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Background

Description of the condition
Despite significant decreases in the prevalence of under-nutrition among young children during the past decade, global estimates in 2012 (Child Malnutrition Database 2012) indicate that 15% (99 million) of children under the age of five years are underweight (weight-for-age z score below -2 standard deviations (SD)), 8% (51 million) are wasted (weight-for-height z score below -2SD), of whom at least 19 million children suffer from severe acute malnutrition (SAM). Stunting (height-for-age below -2SD) also remains a significant public health problem, with 25% (162 million) of children worldwide below the age of five years being classified as stunted (Child Malnutrition Database 2012). The majority of undernourished children are from countries in Africa and Asia (Child Malnutrition Database 2012).

On the contrary, 7% (44 million) of young children globally are overweight (weight-for-height z-score above +2SD), corresponding to a 54% increase in childhood obesity over the past ten years (Child Malnutrition Database 2012). The prevalence of childhood obesity is increasing in all regions of the world, including low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) where maternal and child under-nutrition is prevalent, resulting in the so-called double burden of malnutrition (Child Malnutrition Database 2012).

Several anthropometric parameters have been used in the literature to define moderate under-nutrition among infants and young children. In 1995 the Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) strategy for the prevention and treatment of mortality and illness in young children was adopted by countries worldwide (WHO 2005). Any of the following terms and cut-offs is indicative of moderate under-nutrition (UNICEF 2014; WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group; WHO 2012; WHO 2014):

- Moderately underweight (weight-for-age ≥-3SD but < -2 SD)
- Moderately wasted (weight-for-height ≥ -3SD but < -2SD; MUAC < 125 mm and > 115 mm) or moderate acute malnutrition (MAM)
- Moderately stunted (height-for-age ≥ -3SD but < -2SD) or moderate chronic malnutrition

Description of the intervention
The World Health Organization (WHO) currently recommends the provision of nutrient-dense supplementary food to children with moderate under-nutrition in order to meet the child’s extra needs for weight and height gain and functional recovery (WHO 2012). There are currently no evidence-informed recommendations on the composition of supplementary foods used to treat undernourished children. In this review oral supplementary foods are defined as specially formulated foods in ready-to-eat, milled or powdered form which are modified in energy density, protein, fat and/or micronutrient composition to help meet the nutritional requirements of undernourished infants and children. These foods are intended to supplement the home diet, and not to meet total daily nutritional intake requirements of these children. The various types of supplementary foods include, but are not limited to:
• Lipid-based nutrient supplements (LNP), for example ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF)
• Fortified blended foods, for example corn-soy or wheat-soy flours with/without sugar/oil
• Fortified powdered supplements, for example fortified milk and or soy-based powder to be reconstituted with water

There are currently three Cochrane systematic reviews investigating the effectiveness of various supplementary foods in children below the age of five.

Schoonees 2013 specifically assessed the effectiveness of home-based ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF) in children with severe acute malnutrition (Schoonees 2013). This review of four trials, three of which had a high risk of bias, found limited evidence on the effectiveness of RUTF in children with severe acute malnutrition and concluded that both RUTF and standard diet (flour porridge) could be used to treat severe acute malnutrition in children in a home-based setting. In three of the studies included in this review, RUTF replaced the habitual diet of the children. In the remaining study (Manary 2004; Ndekha 2005) participants in one of the study arms received a RUTF supplement which provided one third of the recommended daily nutrient requirements for severely malnourished children only, whereas the remainder of the participants received the full recommended daily nutrient requirement.

Sguassero 2012 assessed the effectiveness of supplementary feeding to promote growth in children in low- and middle-income countries (Sguassero 2012). This review included studies conducted in children who were at nutritionally at risk of becoming undernourished; whereas our review focuses on studies in children who are already moderately undernourished. Based on the findings of eight randomized controlled trials, deemed to have high risk of bias, supplementary food appeared to have a negligible effect on growth of children in low- and middle-income countries.

Lazzerini 2013 found there to be moderate to high quality evidence for the effectiveness of supplementary food in treating moderate acute malnutrition in children from low- and middle-income countries (Lazzerini 2013).

How the intervention might work
Childhood malnutrition, in any form, is associated with poor health outcomes at all stages of an individual’s life. Stunted, underweight and wasted children are at increased risk of death from diarrhoea, pneumonia, measles and other infectious diseases (Black 2013). Undernourished children also have decreased learning capacity, which may result in decreased work capacity in adulthood (Black 2008). In addition to this, childhood malnutrition is also associated with an increased prevalence of non-communicable diseases in adulthood (Black 2008).

A meta-analysis from five prospective birth cohorts in LMICs investigated the relationship between childhood growth patterns and health and productivity in adulthood (Richter 2012; Adair 2013). A child will weigh more if it grows taller and/or gets fatter or more muscular. In order to assess the independent effect of
weight gain and height gain, conditional relative weight (weight gain that is separated from change in height) and conditional relative height were calculated for all of the individuals in the cohorts. Conditional weight is the amount by which the weight at the end of a time interval exceeds the predicted weight at the beginning of the interval based on previous weight measurements (Menezes 2011). A positive conditional weight or height indicates growing faster than expected given prior size.

