

TITLE: The effect of balanced energy-protein supplementation provided to lactating women on maternal and infant outcomes: study protocol for a prospectively planned individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis

AUTHORS: Mihaela A. Ciulei,¹ Shouhao Zhou,² Kelly Gallagher,^{1,3} Sunita Taneja,⁴ Nita Bhandari,⁴ Patrick Kolsteren,⁵ Ameer Muhammad,⁶ James M Tielsch,⁷ Alemayehu Argaw,⁵ Ranadip Chowdhury,⁴ Parul Christian,⁸ Trenton Dailey-Chwalibóg,⁵ Brenda de Kok,⁵ Daniel J. Erchick,⁸ Fyezah Jehan,⁹ Joanne Katz,⁸ Subarna Khatry,¹⁰ Carl Lachat,⁵ Tsering P Lama,¹⁰ Muhammad Imran Nisar,⁹ Yasir Shafiq,⁹ Ravi Upadhyay,⁴ Alison D Gernand,^{1*} Maternal BEP Studies Harmonization Initiative

AFFILIATION:

¹Department of Nutritional Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

²Department of Public Health Sciences, Division of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, The Pennsylvania State College of Medicine, Hershey, PA, USA

³Ross and Carol Nese College of Nursing, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

⁴Centre for Health Research and Development Society for Applied Studies, New Delhi, India

⁵Department of Food Technology, Safety and Health, Faculty of Bioscience Engineering, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

⁶VITAL Pakistan Trust, Karachi, Pakistan

⁷Department of Global Health, The George Washington University Milken Institute School of Public Health, Washington D.C., USA

⁸Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

⁹Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

¹⁰Nepal Nutrition Intervention Project-Sarlahi, Lalitpur, Nepal

***Corresponding Author:** Alison D. Gernand, 110 C Chandlee Lab, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802 adg14@psu.edu

Tables: 3

Word count: 3683/4000

1 **Abstract** (315/350)

2 **Background:**

3 The high prevalence of infant stunting and maternal undernutrition in low- and middle-income
4 countries poses a significant public health threat. The World Health Organization recommends
5 balanced energy-protein (BEP) supplementation to pregnant women from populations with a
6 high prevalence of underweight (prepregnancy BMI <18.5 kg/m²), leaving a notable gap in
7 guidance for lactating women. To address this problem, we established the Maternal BEP
8 Studies Harmonization Initiative (BEP Initiative) to investigate the impact of BEP
9 supplementation given to pregnant and/or lactating women on maternal and infant outcomes by
10 synthesizing data from multiple clinical trials. This is a study protocol for our prospective
11 individual participant data (IPD) meta-analysis on BEP lactation trials.

12 **Methods:**

13 Data from four randomized controlled trials that include mother-infant dyads in India (n=816),
14 Pakistan (n=957), Burkina Faso (n=800), and Nepal (n=726) will be pooled and analyzed.
15 Women were randomized to BEP (one trial had a third arm with maternal BEP plus infants
16 receiving azithromycin) or control groups at baseline (during the first week) and received the
17 intervention through six months postpartum. A one-stage IPD meta-analysis will be done using
18 mixed-effects linear and log-binomial regression models to account for between-trial
19 heterogeneity. The primary outcome of infant length-for-age z scores (LAZ) at six months of age
20 and secondary outcomes of maternal and infant indicators of nutritional status at six months of
21 age will be examined. Also, we will examine baseline characteristics as covariates and effect
22 modifiers for the BEP to outcome relationship. Risk of bias assessments will be carried out for
23 each of the individual trials using the Cochrane risk of bias tool.

24 **Discussion:**

25 This prospective IPD meta-analysis uses a one-stage IPD meta-analysis, which allows for higher
26 statistical power to examine outcomes, more flexibility in defining variables, and has the ability
27 to examine many individual- and study-level variables as effect modifiers, allowing conclusions
28 on which individuals or populations may benefit more from BEP given during lactation.
29

30 **Trial registration:** This protocol was pre-registered in Open Science Framework
31 (<https://osf.io/9nq7z>)

32 **Keywords:** IPD meta-analysis, BEP supplementation, balanced energy-protein supplementation,
33 lactation, women, low- and middle-income countries, LMIC

34 BACKGROUND

35 Pregnant and lactating women with undernutrition are at high risk of adverse maternal and infant
36 health outcomes. Often, undernutrition is characterized by low body mass index (BMI), low mid-
37 upper arm circumference (MUAC), short stature, and/or micronutrient deficiencies, which put
38 pregnant women at risk for complications such as intrauterine growth restriction and preterm
39 birth (1). The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends balanced energy-protein (BEP)
40 supplementation in populations at risk of underweight (defined as more than 20% of pregnant
41 women with a BMI <18.5 kg/m²) to reduce the risk of stillbirth and small for gestational age
42 neonates (2). However, the consequences of undernutrition among lactating women have
43 commonly been overlooked. Lactating women require additional calories to produce milk, and
44 maternal weight status may impact the volume of milk produced and available for infant
45 consumption (3). In food insecure settings, particularly in low- and middle-income settings, there
46 is a high prevalence of infant stunting (4–6). Stunting, or impaired growth due to inadequate
47 nutrition, can have serious long-term consequences for children's health and development.
48 Meanwhile, breast milk is often the sole or main source of calories and nutrients for infants
49 under six months of age in low-resource settings, and supplementing the diet of women who are
50 breastfeeding could have a direct impact on infant growth and health.

