2018;2(4):255-68. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(18\)30031-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30031-2).
39. Prado EL, Abbeddou S, Yakes Jimenez E, Some JW, Ouedraogo ZP, Vosti SA, Dewey KG, Brown KH, Hess SY, Ouedraogo JB. Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements Plus Malaria and Diarrhea Treatment Increase Infant Development Scores in a Cluster-Randomized Trial in Burkina Faso. *J Nutr* 2016. doi: 10.3945/jn.115.225524.
40. Prado EL, Adu-Afarwuah S, Lartey A, Ocansey M, Ashorn P, Vosti SA, Dewey KG. Effects of pre- and post-natal lipid-based nutrient supplements on infant development in a randomized trial in Ghana. *Early Human Development* 2016;99:43-51. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2016.05.011>.
41. Iannotti L, Jean Louis Dulience S, Wolff P, Cox K, Lesorogol C, Kohl P. Nutrition factors predict earlier acquisition of motor and language milestones among young children in Haiti. *Acta Paediatr* 2016;105(9):e406-11. doi: 10.1111/apa.13483.
42. Stewart CP, Kariger P, Fernald L, Pickering AJ, Arnold CD, Arnold BF, Hubbard AE, Dentz HN, Lin A, Meerkerk TJ, et al. Effects of water quality, sanitation, handwashing, and nutritional interventions on child development in rural Kenya (WASH Benefits Kenya): a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health* 2018;2(4):269-80. doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30025-7.
43. Prado EL, Maleta K, Ashorn P, Ashorn U, Vosti SA, Sadalaki J, Dewey KG. Effects of maternal and child lipid-based nutrient supplements on infant development: a randomized trial in Malawi. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2016;103(3):784-93. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.115.114579.
44. Prado EL, Phuka J, Maleta K, Ashorn P, Ashorn U, Vosti SA, Dewey KG. Provision of Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements from Age 6 to 18 Months Does Not Affect Infant Development Scores in a Randomized Trial in Malawi. *Matern Child Health J* 2016;20(10):2199-208. doi: 10.1007/s10995-016-2061-6.
45. Gladstone MJ, Chandna J, Kandawasvika G, Ntozini R, Majo FD, Tavengwa NV, Mbuya MNN, Mangwadu GT, Chigumira A, Chasokela CM, et al. Independent and combined effects of improved water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) and improved complementary feeding on early neurodevelopment among children born to HIV-negative mothers in rural Zimbabwe: Substudy of a cluster-randomized trial. *PLoS Med* 2019;16(3):e1002766. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002766.
46. Chandna J, Ntozini R, Evans C, Kandawasvika G, Chasekwa B, Majo F, Mutasa K, Tavengwa N, Mutasa B, Mbuya M, et al. Effects of improved complementary feeding and improved water, sanitation and hygiene on early child development among HIV-exposed children: substudy of a cluster randomised trial in rural Zimbabwe. *BMJ Glob Health* 2020;5(1):e001718. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001718.