The main findings of the meta-analysis showed that although higher birthweight was associated [OR: 1.28, 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.21–1.35; body mass index (BMI) increased by 0.5 kg/m² per standard deviation (SD) increase in birthweight] with adult overweight (BMI > 25kg/m²), it was also associated with large gains in human capital (In the meta-analysis attained schooling was used as a proxy for human capital which is "the stock of knowledge, habits, social and personality attributes, including creativity, embodied in the ability to perform labor so as to produce economic value"); birthweight versus "did not complete secondary school": OR: 0.82, 95% CI: 0.78–0.87), with little association with adult cardiovascular risk factors [Birth weight versus elevated blood pressure (systolic blood pressure ≥130 mm Hg or diastolic blood pressure ≥85 mm Hg): OR: 0.93, 95% CI: 0.88–0.99; Adair 2013]. A similar relationship was noted with faster linear growth from 0 to 2 years. Although associated with slightly increased likelihood of adult overweight (mostly related to lean mass; conditional height at age 2 years versus BMI >25 kg/m2: OR=1.24, 95% CI:1.17–1.31) and elevated blood pressure (conditional height at age 2 years versus elevated blood pressure: OR=1.12 95% CI: 1.06–1.19), higher conditional heights at age 2 years and at mid-childhood (4 years of age in 4 of the cohorts and 8 years of age in the Phillipines cohort) were related to lower risk of short stature (Conditional height at age 2 years: OR=0.23 95% CI: 0.20–0.25; Conditional height mid-childhood:OR=0.39 95% CI:0.36–0.43) and poor educational attainment (Conditional height at age 2 years: OR=0.74 95% CI: 0.67–0.78; Conditional height mid-childhood: OR=0-87 95% CI: 0.83–0.92). In contrast, faster weight gain, independent of linear growth, had little benefit for human capital (Adair 2013). After the age of 2 years, faster weight gain was associated with a higher likelihood of overweight (Conditional relative weight at age 2 years: OR=1.51 95% CI: 1.43–1.60) and elevated blood pressure (Conditional relative weight at age 2 years: OR=1.07 95% CI: 1.01–1.13) in adulthood. Higher conditional relative weight in mid-childhood (4 years of age in 4 of the cohorts and 8 years of age in the Phillipines cohort) was associated with higher likelihood of being overweight (Conditional relative weight mid-childhood: OR=1.76 95% CI: 1.66–1.86) and having elevated blood pressure (Conditional relative weight mid-childhood: OR=1.22 95% CI: 1.15–1.30) as an adult (Adair 2013).

Based on the findings of the meta-analysis, there appears to be a critical period of the under-nourished child’s life when providing supplementary food is beneficial but that beyond this age/stage supplementary food that promotes rapid weight gain independent of a gain in height may be detrimental to the child’s future health. The authors concluded that a review of current practices is necessary in order to avoid the promotion of excess weight gain in children older than 2 years and emphasized the importance of monitoring the linear growth of young children (Adair 2013).
Why it is important to do this review
In the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty and malnutrition, malnourished children grow up to be unhealthy and unproductive adults who are unable to rise out of poverty they were born into. These unhealthy, poor adults give birth to offspring who are predisposed to ill-health as a consequence of genetic alterations in the foetus of malnourished mothers (Adair 2004; Barker 1999) as well as to a sub-optimal nutritional environment in early childhood. Interventions aimed at improving the well being of women and young children are of vital importance to break this cycle (Barker 2012).

The meta-analysis of the COHORT data (Adair 2013) showed that excess weight gain in children older than 2 years may is associated with increased risk for non-communicable diseases in adulthood. It is unclear from this data what caused the rapid increase in weight gain in the children. Supplementary food is provided to undernourished children to promote weight and height gain. Therefore, it is important to assess the benefits and potential long-term harm of providing supplementary food to severely and moderately undernourished children.

The promotion of optimum growth patterns in early life is likely to lead to less under-nutrition, increased human capital, and reduced risks of obesity and non-communicable diseases, thus addressing both components of the double burden of malnutrition. In 2012, the WHO Member States endorsed six global targets for improving maternal, infant and young child nutrition and are committed to monitoring progress towards these targets (WHO 2014). The targets are vital for identifying priority areas for action and catalyzing global change. The targets for 2025 include:
· reduction of childhood stunting
· reduction of anaemia in women of reproductive age
· reduction of low birth weight
· no increase in childhood overweight
· increasing exclusive breastfeeding rates in the first six months of life reduction of wasting in children.
In line with these targets, the WHO Nutrition group is updating its current recommendations on infant and child feeding. This systematic review will form part of this process and specifically aims to evaluate the evidence on the short term (childhood) and long term (adulthood) benefits and harms of providing supplementary food or nutrition counseling or both to undernourished infants and children below the age of five years.

Objectives
To evaluate the effects of supplementary foods or nutrition counseling or both on linear growth, becoming overweight or obese, developing risk factors for cardiovascular disease or diabetes mellitus, and developing cardiovascular disease or diabetes mellitus later in life in infants and children (6 – 59 months), classified as moderately malnourished (weight-for-age Z score: < -2 Z score and ≥ -3 Z score; wasted; weight-for-height < -2 Z score and ≥ -3 Z score or mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) <125mm and >115).
Methods

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies
We planned to include randomised controlled trials (RCTs), non-randomised trials with a control group (CCTs) and prospective analytical cohort studies with appropriate comparison groups. Eligible trials could be of a parallel or crossover design. For crossover studies the first period data had to be available. Studies with follow-up periods of any duration were included. We excluded prospective cohort studies that included historical comparison groups. We also excluded retrospective cohort, case-control and case series studies based on the low quality of interventional evidence provided by these study designs.