51
52 BEP supplementation products are ready-to-use or prepared foods that provide energy and
53 protein (accounting for less or equal to 25% of the total energy content) (7). When given during
54 pregnancy, packaged BEP products are often fortified with multiple micronutrients or if BEP is
55 in the form of locally-prepared food, it is often given along with a multiple micronutrient or iron
56 and folic acid (IFA) tablet. The current evidence in systematic reviews and meta-analyses has
57 focused on studies where BEP supplements are given during pregnancy, and synthesis is lacking
58 for trials giving BEP during lactation (8–12).

59
60 To align BEP product formulations, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) assembled an
61 expert panel in 2017 to develop guidelines for the macro- and micronutrient content of BEP
62 supplements for pregnancy and lactation (7). The panel also recommended that BEP products be
63 developed and evaluated in both pregnant and lactating women in low-resource settings to assess
64 health benefits. To further advance the evidence-based research, BMGF funded several
65 independent RCTs and in 2020, convened the Maternal Nutrition Harmonization Workshop to
66 harmonize key variables across these trials and prioritize outcomes for the IPD meta-analysis
67 (13). This later led to the formation of the Maternal BEP Studies Harmonization Initiative
68 (hereinafter BEP Initiative) to examine the pooled effect of BEP in pregnancy and lactation on
69 maternal and child health.

70
71 The current protocol describes the objectives, data, and analysis plan of our prospective
72 individual participant data (IPD) meta-analysis that focuses on the effect of BEP
73 supplementation given during lactation in four trials with similar designs, outcome measures, and
74 settings (i.e., low-and middle-income countries (LMIC)). The primary aim of this IPD meta-
75 analysis is to assess the effect of BEP supplementation in lactating women on infant length-for-
76 age z scores (LAZ) at six months of age. For secondary outcomes, we will assess maternal and
77 infant weight and malnutrition indicators at six months postpartum. Last, we will examine
78 maternal and infant characteristics that may modify the relationship between BEP intervention
79 and outcomes.

80 **METHODS/DESIGN**

81 **Protocol and registration**

82 This protocol was preregistered in Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/9nq7z>) and all
83 individual trials were prospectively registered online (**Table 1**). We followed The Preferred
84 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis-Protocol framework, and the
85 checklist is appended.(14) The reporting of the IPD meta-analysis will use the PRISMA-IPD
86 reporting checklist (15).

87 **Trials and sample size**

88 Four BEP supplementation trials during lactation will be included in this prospective IPD meta-
89 analysis located in: India (IMPRINT), Burkina Faso (MISAME-III), Pakistan (MumtaLW), and
90 Nepal (MINT) (see **Table 1** for study information and acronym definitions). All four studies are
91 part of the BEP Initiative. Recruitment is complete for IMPRINT, MumtaLW, and MISAME-III,
92 and sample sizes are as follows: IMPRINT (n=816), MumtaLW (n=957), MISAME-III (n=800),
93 and MINT (n=726). The expected total sample size is 3,299 women. The sample size for some
94 exploratory outcomes will be lower than the total enrollment sample size due to certain
95 information (e.g., blood collection or analysis) being collected on a subset of participants (by
96 design). Also, the sample size for the MISAME-III and MINT trials is lower than the sample size
97 for the full trials because these trials have a factorial design to provide BEP during pregnancy
98 and/or lactation. Groups receiving BEP supplementation during pregnancy are not included in
99 this analysis. Risk of bias assessments will be carried out and reported for each of the individual
100 trials using the Cochrane risk of bias tool (16). There is no risk of duplicate data.

101 **Power calculations**

102 For this prospective meta-analysis, we assume the mean LAZ at six months of age to be -0.57
103 (standard deviation 1.10) in the control group(17). A total sample size of 3,299 (1,809 for BEP
104 package group and 1,490 for control group) yields 88% power to detect a minimum LAZ
105 difference of 0.10 between BEP and control at a significance level of 5% using mixed-effects
106 linear regression, and assuming an intra-class correlation as low as 0.30. For secondary
107 outcomes, we will have 89% power to detect a standardized mean difference of 0.10, assuming
108 an intra-class correlation as low as 0.20. The PASS Software v22.0.4 was used for sample size
109 calculation (NCSS, LLC, Kaysville, Utah).

110 **Participants, eligibility, and study design**

111 In the IMPRINT trial, mother-infant dyads were included in the study if a participant initiated
112 breastfeeding within seven days postpartum. In the MumtaLW trial, lactating women with
113 undernutrition (MUAC <23.0 cm), between 13-49 years of age, and their newborns (captured
114 within seven days from birth) were included in the study. Additionally, lactating women had to
115 intend to exclusively breastfeed the infant for the first six months of age. In the MISAME-III and
116 MINT trials, women between 15-40 and 15-30 years, respectively, were enrolled in the study
117 following a positive urine test if they were found to be missing menstruation in the prior five
118 weeks and following an ultrasound examination that revealed an intrauterine pregnancy <21
119 completed weeks of gestation. They were in the trial from early gestation through 6 months
120 postpartum and were counseled to exclusively breastfeed for 6 months. Additionally, in all trials,
121 participants indicated that they were not allergic to BEP ingredients (e.g., peanuts).

122

123 **Table 1** summarizes the basic study information for included maternal BEP lactation trials.
124 Among them, IMPRINT followed an individual randomization, controlled efficacy trial design.
125 MumtaLW followed a multi-arm, community-based randomized controlled, open-label, assessor-
126 blinded superiority trial design with a treatment allocation ratio of 1:1:1. MISAME-III was an
127 individual randomized 2x2 factorial efficacy design where participants are individually and
128 randomly allocated to a prenatal intervention or control and a postnatal intervention or control
129 group. Similarly, MINT followed a household randomized 2x2 factorial efficacy design where
130 participants in the same household obtained the same prenatal and postnatal intervention or
131 control. The current analyses will focus only on the postpartum intervention.