Types of participants
Studies including moderately undernourished infants and children (6–12 months, 13–24 months and 25–59 months) were included in the review. A variety of anthropometric parameters have been used in the literature to define moderate under-nutrition among infants and young children. Studies that included participants with at least one of the following anthropometric parameters at study entry were included in this review:

- Moderately underweight (Weight-for-age Z score ≥-3SD but < -2 SD)
- Moderately wasted (Weight-for-height Z score ≥-3SD but < -2SD; MUAC < 125 mm and > 115 mm) or moderate acute malnutrition (MAM)
- Moderately stunted (Height-for-age Z score ≥-3SD but < -2SD) or moderate chronic malnutrition

Studies conducted in “nutritionally at risk” children, were excluded from the review but were flagged accordingly in order to keep track of these studies. Studies conducted in villages where a proportion of the children were severely or moderately undernourished were included in the review if the study outcomes were presented for these specific groups of children. Studies conducted on children with congenital abnormalities or any other special needs (e.g. have had an organ transplant) were excluded.

Types of interventions

Intervention:
Studies investigating the provision of any community or home-based oral supplementary foods for at least 4 weeks, nutrition counseling, or both, would be eligible for inclusion. In this review nutrition counseling or advice is the use of an interactive helping process focusing on the need for diet modification. Oral supplementary foods are defined as specially formulated foods in ready-to-eat, milled or powdered form which are modified in energy density, protein, fat and/or micronutrient composition to help meet the nutritional requirements of undernourished infants and children. These foods are intended to supplement the home diet, and not to meet total daily nutritional intake requirements of these children. Various types of supplementary foods were included in the review:

- Lipid-based nutrient supplements (LNP), for example ready-to-use supplementary food (RUSF), also referred to as ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF) supplement or fortified spread
• Fortified blended foods, for example corn-soy or wheat-soy flours with/without sugar and/or oil
• Fortified powdered supplements, for example fortified milk and or soy-based powder to be reconstituted with water

Studies investigating the singular effect of micronutrient powders, which refer to vitamin and mineral supplements in unit dose forms such as capsules, tablets, powders or solutions, were excluded. Studies investigating the use of different types of complementary foods (when breast milk is no longer enough to meet the nutritional needs of the infant, complementary foods should be added to the diet of the child. The transition from exclusive breastfeeding to family foods, referred to as complementary feeding, typically covers the period from 6 to 18-24 months of age), in infants 6 months of age and older were excluded.

Comparison:
Any form of nutrition counseling or standard of care (as defined by the study authors or whatever is determined appropriate for the study setting). If the intervention is stand-alone nutrition counseling then the comparison group should not include nutrition counseling. Studies comparing different types of supplementary foods were placed in the studies awaiting assessment section of the review.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes
• Linear growth measured by length/height-for-age and rate of change of length/height-for-age
• Overweight /obesity as measured by weight-for-height or body mass index-for-age in children under 18 years, and body mass index (BMI) for adults
• Risk factors for cardiovascular disease or diabetes (for example, abnormal blood pressure, blood lipids, fasting blood glucose, HbA1c)
• Cardiovascular events or diagnosis of diabetes mellitus

Secondary outcomes
• Other anthropometric measures include MUAC, waist circumference, % body fat, fat mass, skinfold thickness, rate of change of weight-for-age, weight-for-height or BMI-for-age up to 59 months; up to 19 years; any time after 19 years.
• Adverse events resulting from the supplementary food such as diarrhoea, vomiting, nausea, constipation, food-related allergies.
• Adherence to the issued supplementary food and attendance at follow-up counseling

Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches
A comprehensive search strategy (see Appendix 1), developed in consultation with Vittoria Lutje (information specialist at Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine), was used to search the following databases for relevant studies. The search was
run on the 24 August 2014 and it was not limited by language or date of publication:

• Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), published in The Cochrane Library;
• MEDLINE (OVID);
• EMBASE (OVID);
• LILACS;
• WHO Global Health Library;
• Cumulative Index to Nursing & Allied Health (CINHAL, through EbscoHost)
• African Index Medicus

We searched the following databases for ongoing trials:

• WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) ([http://www.who.int/ictrp/en/](http://www.who.int/ictrp/en/))
• MetaRegister of Current Controlled Trials (mRCT; http://www.controlled-trials.com/mrct/)
• ClinicalTrials.gov ([http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/))

We contacted the author of each trial identified in the trial registries to establish whether the trial had already been published and to find out if he/she was aware of any other relevant studies.

We searched the following web site for additional trials:

• iLiNS project website - The [International Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements (iLiNS) Project](http://www.ilins.org/) is a research collaboration that grew out of a shared commitment to accelerate progress in preventing malnutrition

**Searching other resources**

For assistance in identifying ongoing or unpublished studies, we contacted non-profit organisations and research collaborations [MANA (Mother Administered Nutritive Aid), International Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements (iLiNS) Project], nutrition industry partners (Nutriset and Edesia Global Nutrition Solutions) and international organisations (Home Fortification Technical Advisory Group. We planned to contact other international organisations such as the nutrition section of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the World Food Programme (WFP), the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), Hellen Keller International (HKI), Sight and Life Foundation, the Department of Nutrition for Health and Development and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

In order to obtain additional references, experts in the field of childhood nutrition were contacted. Reference lists of included studies and appropriate reviews were screened to identify other relevant studies. We also contacted the authors of all included studies to determine if they were aware of additional trials or studies (published, unpublished or ongoing) in the field.

**Data collection and analysis**

**Selection of studies**
Two reviewers (Liesl Nicol: LN and Marianne Visser: MV) independently screened the titles and abstracts of all records retrieved through searching of the electronic databases. We applied the pre-specified selection criteria to screen studies for potential inclusion. Full-texts of all reports deemed potentially eligible by either of us were retrieved for closer inspection. Full-texts that appeared to meet the inclusion criteria on the first screening but were later deemed unsuitable for inclusion were listed in the table “Characteristics of Excluded Studies”, together with the reasons for their exclusion. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (Nandi Siegfried: NS).

Data extraction and management
We (LN and MV) independently extracted relevant data from all eligible studies. A data extraction form was used as a template to guide domains for data extraction. Discrepancies regarding extracted data were resolved by discussion with a third reviewer (NS). The following information was extracted from each included study:

- Administrative details: Study identification number; author(s); published or unpublished; year of publication; number of studies included in paper; year in which study was conducted; details of other relevant papers cited;
- Details of the study: study design (e.g. RCT, CCT, prospective cohort); type, duration and completeness of follow-up; country and location of study (e.g. higher-income vs. lower-income country); informed consent and ethics approval;
- Details of participants: age, sex, sample size, relevant baseline characteristics including birth weight and length and nutritional status (birth weight, stunted, wasted, very low birth weight);
- Details of intervention and control group: type of supplementary food or nutrition counseling, dosage of supplementary food or nutrition counseling, form and formulation of supplementary food or nutrition counseling, additional co-interventions (such as fortification with micronutrients); description of treatment received by the control group.
- Details of outcomes: all pre-specified outcomes and any additional outcomes reported in the study; adverse events.
- Details of quality assessment: quality assessment of the study based on the Risk of Bias tool (see Appendix 3).
- Details of data analysis: numbers and reported statistics for each reported outcome.

When study outcomes were reported in more than one reference, all of the study reports were used to extract data as comprehensively as possible.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies
We (LN and MV) independently assessed the risk of bias of each included study. The Cochrane Risk of Bias tool was used to assess bias in RCTs. In the case of cluster RCTs, the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool was used in combination with the additional domains of recruitment bias, baseline imbalance and loss of clusters (Cochrane Handbook chapter 16; see Appendix 2). The Newcastle Ottawa Scale was used to assess the methodological quality of eligible prospective cohort studies (see Appendix 3).
Measures of treatment effect
We summarised the evidence by outcome and study design. For each study data analysis was conducted using Review Manager (RevMan) version 5.3 (Review 2011). Outcome measures for dichotomous data (e.g. proportion of participants with BMI>25 kg/m²) were calculated as a relative risk with 95% confidence intervals. For continuous data (e.g. mean change in height) the weighted mean difference and standard deviations were calculated for normally distributed data. This was only possible where means and not medians were reported. If no means were reported and we were not able to obtain this information from the authors, then the results reported by the authors are described in the text.

If only the adjusted analyses [for example, the absolute change from a statistical analysis adjusting for baseline differences (such as regression models, mixed models or hierarchical models) or the relative change adjusted for baseline differences in the outcome measures (i.e. the absolute post-intervention difference between the intervention and control groups minus the absolute pre-intervention difference between the intervention and control groups) / the post-intervention level in the control group)] were provided by the studies then these values were reported in the narrative.

Unit of analysis issues
If there was a unit of analysis error in the reported analysis for a study and there is insufficient information to re-analyse the results, the study authors were contacted to obtain necessary data. If these data are not available, we will not report confidence intervals or p-values for which there is a unit of analysis error.

Dealing with missing data
Where data was missing or unclear, we contacted study authors wherever possible (see contact log). When percentages were provided without denominators we back-calculated to determine denominators. If only standard errors or 95% confidence intervals are reported for means and no standard deviations, the standard deviations were calculated as follows: $SD = SEM \times \sqrt{\text{sample size}}$. If unable to obtain missing data, we reported the results that were available, provided they were not likely to be misleading (e.g. if there is a unit of analysis error).

Assessment of heterogeneity
Studies were first assessed for methodological heterogeneity prior to conducting meta-analysis. Separate meta-analyses were conducted for RCTs, CCTs and cohort studies. We examined studies for clinical heterogeneity by examining variability in the participants, interventions and outcomes. Where it was clinically meaningful to combine studies, we conducted a meta-analysis using random-effects model as we anticipated statistical heterogeneity. We further assessed statistical heterogeneity in the meta-analysis study results using the Chi-square test for heterogeneity (significance level $p < 0.1$). Statistical heterogeneity was also quantified with the $I^2$ test, using the following guidelines for the interpretation of the $I^2$ values (Higgins 2002):

$I^2 = 0\% \text{ to } 40\%$: might not be important
Data synthesis
Where studies are sufficiently homogenous we combined the results of the studies using random-effects meta-analysis as we anticipate some heterogeneity. If the results of the included studies were not similar enough to combine then the study results were presented in the narrative.

Where appropriate, in studies with more than one intervention arm we combined the data from the intervention arms and compared it to the control arm of the study (Cochrane Handbook: see section 16.5.4.). We used the recommended formulae in Table 7.7.a of the Cochrane Handbook to combine numbers into a single sample size, mean and standard deviation for each intervention group (see Appendix 4 for formula details).