132 **Intervention**

133 The intervention tested in each trial was a BEP supplement given to women from birth (or within
134 a week of birth) to six months postpartum. The intervention groups also received what the
135 control group received as the standard of care (see below) in addition to BEP. IMPRINT's
136 nutritional intervention was five different BEP snacks produced by a local company and a
137 separate multiple micronutrient supplement (**Table 2**) (18). The MumtaLW trial provided a BEP
138 local product called Mumta that is fortified with multiple micronutrients; two sachets per day
139 were provided (19). MumtaLW had a third intervention arm in which the women received BEP
140 and the infants also received one dose of azithromycin at 42 days. The MISAME-III and MINT
141 trials provided a micronutrient fortified BEP supplement produced by the Nutriset (Malaunay,
142 France) (20).

143 **Control/Standard of care**

144 All four trials had a control arm that was intended to align with the standard of care for
145 postpartum women in each country (Table 2). In the IMPRINT trial, women were encouraged to
146 use IFA, calcium, and vitamin D supplements for six months postpartum from the national
147 program in India (i.e., not provided by the trial) (18). The national program also provides a food
148 supplement that contains 600 kcals (18-20 g protein). In the MumtaLW trial, women received
149 IFA from the government program or the trial (i.e., the trial ensured it was provided) for six
150 weeks postpartum. In the MISAME-III trial, women also received IFA from the trial for six
151 weeks postpartum. Finally, in the MINT trial, IFA was not provided as it was not part of the
152 standard of care during lactation in Nepal.

153
154 Most trials provided participants (intervention and control) with counseling for nutrition,
155 breastfeeding, and infant care, or referred to services where counseling was available. Trials also
156 encouraged women to use postnatal clinical care for themselves and their infants and referred to
157 clinical services in the case of illness.

158 **Outcomes and prioritization**

159 The primary outcome for this IPD meta-analysis is infant length-for-age z score (LAZ) at six
160 months of age, which represents linear growth across that timeframe. Secondary outcomes
161 include infant weight and malnutrition at six months of age (weight-for-length z score (WLZ)
162 and weight-for-age z score (WAZ)), infant growth velocity (i.e., change in length and weight),
163 infant stunting (LAZ <-2), wasting (WLZ <-2), and underweight (WAZ <-2)) at six months of
164 age. All infant weight and nutrition status indices (LAZ, WAZ, WLZ) will be calculated based
165 on WHO Growth Standards (21) (or INTERGROWTH-21st for infants born preterm, when
166 gestational age is available), which are sex-specific. We will also assess maternal anthropometry

167 including mean BMI and MUAC, underweight (BMI <18.5 kg/m²) and low MUAC (<23.0 cm)
168 at six months postpartum (**Table 3**).

169
170 Exploratory outcomes include infant head circumference-for-age and MUAC-for-age z scores
171 (based on WHO Growth Standards, see above) at six months; maternal and infant biomarkers for
172 iron deficiency, anemia, inflammation, and other micronutrients at six months of infant age
173 (ferritin, transferrin receptor, hemoglobin, C-reactive protein (CRP), alpha-1-acid glycoprotein
174 (AGP), other micronutrients (biomarkers to be determined)); and maternal mortality rate (per
175 100,000 live births) and infant mortality rate (per 1,000 live births; Table 3).

176 **Individual- and study-level covariates**

177 Individual-level variables collected by trials for women include maternal age, education, baseline
178 weight and height, parity, adherence to BEP, health and pregnancy history, diet, breastfeeding
179 type (exclusive, predominant, and partial), and household food insecurity. For infants, variables
180 include sex, gestational age at birth, age at each measurement (calculated from birth date),
181 weight, length, head circumference, and MUAC. Nutritional biomarkers are available for some
182 maternal and infant blood samples (see list in exploratory outcomes). Study-level variables
183 include nutritional content of BEP, geographic setting (Africa or South-East Asia), and
184 prevalence of undernutrition in study population (e.g., infant stunting or maternal underweight).

185 **IPD data collection and flow**

186 Data for this meta-analysis will come from the four participating trials. The investigators of each
187 trial have agreed to provide data and will send individual trial datasets to a data repository
188 (hosted by the study sponsor). Trial investigators will remove personal identifiers, and the data
189 repository analysts will further scan for and remove any identifiable information. Then, de-
190 identified data will be shared with the meta-analysis research team at Penn State. After Penn
191 State receives individual data sets, they will clean and merge them to create a pooled dataset for
192 the IPD meta-analysis. While working with these data sets, only the Penn State IPD meta-
193 analysis research team will have access to the individual and pooled datasets, which will be
194 stored in a secure drive, password protected by the university.