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity
Where appropriate, subgroup analysis was undertaken based on:

- The nutritional status of the children i.e. moderately wasted (weight-for-height < -2 Z score) or stunted (height-for-age < -2 Z score) but not severely wasted (weight-for-height <-3 Z score)
- Relevant anthropometrical parameters (severely stunted, moderately stunted, severely wasted, moderately wasted),
- Age (6-24 months and 24-60 months)
- Duration of supplementary feeding. Outcomes were sub-grouped based on the length of exposure to the supplementary food or comparison
- Children with or without co-infections e.g. HIV, TB, malaria
- Categories of oral supplementary foods e.g. Lipid based nutrient supplements, fortified blended foods, fortified powdered supplements, macronutrient composition of supplementary food (i.e. high fat, protein or carbohydrate), solid food versus liquid food, ready to use food versus not ready to use food, with or without micronutrients

To determine how robust and consistent the results were we had planned to conduct sensitivity analyses based on the risk of bias in each study (high, medium, low risk of bias in the allocation concealment). However, we have not yet done this. In the event of missing data, we planned to perform sensitivity analyses for missing data by imputing a plausible range of assumptions. We discussed the potential implications of missing information.

Quality of the evidence
The quality of the evidence will be assessed using Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE), and GradePro (Grade Profiler) 3.2.2 was used to create Summary of Findings tables for each comparison using the seven pre-specified outcomes determined as most important to patients by the WHO Guidelines Development Group. In determining the level of evidence for each outcome, both the efficacy results and the assessment of the risk of bias were integrated into a final assessment of the level of evidence and full details of the decision will be provided.
Results

Description of studies

Results of the search
Searching all of the electronic databases resulted in a yield of 2048 records. At the end of the initial screening phase we assessed 258 full text articles for eligibility. We identified 34 references, pertaining to 13 studies that met the inclusion criteria of the review. The reasons for excluding ineligible studies are outlined in the study flow diagram (Figure 1).

Included studies
Thirteen studies met the inclusion criteria of our review. All of the included studies were conducted in low and middle-income countries (LMICs). Three studies were conducted in India (Missiriya 2014; Roy 2005; Rao 1977), seven studies were conducted in Africa (Krahenbuhl 1998; Kuusipalo 2006; Lopriore 2004; Nikiema 2014; Richter-Strydom 1985; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012), two studies were conducted in Jamaica (Heikens 1989; Walker 1991) and one study was conducted in Guatemala (INCAP study: Habicht 1992).

Study design
Nine studies were randomised controlled trials (RCTs), three studies were cluster randomised controlled trials (Nikiema 2014, Roy 2005, INCAP study: Habicht 1992) and one study was a cluster-controlled trial in which the villages were randomly selected for inclusion but the allocation of the treatment to the different villages does not appear to have been random (Rao 1977).

Participants
Age: The age of the participants in the included studies ranged from seven months (Richter-Strydom 1985) up to 5 years. In eight studies the children were below the age of two years at the start of the study (Heikens 1989; Kuusipalo 2006; Nikiema 2014; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012; Walker 1991; Richter-Strydom 1985; Roy 2005) and in three studies the children were above the age of two years (Krahenbuhl 1998; Lopriore 2004; Missiriya 2014). In Krahenbuhl 1998 the mean age of the children at baseline was 5.6 years. In the INCAP trial the children ranged from 0-7 years of age (Habicht 1992). Rao 1977 included children aged 1-5 years old.

Nutritional status of the participants: Rao 1977 reported on the effect of supplementary food in a subgroup of moderately underweight children (60-75% of expected weight for age based on NCHS growth reference standards). The remainder of the included studies reported on the effect of supplementary food in moderately underweight children (Missiriya 2014; Richter-Strydom 1985; Roy 2005), some of whom were also moderately stunted (Heikens 1989; Krahenbuhl 1998; Kuusipalo 2006; Lopriore 2004; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012; Walker 1991). One study specifically investigated moderately underweight children with moderate wasting or moderate acute malnutrition (MAM; Nikiema 2014). In Habicht 1992 the children in the selected villages were “nutritionally at risk”. It is reported that 67% of them were moderately stunted (height-for-age z
score \(<-2 \text{ but } \geq -3\) at the age of 2 years (Habicht 1992). Children identified with severe under-nutrition (marasmus or kwashiorkor) during the study period received special care and were excluded from the main trial analyses.

Interventions
Based on the study intervention and comparison and the baseline characteristics of the participants we categorized the studies as follows:

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
   1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
       1.1.1. Aged 6-24 months (5 RCTs)
       High-energy supplement (full cream milk powder, sugar, soya oil) versus no supplement (Heikens 1989)
       Milk-based fortified spread (lipid based nutrient supplement) (50g group); Soy-based fortified spread (lipid-based nutrient supplement) (50g group) versus no supplement (Kuusipalo 2006)
       Lipid-based nutrient supplement; corn soy blend versus no supplement (Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012)
       Milk-based formula versus no supplement (Walker 1991)

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
   1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
       1.1.2. Aged 24-59 months (2 RCTs)
       Fortified spread (lipid-based nutrient supplement) versus no supplement (Lopriore 2004)
       Milk-based formula versus no supplement (Walker 1991)

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
   1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
       1.1.3. Outcomes in children aged 5-10 years (2 RCTs)
       High fat biscuit; high carbohydrate biscuit versus no supplement (Krahenbuhl 1998)
       Milk-based formula versus no supplement (Walker 1991)

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
   1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
       1.1.4. Outcomes in adolescents (10-18 years) (1 RCT)
       Milk-based formula versus no supplement (Walker 1991)

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
   1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
       1.1.5. Outcomes in adults (>18 years) (0 studies)
       No data for any of the relevant outcomes

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
   1.2. Moderately underweight children
       1.2.1. Outcomes in subgroup of 1-5 years old (1 cluster controlled study)
       Supplementary food [sweet cakes: wheat flour (23g), sugar (35g) and edible oil (10g)] daily for 6 days a week for 14 months (Rao 1977)
2. Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus nutritional advice
2.1 Moderately underweight children with moderate acute malnutrition
2.1.1 Aged 6-24 months (1 RCT)
Corn soy blend; soy based ready-to-use supplementary food/fortified spread (lipid-based nutrient supplement) versus child-centered counseling (Nikiema 2014)

2. Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus nutritional advice
2.2. Moderately underweight children
2.2.1. Aged 6-59 months (1 RCT, 1 cluster RCT)
Rice/pulse-based supplement plus intensive nutrition education versus intensive nutrition education (Roy 2005)
Rice/soy/nut-based supplement (nutritional bolus) versus nutritional advice (Missiriya 2014)

3. Nutritional advice versus no intervention
3.1. Moderately underweight children
3.1.1. Aged 7-36 months (1 RCT)
Home-based nutrition education programme versus no intervention (Richter-Strydom 1985)

4. Supplementary food versus placebo
4.1. Nutritionally at risk children (1 cluster RCT with long term follow up)
High-energy, high-protein supplement (Atole) versus low-energy protein-free supplement (Fresco) (Habicht 1992)

Nutritional composition of the intervention: The various supplementary foods provided a daily energy intake of between 258kcal (Nikiema 2014) to 750 kcal (Walker 1991). The daily amount of protein provided by the supplementary food ranged from 3g (Rao 1977) to 23g (Habicht 1992), with the majority of the supplementary food providing approximately 8g of protein per day.

Length of intervention: The length of the intervention ranged from 3 months to 2 years. The majority of the studies investigated the effect of a 3-month intervention (Heikens 1989; Kuusipalo 2006; Nikiema 2014; Richter-Strydom 1985; Roy 2005; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012). In two studies the length of the intervention was 6 months (Lopriore 2004; Missiriya 2014). Krahenbuhl 1998 investigated the effect of providing supplementary food for a year in moderately underweight children. Walker 1991 provided a milk-based formula to moderately stunted children for two years. In Rao 1977 the intervention was provided for 14 months and in the INCAP study (Habicht 1992) children aged 0 to 7 years residing in the study villages during 1969 to 1977 received either a high-protein high energy supplement or a protein-free, low energy supplement.
Outcomes:
Only two studies report on health outcomes in adolescents and adults who were moderately underweight children who had or had not received supplementary food (Habicht 1992; Walker 1991).

Habicht 1992:
From 1969-1977, four Guatemalan villages were randomised to receive a high-energy, high-protein supplement (Atole) or low-energy, protein-free supplement (Fresco). Pregnant and lactating mothers and children from 0-7 years residing in these villages were the recipients of the supplements (Habicht 1992). The study participants of the original trial were followed up on three occasions, in 1988-1989, 1997-1998 and 2002-2004. Not all of the children included in the study were either moderately or severely malnourished. The majority of the children in the selected villages were “nutritionally at risk”. Sixty-seven percent of the adolescents and adults included in the long-term follow up studies were moderately stunted (height-for-age z score <-2 but ≥ -3) at 2 years of age. The baseline characteristics of the children in this study do not strictly meet the inclusion criteria of our review. However, we deemed the outcomes from this trial as informative due to the dearth of information on long-term health outcomes in adolescents and adults who were moderately underweight children and who received supplementary food. The following short-term outcomes from this study will be described in the narrative:

Schroeder 1995 reported on the annual increments in length and weight of 1208 children from the Atole and Fresco villages. Outcome data was reported for seven different age intervals ranging from 3 to 84 months (Habicht 1992). Rivera 1991a reported on the household recovery rates after supplementation for 3 months for a sample of children aged 6 to 24 months with mild to moderate wasting (<90% expected weight-for-height) from 372 INCAP households (Habicht 1992).

The long-term outcomes that were included in this review are height (cm), weight (kg) and fat-free mass (kg) among 460 adolescent participants (14-20 years) in a follow-up study (1988-1989) who were participants of the INCAP study during their first 3 years of life. These outcomes were reported in relation to the height (cm) and weight (kg) of each participant at 3 years (Rivera 1995, Habicht 1992). Another follow-up study (1997-1998) of the INCAP study reported data from 450 adults with a mean age of 24.4 years, who were participants of the INCAP study and who had a history of at least one year of growth monitoring in early childhood. Outcomes reported included height, Body Mass Index (BMI), Waist-to-hip ratio (WHR), fasting blood glucose levels, systolic and diastolic blood pressure measurements. These outcomes were reported in relation to each participant’s nutritional status in early childhood (Conlisk 2004; Webb 2005; Habicht 1992).

Walker 1991:
A study conducted in Kingston, Jamaica, provided stunted (recumbent lengths < -2 SD of the NCHS reference) children aged 9-24 months were randomized to receive a milk-based food supplement, stimulation, supplement plus stimulation or weekly visits only (control) for 24 months. Length (cm), weight (kg), head circumference (cm), mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC; cm), tricep skinfold (TSF; mm),
subscapular skinfold (SSF; mm) and weight for length Z-score were reported after 6, 12 and 24 months of supplementation (Walker 1991, Walker 1996).

Follow up assessments were conducted when the study population was 7-8 years old (four years post supplementation) (Grantham-McGregor 1997a), 11-12 years old and 17-18 years old (13 years post supplementation; Walker 2006).