195 **Data merging and quality assurance (IPD integrity)**

196 Each trial will share their original data to the data repository team, which will prepare de-
197 identified datasets. First, we will review the dataset processed by the data repository team to see
198 if it includes all variables needed for the meta-analysis. Although we will receive cleaned data,
199 we will conduct additional examination of variables quantitatively and visually by checking
200 distributions, frequencies, missingness, and outliers (biological or statistical). For instance, for
201 the LAZ outcome and all other z-scores, we will use the WHO criteria in determining
202 biologically implausible values using the recommended cutoffs (LAZ <-6 or >+6; WAZ <-6 or
203 >+5, WLZ, MUAC z-score, and head circumference z-score <-5 or >+5) (22,23). Next, we will
204 complete initial transformations to normalize continuous distributions and categorize variables as
205 appropriate. This step will include re-coding or creating new variables to align variable
206 definitions for analysis with the proposed definitions from the prior harmonization work (13).
207 Further, we will query any anomalies and compare the sample sizes and descriptive statistics
208 with prior publications and study protocols. We will resolve any data issues or questions with the
209 investigators for the corresponding trial. Then, we will be able to combine individual trial data
210 sets into an analytic data set along with a variable to indicate which trial the data came from. The
211 final product of this stage will be a merged dataset that is ready for the main analysis.

212 **Statistical IPD meta-analysis plan**

213 Data validation and merging will be conducted in Stata (StataCorp, College Station, Texas); data
214 analysis and graphic presentation of the results will be run in Stata and R (R Core Team). To
215 investigate the effects of the BEP intervention package on outcomes, a one-stage IPD approach
216 will be implemented for all analyses (24). This approach is preferred over the conventional two-
217 stage IPD approach, in which trial-level aggregated summary data are pooled in the first stage for
218 a meta-analysis model in the second stage (25,26). Overall, the use of a one-stage IPD approach
219 will allow us to adopt more appropriate likelihood functions, make fewer model assumptions,
220 and incorporate more effective modelling of effect modifiers to accommodate the between-study
221 heterogeneity while we quantify the effects of BEP on maternal and child outcomes (27).

222
223 For the main analysis, the BEP intervention package will include all study arms that provided
224 BEP to women (in the MumtaLW trial, BEP and BEP with infant azithromycin are combined;
225 for the other trials, there is only one BEP arm). For continuous outcomes measured at six months
226 of infant age, the effect of BEP on the outcome (e.g., LAZ) will be assessed with mixed-effects
227 linear regression models. For dichotomous outcomes (e.g., stunting), the effect of BEP on the
228 outcome will be assessed using relative risk estimates from mixed-effects log binomial models
229 (or alternatively, Poisson regression if log-binomial models do not converge). We will perform
230 both univariable analysis (BEP intervention and trial in model) and multivariable analysis
231 (adding adjustment for baseline individual- and study-level characteristics) to examine the effect
232 of BEP on outcomes. For multivariable models, we will include variables that are statistically
233 significant predictors of the same outcome in the univariable analysis and variables that are
234 unbalanced at baseline in randomized groups. In all models, intervention arm will be specified as
235 a fixed effect, trial will be specified as a random effect (to account for heterogeneity between
236 trials), and any other variables in multivariable models will be specified as fixed effects.
237 Heterogeneity between trials will be assessed using I^2 statistics. Risk of bias assessments will be
238 carried out and reported for each of the individual trials using the Cochrane risk of bias tool.

239 **Subgroup Analysis: individual-level and study-level effect modification**

240 We plan to examine effect modifiers because understanding which groups may benefit the most
241 from BEP supplementation is an important goal of this initiative. An interaction term between
242 the treatment and a potential effect modifier will be included in separate mixed-effects linear or
243 log binomial (or Poisson) regression models. We will examine the following individual-level
244 subgroups based on biological plausibility and prior literature: maternal age (<20 y, 20-29 y, ≥30
245 y), education (none vs ≥1 year), parity (1 child vs ≥2 children), maternal BMI (<18.5 kg/m² vs
246 ≥18.5 kg/m²), maternal height (<150 cm vs ≥150 cm), MUAC (<23 cm vs ≥23 cm)(28), infant
247 sex (male vs female), and infant malnutrition as defined by low birth weight (<2,500 g vs ≥
248 2,500 g), stunting (LAZ <-2 vs ≥ -2), wasting (WLZ <-2 vs ≥ -2), and underweight (WAZ <-2 vs
249 ≥ -2). Study-level variables we plan to examine are: prevalence of infant stunting at baseline, and
250 prevalence of maternal underweight at baseline.

251
252 In a set of exploratory analyses, we will examine if breastfeeding types (exclusive, predominant,
253 partial) mediate the effect of BEP on the outcomes at six months. We will also analyze
254 differences in benefits to maternal outcomes by levels of BEP adherence (<80% vs ≥80%),
255 which can be useful in planning future studies or dissemination efforts.

256 **Significance level**

257 We will set an alpha cutoff of $p < 0.05$ to determine if our results are significantly different from
258 those expected if the null hypothesis was correct. For testing interactions, we will use a cutoff of
259 $p < 0.10$. The method of Benjamini and Hochberg (29) will be applied to control for false
260 discovery in multiple comparisons in the assessment of interaction effects in subgroup analyses.

261
262 **Missing data**

263 The IPD meta-analysis will be analyzed based on an intent-to-treat protocol, which assumes that
264 all randomized individuals will be included in the analyses. However, if we observe more than
265 20% of data missing per treatment arm, it will be flagged as potential bias (differential
266 missingness), and we will consider two possible approaches, either performing multiple
267 imputation assuming that data are missing-at-random (30,31), or modeling the missing data by
268 building a Bayesian hierarchical modeling and test different missing data patterns (32). The
269 robustness of the results will be tested in sensitivity analyses using complete cases. To estimate
270 the missing values, the participant baseline characteristics (maternal age, maternal education,
271 maternal BMI and height at baseline, parity, household food insecurity, baseline value of LAZ,
272 and infant sex) will be summarized using descriptive statistics.

273 **Sensitivity analysis**

274 We will test a two-stage approach in sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of our results to
275 different approaches. Usually, both approaches provide similar results (25,26). We will also
276 assess the effects of variations in interventions such as BEP alone vs BEP with azithromycin vs
277 control; BEP given with vs. without an IFA tablet; and differences in nutrient content (e.g., total
278 calories (400 vs 600 vs 800 kcals)) in BEP products.

279 **Ethics and dissemination**

280 For each individual trial, local ethical approval was obtained. This IPD meta-analysis uses de-
281 identified data (deemed exempt from ethical approval). A centralized data repository will
282 provide the pooled and de-identified datasets for data analysis. Further, the results of this work
283 will seek peer-review and publication in fully open-access journals.

284 **DISCUSSION**

285 Since 2016, the WHO has recommended BEP supplementation for pregnant women in settings
286 with high rates of undernourishment to reduce incidence of small for gestational age and
287 stillbirth. However, there are no current BEP recommendations for lactating women, and similar
288 to pregnancy, more energy and nutrients are required in this life stage. In response, this
289 prospective IPD meta-analysis aims to fill in that gap and investigate the effects of BEP
290 supplementation given to lactating women. We will assess infant and maternal outcomes and
291 identify subgroups that may benefit the most from this intervention. Prior systematic reviews and
292 meta-analysis studies have suggested that BEP supplementation given to pregnant women may
293 improve low birth weight, birth weight, small for gestational age, and stillbirth outcomes (8–12);
294 improvements to maternal and child health from BEP in lactation are expected.

295
296 The four BEP trials included in our meta-analysis are conducted in low- and middle-income
297 countries among women at risk of or with undernutrition. The BEP intervention is administered
298 either in the form of a packaged supplement or snack, with all studies providing $\leq 25\%$ of energy
299 from protein. Unlike prior BEP research, the proposed IPD meta-analysis study has harmonized

300 definitions for key variables of interest, and we will use concurrently conducted RCTs, which
301 should improve the quality of data and the reliability of our estimates.

302
303 This study protocol has several strengths. Generally speaking, prospectively planned IPD meta-
304 analysis is superior to retrospective IPD meta-analysis or aggregate meta-analysis because it is
305 the least biased and most reliable in producing quality results. Additionally, this approach allows
306 the combination of study- and individual-level variables from multiple trials into one dataset,
307 thereby improving the power to assess overall effect estimates and effect modifiers. The effect
308 modifiers can identify which groups of lactating women benefit the most from BEP
309 supplementation (if any). We will also be able to include study-specific random effects into the
310 analyses and investigate the influence of covariates on heterogeneity of treatment effects. These
311 aspects will strengthen the current but limited evidence on BEP interventions and help generalize
312 the findings in food insecure settings.

313
314 This study has a few limitations that should be considered when interpreting results. Although all
315 studies provided BEP to lactating women, there are variations in the form and quantity of the
316 BEP. For instance, in the IMPRINT and MumtaLW trials, BEP provides 600 and 800 kcals,
317 respectively, which is a higher amount than the recommended range of 250-500 kcals (7).
318 Further, the control group varies, which may impact our results. For example, IFA is not the
319 standard of care in lactation in all settings, such as in Nepal. Also, compliance is not measured in
320 all trials for the control group, especially when this group is advised to take advantage of the
321 national standard of care available. Furthermore, the included trials have some differences in
322 study design, data definitions, and data collection methods. Substantial efforts were made later to
323 harmonize the primary and secondary outcome measures, in our case, through the BEP Initiative
324 (13). Last, studies also differ in eligibility criteria, and one study only enrolled women that were
325 undernourished. However, we will test in subgroup analyses if maternal undernourishment status
326 is an important factor in the BEP treatment effect.

327
328 Ultimately, this prospective IPD meta-analysis protocol will extend our knowledge on the
329 effectiveness of giving BEP supplementation to lactating women on infant growth and other
330 important maternal and infant outcomes. Thus, this work aims to overcome prior challenges and
331 clarify the benefits of BEP in dyads from low-and middle-income settings. The results of this
332 study will be disseminated through publication in fully open-access peer-reviewed journals.

333 **Trial status**

334 Protocol version 2. The project began on October 15, 2020. It is funded by the Bill & Melinda
335 Gates Foundation until April 14, 2024. We preregistered the lactation meta-analysis on Open
336 Science Framework (<https://osf.io/9nq7z>) on October 4, 2022. This protocol manuscript mirrors
337 our preregistration but expands and adds important details for the included trials and data
338 analysis methods. We have received data from three out of four participating trials via an
339 external data repository. The data collection is on-going for the fourth trial and will conclude in
340 the first quarter of 2024, when we anticipate to have the complete pooled dataset.

341

342 **List of abbreviations**

343 AGP - alpha-1-acid glycoprotein
344 BEP - balanced energy-protein
345 BMGF - Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
346 BMI - Body Mass Index
347 CRP - C-reactive protein
348 IFA - iron and folic acid
349 IPD - individual participant data
350 LAZ - length-for-age z-score
351 LMIC - low and middle-income countries
352 MUAC - mid-upper arm circumference
353 RCT - randomized controlled trial
354 WAZ - weight-for-age z-score
355 WHO - World Health Organization
356 WLZ - weight-for-length z-score

357 **DECLARATIONS**

358 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

359 For each individual trial, local ethical approval was obtained. This IPD meta-analysis will use
360 de-identified data (deemed exempt from ethical approval by the Institutional Review Board at
361 Penn State). The de-identified and harmonized IPD meta-analysis dataset will be stored in a data
362 repository. The research findings will be disseminated in peer-reviewed, open-access journals.