The following relevant outcomes were reported at each of these time points:
- 7-8 years old (4 years post supplementation): Systolic blood pressure; height-for-age Z-score; weight-for-height Z-scores; resting metabolic rate and body composition; length; weight; head circumference; mid-upper arm circumference; triceps skinfold; subscapular skinfold
- 11-12 years old (7 years post supplementation): Blood pressure, BMI, fatness and fat distribution, anthropometry and serum glucose and lipid concentrations
- 17-18 years old (13 years post supplementation): Height-for-age Z score

The remainder of the included studies reported on various anthropometrical measurement and indices of childhood nutritional status. The following short-term outcomes were reported for each of the comparisons below. We have incorporated the relevant short-term outcomes from Walker 1991 into these comparisons.

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:
   1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
   1.1.1. Aged 6-24 months
   - Height after 3 months supplementation (Kuusipalo 2006; Heikens 1989; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012)
   - Height after 6 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
   - Height 3 months post supplementation (Heikens 1989)
   - Height-for-age Z score after 3 months supplementation (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012)
   - Weight-for-height Z score after 3 months supplementation (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012)
   - Weight-for-length Z score after 6 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
   - Weight after 3 months supplementation (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012)
   - Weight after 6 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
   - Weight-for-age Z score after 3 months supplementation (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012)
   - Body mass index after 3 months supplementation (Heikens 1989)
   - Body mass index 3 months post supplementation (Heikens 1989)
   - Mid-upper arm circumference after 3 months supplementation (Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012)
   - Mid-upper arm circumference after 6 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
   - Subscapular skinfold thickness after 6 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
   - Tricep skinfold thickness after 6 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
1. **Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:**

1.1. **Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting**

1.2. **Aged 24-59 months**

- Height after 3 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Height after 6 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Height after 12 months supplementation (Krahenbuhl 1998; Walker 1991)
- Height after 24 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Height-for-age z score after 3 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Height-for-age z score after 6 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Height-for-age z score after 24 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Weight-for-height z score after 3 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Weight-for-height z score after 6 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Weight-for-height z score after 12 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Weight-for-height z score after 24 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Weight after 3 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Weight after 6 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004; Walker 1991)
- Weight after 12 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Weight after 24 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Weight-for-age z score after 3 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Weight-for-age z score after 6 months supplementation (Lopriore 2004)
- Subscapular skinfold thickness after 12 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Subscapular skinfold thickness after 24 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Tricep skinfold thickness after 12 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Tricep skinfold thickness after 24 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Mid-upper arm circumference after 12 months supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Mid-upper arm circumference after 24 months supplementation (Walker 1991)

1.3. **Outcomes in children aged 5-10 years**

- Height after 12 months supplementation (Krahenbuhl 1998)
- Height 4 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Height-for-age z score 4 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Weight-for-height z score 4 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Weight after 12 months supplementation (Krahenbuhl 1998)
- Weight 4 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Mid-upper arm circumference after 12 months supplementation (Krahenbuhl 1998)
- Mid-upper arm circumference 4 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Change in sum of skinfolds after 12 months supplementation (Krahenbuhl 1998)
- Subscapular skinfold thickness 4 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Tricep skinfold thickness 4 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)
- Systolic blood pressure 4 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)
1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:
1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
1.4. Outcomes in adolescents (10-18 years)
   • Height-for-age z score 13 years post supplementation (Walker 1991)

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:
1.2. Moderately underweight children
1.2.1. Subgroup of 1-5 years old
   • Mean increment in height and weight after 14 months of supplementation
     (Rao 1977: No SD values provided therefore describe in the narrative).

2. Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus nutritional advice:
2.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate wasting (MAM)
2.1.1. Aged 6-24 months
   • Daily change in height (Nikiema 2014)
   • Daily change in weight (Nikiema 2014)
   • Daily change in mid-upper arm circumference (Nikiema 2014)
   • Height-for-age z score after 3 months of supplementation (Nikiema 2014)
   • Weight-for-height z score after 3 months of supplementation (Nikiema 2014)

2. Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus nutritional advice:
2.2. Moderately underweight children
2.2.1. Aged 6-59 months
   • Weight, height and MUAC pre and post for supplementation group but not for the control group. Graphs showing the proportion of underweight, wasted and stunted children pre and post intervention in the supplement and control group (Missiriya 2014)
   • Change in weight-for-age Z score after 3, 6, 9 months supplementation (Roy 2005). No standard deviations provided, therefore results reported in the narrative.

3. Nutritional advice versus no nutritional advice
3.1. Moderately underweight children
3.1.1. Aged 7-36 months
   • Weight, height, arm circumference after 3 years. No data obtained from Richter-strydom yet.

4. Supplementary food versus placebo
4.1. Nutritionally at risk children
4.1.1. Aged 0-7 years
4.1.2. Outcomes in adolescents
4.1.3. Outcomes in adults

Nutritional status reference standard used:
The majority of the included studies used the NCHS reference standards
(Krahenbuhl 1998; Roy 2005; Habicht 1992; Rao 1977; Heikens 1989; Walker)
to determine the nutritional status of the children. Richter-Strydom 1985 used a combination of Boston and NCHS reference standards (Richter-Strydom 1985). Nikiema 2014 used WHO growth reference standards (Nikiema 2014). The studies by Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012 report that NCHS growth standards were used to calculate their anthropometric outcome variables, but that sensitivity analyses were conducted with regard to baseline anthropometric indices with the WHO growth standards.