363 **Consent for publication**

364 Not applicable

365 **Availability of data and materials**

366 No data available at this stage

367 **Competing interests**

368 All authors have been funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Parul Christian worked at
369 the BMGF from 2015-2019 during which the BEP trials were funded. All other authors, co-
370 authors, and collaborators have nothing to declare. JT participated on a Data Safety Monitoring
371 Board or Advisory Board at University of North Carolina and University of California San
372 Francisco on studies unrelated to this manuscript. JT was a non-profit board member, unpaid, for
373 the Helen Keller International, which may use the results of these trials, depending on the results,

374 in their programming. JT was a non-profit board member, unpaid, for the Health Volunteers
375 Overseas that conducts work unrelated to the topic of this manuscript.

376 [Funding source](#) □

377 This work was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, investment grant number □INV-
378 022373. The funder had no role in the study design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of
379 data and in writing the manuscript.

380 [Authors' contributors](#)

381 MAC and SZ drafted the study protocol with critical guidance and input from ADG and KG. NB,
382 PK, AM, ST, JT, RC, PC, AA, TD-C, BK, DE, FJ, JK, SK, CL, TL, MN, YS, RU contributed to
383 the original data acquisition and to the BEP Initiative, providing input and feedback to the meta-
384 analysis plans throughout the process. ADG led overall study design and BEP Initiative work
385 with input from all authors. All authors read, commented, and approved the final protocol. This
386 protocol is written on behalf of the Maternal BEP Studies Harmonization Initiative.

387

388 [Acknowledgements](#) We would like to thank all members of each research team for the studies
389 included in the BEP Initiative. Our Technical Advisory Group, Drs. Martha Mwangome, Wafaie
390 Fawzi, Sant-Rayn Pasricha, Parul Christian, and Rajiv Bahl served as scientific advisors, and we
391 are grateful for their important guidance. Collaborators listed under **Maternal BEP Studies**
392 **Harmonization Initiative:** Eleonor Zavala, Steven C. LeClerq (Johns Hopkins Bloomberg
393 School of Public Health), Benazir Baloch (Aga Khan University),
394 Lieven Huybregts (International Food Policy Research Institute), Laeticia C Toe (Institut de
395 Recherche en Sciences de la Santé Burkina Faso), Giles Hanley-Cook (Ghent University), Grace
396 J Chan (Boston Children's Hospital), Mulatu M Derebe (Amhara Public Health Institute), Fred
397 van Dyk, Luke C Mullany, Daniel Erchick (Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health),
398 Michelle S Eglovitch, Chunling Lu, Krysten North, Ingrid E Olson (Brigham and Women's
399 Hospital), Nebiyou Fasil, Workagenehu T Kidane, Fisseha Shiferie, Tigest Shifraw, Fitsum
400 Tsegaye, Sitota Tsegaye (Addis Continental Institute of Public Health), Sheila Isanaka (Harvard
401 TH Chan School of Public Health), Rose Molina, Michele Stojanov, Blair Wylie, (Beth Israel
402 Deaconess Medical Center), Amare W Tadesse (London School of Hygiene and Tropical
403 Medicine and Addis Continental Institute of Public Health)

References

1. Kozuki N, Katz J, Lee ACC, Vogel JP, Silveira MF, Sania A, et al. Short Maternal Stature Increases Risk of Small-for-Gestational-Age and Preterm Births in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis and Population Attributable Fraction. *J Nutr*. 2015 Nov;145(11):2542–50.
2. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2022 Feb 2]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241549912>
3. Nommsen LA, Lovelady CA, Heinig MJ, Lönnerdal B, Dewey KG. Determinants of energy, protein, lipid, and lactose concentrations in human milk during the first 12 mo of lactation: the DARLING Study. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 1991 Feb;53(2):457–65.
4. World Health Organization. Joint child malnutrition estimates-levels and trends (2019 edition). WHO Geneva <https://www.who.int/nutgrowthdb/estimates2017/en>. 2018;
5. Local Burden of Disease Child Growth Failure Collaborators. Mapping child growth failure across low-and middle-income countries. *Nature*. 2020;577(7789):231–4.
6. UNICEF/WHO/World Bank Group. Levels and trends in child malnutrition: UNICEF/WHO/World Bank Group joint child malnutrition estimates: key findings of the 2023 edition [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 May 26] p. 32. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240073791>
7. Report of an Expert Consultation held at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Framework and specifications for the nutritional composition of a food supplement for pregnant and lactating women (PLW) in undernourished and low income settings. *Gates Open Res*. 2017;3(1498):1498.
8. Imdad A, Bhutta ZA. Maternal nutrition and birth outcomes: effect of balanced protein-energy supplementation. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2012 Jul;26 Suppl 1:178–90.
9. Ota E, Hori H, Mori R, Tobe Gai R, Farrar D. Antenatal dietary education and supplementation to increase energy and protein intake. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2022 Feb 2];(6). Available from: <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD000032.pub3/full>
10. Stevens B, Buettner P, Watt K, Clough A, Brimblecombe J, Judd J. The effect of balanced protein energy supplementation in undernourished pregnant women and child physical growth in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2015;11(4):415–32.
11. Lassi ZS, Padhani ZA, Rabbani A, Rind F, Salam RA, Bhutta ZA. Effects of nutritional interventions during pregnancy on birth, child health and development outcomes: A systematic review of evidence from low- and middle-income countries. *Campbell Syst Rev*. 2021;17(2).

12. Perumal N, Blakstad MM, Fink G, Lambiris M, Bliznashka L, Danaei G, et al. Impact of scaling up prenatal nutrition interventions on human capital outcomes in low- and middle-income countries: a modeling analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2021 Nov 8;114(5):1708–18.
13. Gernand AD, Gallagher K, Bhandari N, Kolsteren P, Lee AC, Shafiq Y, et al. Harmonization of maternal balanced energy-protein supplementation studies for individual participant data (IPD) meta-analyses – finding and creating similarities in variables and data collection. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2023 Feb 11;23(1):107.
14. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015 Dec;4(1):1–9.
15. Stewart LA, Clarke M, Rovers M, Riley RD, Simmonds M, Stewart G, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Individual Participant Data: The PRISMA-IPD Statement. *JAMA*. 2015 Apr 28;313(16):1657–65.
16. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2019 Aug 28;366:l4898.
17. Becquey E, Huybregts L, Zongrone A, Le Port A, Leroy JL, Rawat R, et al. Impact on child acute malnutrition of integrating a preventive nutrition package into facility-based screening for acute malnutrition during well-baby consultation: A cluster-randomized controlled trial in Burkina Faso. *PLoS Med*. 2019 Aug;16(8):e1002877.
18. Taneja S, Upadhyay RP, Chowdhury R, Kurpad AV, Bhardwaj H, Kumar T, et al. Impact of nutritional interventions among lactating mothers on the growth of their infants in the first 6 months of life: a randomized controlled trial in Delhi, India. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2021 Apr 6;113(4):884–94.
19. Muhammad A, Shafiq Y, Nisar MI, Baloch B, Yazdani AT, Yazdani N, et al. Nutritional support for lactating women with or without azithromycin for infants compared to breastfeeding counseling alone in improving the 6-month growth outcomes among infants of peri-urban slums in Karachi, Pakistan—the protocol for a multiarm assessor-blinded randomized controlled trial (Mumta LW trial). *Trials*. 2020 Sep 1;21(1):756.
20. Vanslambrouck K, Kok B de, Toe LC, Cock ND, Ouedraogo M, Dailey-Chwalibóg T, et al. Effect of balanced energy-protein supplementation during pregnancy and lactation on birth outcomes and infant growth in rural Burkina Faso: study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2021 Mar 1;11(3):e038393.
21. World Health Organization. 2018 Global reference list of 100 core health indicators (plus health-related SDGs). Geneva; 2018.
22. WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group. WHO Child Growth Standards based on length/height, weight and age. *Acta Paediatr Oslo Nor* 1992 Suppl. 2006 Apr;450:76–85.

23. World Health Organization. WHO Anthro Survey Analyser; Quick guide. 2019; Available from: https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/child-growth/child-growth-standards/software/anthro-survey-analyser-quickguide.pdf?sfvrsn=dc7ddc6f_6
24. Riley RD, Legha A, Jackson D, Morris TP, Ensor J, Snell KIE, et al. One-stage individual participant data meta-analysis models for continuous and binary outcomes: Comparison of treatment coding options and estimation methods. *Stat Med*. 2020;39(19):2536–55.
25. Riley RD, Lambert PC, Abo-Zaid G. Meta-analysis of individual participant data: rationale, conduct, and reporting. *BMJ*. 2010 Feb 5;340:c221.
26. Debray TPA, Moons KGM, Abo-Zaid GMA, Koffijberg H, Riley RD. Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis for a Binary Outcome: One-Stage or Two-Stage? *PLOS ONE*. 2013 Apr 9;8(4):e60650.
27. Kontopantelis E. A comparison of one-stage vs two-stage individual patient data meta-analysis methods: A simulation study. *Res Synth Methods*. 2018 Sep;9(3):417–30.
28. Ververs M tesse, Antierens A, Sackl A, Staderini N, Captier V. Which Anthropometric Indicators Identify a Pregnant Woman as Acutely Malnourished and Predict Adverse Birth Outcomes in the Humanitarian Context? *PLoS Curr* [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 17];5. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3682760/>
29. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol*. 1995;57(1):289–300.
30. White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Stat Med*. 2011;30(4):377–99.
31. Bell ML, Fiero M, Horton NJ, Hsu CH. Handling missing data in RCTs; a review of the top medical journals. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2014 Nov 19;14(1):118.
32. Hong H, Chu H, Zhang J, Carlin BP. A Bayesian missing data framework for generalized multiple outcome mixed treatment comparisons. *Res Synth Methods*. 2016;7(1):6–22.

Table 1: Study information for the maternal BEP lactation trials that will be included in the IPD meta-analysis

Full study name	Short name	Country	Study design ¹	Sample size	Enrollment dates	Registry	References
Nutritional Interventions to Improve Linear Growth during Infancy in India: Supplementing Lactating Mothers	IMPRINT	India	Individual randomization Arm 1: BEP Arm 2: Control	816	April 2018 – January 2020	Clinical Trials Registry-India CTRI/2018/04/0130 95	Taneja et al. 2021
Mumta Lactating Women Trial	MumtaLW	Pakistan	Individual randomization Arm 1: BEP Arm 2: BEP with Azithromycin (infants only) Arm 3: Control	957 ³	June 2018 – January 2021	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT03564652	Muhammad et al. 2020
Micronutriments pour la Santé de la Mère et de l'Enfant-III ²	MISAME-III	Burkina Faso	Individual randomization with factorial design ³ Arm 1: BEP Arm 2: Control	800 ⁴	October 2019 – December 2020	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT03533712	Vanslambrouck, Kok, et al. 2021
Maternal Infant Nutrition Trial	MINT	Nepal	Household randomization with factorial design ³ Arm 1: BEP Arm 2: Control	726 ⁴	November 2021 – June 2022 (second cohort: January 2023- July 2023) ⁵	ClinicalTrials.gov NCT03668977	

¹Intervention and control given for 6 months postpartum; all trials provided multiple micronutrients as part of BEP intervention; MumtaLW and MISAME-III gave iron-folic acid supplements to both intervention and control for 6 weeks; see Table 2 for details

²French to English translation: Micronutrients for the health of the mother and infant

³Factorial design for MISAME-III and MINT was random assignment for pregnancy and random assignment for postpartum. Only data on

lactation will be used for this portion of the meta-analysis

⁴Sample size for enrollment (final analytic sample size may be different)

⁵The MINT trial had a break in enrollment

Table 2: BEP and control trial arm descriptions of energy and nutrients provided to women in the lactation trials that will be included in the IPD meta-analysis¹

Study	BEP intervention given during the lactation period					Control given during the lactation period	
	Serving size (g)	Kcals	Protein (g)	Fat (g)	Description		
IMPRINT	140-150	600	20	15-20	5 different locally prepared snacks (Hungry Foal Company)	MMN tablet provided containing: vitamins A, C, D, E, B6, and B12, folate, thiamin, riboflavin, niacin, copper, iron, iodine, zinc, and selenium Encouraged to use IFA, calcium, and vitamin D for 6 months available through national program (supplement that provides 600 kcals [18-20 g protein] also available but has low coverage)	Encouraged to use IFA, calcium, and vitamin D for 6 months available through national program (supplement that provides 600 kcals [18-20 g protein] also available but has low coverage)
MumtaLW	150 ²	800	21	24	BEP product (Ismail Industries, certified by World Food Program)	BEP was fortified with MMN: vitamins A, C, E, B1, B2, B6, B12, folic acid, niacin, pantothenic acid, calcium, copper, iodine, iron, magnesium, manganese, selenium, zinc, phosphorus, potassium IFA tablet given for 6 weeks (by government program, or by trial if participant did not receive	IFA tablet given for 6 months (by government program, or by trial if participant did not receive from program)

from program)

MISAME-III	72	393	14.5	26	BEP product (Nutriset Company)	BEP was fortified with MMN: vitamins A, C, D, E, B1, B2, B6, and B12, folic acid, niacin, K, calcium, copper, iron, iodine, phosphorus, selenium, and zinc	IFA tablet given for 6 weeks (by trial)
MINT	72	391	14.7	26	BEP product (Nutriset Company)	BEP was fortified with MMN: vitamins A, C, D, E, B1, B2, B6, and B12, folic acid, niacin, K, calcium, copper, iron, iodine, phosphorus, selenium, and zinc	IFA tablet provided for 6 weeks (by trial) No IFA from trial or government program (not part of standard of care during lactation)

¹ Groups in the intervention and control received the standard of care for maternal and infant clinical care. Trials also provided health-based counseling (e.g., on breastfeeding), which varied by study. Further details can be found in each trial's published protocol.

² Values for serving size, kcals, and protein represent two sachets of BEP (75 g each).

Abbreviations: BEP=Balanced energy-protein; IFA=Iron and folic acid; IMPRINT=Nutritional Interventions to Improve Linear Growth during Infancy in India: Supplementing Lactating Mothers; MISAME-III=Micronutriments pour la SAnté de la Mère et de l'Enfant-III or Micronutrients for the health of the mother and infant; MMN=Multiple micronutrients; MumtaLW=Mumta Lactating Women Trial

Table 3: Maternal and infant outcomes (at six months of infant age) to be assessed in the IPD meta-analysis of BEP lactation trials

Study outcomes	Variables	Infant or Maternal	Measurements/ Units
Primary	Length-for-age z-score (LAZ)	Infant	z-score
Secondary	Weight-for-length z-score (WLZ)	Infant	z-score
	Weight-for-age z-score (WAZ)	Infant	z-score
	Growth velocity (birth to 6 months)	Infant	g/kg/day
	Stunting	Infant	LAZ <-2; %
	Wasting	Infant	WLZ <-2; %
	Underweight	Infant	WAZ <-2; %
	Body mass index (BMI)	Maternal	kg/m ²
	Mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC)	Maternal	cm
	Low MUAC	Maternal	MUAC <23.0 cm
	Underweight	Maternal	BMI <18.5 kg/m ²
Exploratory	Head circumference-for-age z-score	Infant	z-score
	MUAC-for-age z-score	Infant	z-score
	Ferritin	Infant & maternal	ng/mL
	Transferrin receptor	Infant & maternal	mcg/dL
	Hemoglobin	Infant & maternal	g/dL
	C-reactive protein (CRP)	Infant & maternal	mg/L
	Alpha-1-acid glycoprotein (AGP)	Infant & maternal	mg/dL
	Iron deficiency	Infant & maternal	%
	Anemia	Infant & maternal	%
	Infant mortality rate (birth to 6 months)	Infant	per 1,000 live births
Maternal mortality rate (birth to 6 months)	Maternal	per 100,000 live births	

Indices were assessed based on World Health Organization Growth Standards(21) and INTERGROWTH-21st methodology. Abbreviations: BEP=Balanced Energy-Protein supplementation; IPD=Individual Participant Data