Excluded studies
After screening the full text articles, 217 citations were excluded (see Figure 1) for the following reasons:

- Reviews/guidelines/commentaries = 39
- Description of study design/methods = 3
- Ineligible participants (eg. too young or hospitalised) = 24
- Ineligible participants (severely malnourished) = 2
- Ineligible participants (nutritionally at risk) = 26
- Ineligible intervention = 34
- Ineligible intervention period = 6
- Ineligible comparison group (eg. historical controls) = 5
- Ineligible comparison group (comparative studies) = 15
- No relevant outcomes = 31.

There are 7 references pertaining to six studies awaiting assessment, as we do not yet have sufficient information about the studies to determine their eligibility (see Table of studies awaiting assessment) (Elizabeth 1997; Grellety 2012; Kabahenda 2014; Kielman 1978; Kinra 2008; Perez-Escamilla 1995). The comparative studies have also been added to the table: Studies awaiting assessment.

Risk of bias in included studies
We assessed the risk of bias of RCTs using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool. In the case of cluster RCTs, the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool was used in combination with the additional domains of recruitment bias, baseline imbalance and loss of clusters (Cochrane Handbook chapter 16). We provide a full description of the risk of bias for each included study in the Characteristics of included studies table, which is summarised in Figure 2 and Figure 3.

Allocation (selection bias)
Random sequence generation: Six studies described how the randomization sequence was generated. In all of these studies the method described was adequate and was therefore judged as low risk of bias (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2012; Walker 1991; Lopriore 2004; Nikiema 2014; Roy 2005). The remainder of the studies did not describe how the randomization sequence was generated.

Allocation concealment: Three studies described how the allocation process was conducted. These studies had a low risk of bias for this domain as the person allocating the participants to the treatment groups did not know what group the participants were being assigned to (Nikiema 2014; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012). In the remaining studies it is unclear if allocation
concealment was carried out or if it was adequately conducted. Therefore these studies have been judged as unclear risk of bias for this domain.

**Blinding (performance bias and detection bias)**
Overall blinding was very poorly reported in the included studies. Five studies had low risk of detection bias as it was reported that the outcome assessors were blinded to the treatment group of the participants (Kuusipalo 2006; Lopriore 2004; Richter-Strydom 1985; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012). The risk of performance and detection bias was unclear in the remainder of the studies as blinding of the participants, caregivers and outcome assessors were not described.

**Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)**
Three studies had a high risk of attrition bias (attrition > 10% within study groups and/or between groups in the study; Lopriore 2004; Nikiema 2014; Rao 1977). Six studies had a low risk of bias (Heikens 1989; Krahenbuhl 1998; Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012; Walker 1991) and four studies had unclear risk of bias (Habicht 1992; Missiriya 2014; Richter-Strydom 1985; Roy 2005).

**Selective reporting (reporting bias)**
We were able to access the protocol of three studies (Nikiema 2014; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012). The risk of reporting bias was judged low in these studies as the reported outcomes were in line with those stated in the respective study protocols. We were unable to obtain the study protocol of any of the other included studies. Therefore we judged the studies to have unclear risk of reporting bias.

**Other potential sources of bias**
We used baseline comparability, source of funding (conflicted/non-conflicted) and conflict of interest (presence/absence if reported) as other potential sources of bias. Seven studies were judged to have low risk of bias for this domain based on the fact that in all of the studies the source of funding was non-conflicting; the study authors declared no conflict of interest and the study groups were comparable at baseline (Heikens 1989; Kuusipalo 2006; Lopriore 2004; Nikiema 2014; Roy 2005; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012). In the remaining studies the risk of bias is unclear as appropriate information on one or more of the three criteria was not provided.

**Additional domains for cluster RCTS**
Three of the included studies were cluster randomised controlled trials (Nikiema 2014; Habicht 1992; Roy 2005). Three additional domains were assessed for risk of bias related to the effect of randomising clusters rather than individuals.

**Recruitment bias**
Nikiema 2014 recruitment of participants occurred after randomization of rural health centres and therefore recruitment was judged as inadequate. In Roy 2005 children were recruited into the study before the centres were randomized, therefore recruitment was judged as adequate. In Habicht 1992, all eligible
participants living in the selected villages were included in the study so recruitment was judged as adequate.

**Baseline imbalance**
In Nikiema 2014 and Roy 2005 baseline characteristics of the clusters were not reported so baseline imbalance was judged as unclear. In Habicht 1992 baseline comparability of villages was similar so baseline balance was judged as adequate.

**Loss of cluster**
In Nikiema 2014 there was no loss of cluster but there was missing data on individuals. The number lost to follow up and the defaulters were reported and the number randomized was the same number analyzed so Intention-to-treat analysis was performed. Therefore, we judged that there was a low risk of loss of cluster. In Roy 2005 the study does not report on missing individual data so bias due to loss of cluster was judged unclear.

**Effects of interventions**

1. **Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:**
   1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
   1.1.1. Age: 6-24 months

**Height (cm)**
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no difference in height between the children who received supplementary food and those who did not (4 studies; N=627; mean difference: 0.32 cm; 95% CI: -0.1-0.73; p=0.14; I²=58%; Analysis 1.1; Figure 4). The I² results indicate moderate statistical heterogeneity between the studies included in the meta-analysis. In the meta-analysis of this subgroup, endpoint height data from Heikens 1989 (high energy milk-based supplement) was combined with change in height data from the other three trials. The data from the two intervention arms in Kuusipalo 2006 (50g milk-based fortified spread and 50g soy-based fortified spread) and Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012 (lipid-based nutrient supplements and corn-soy blend) were combined and treated as a single intervention arm (see Methods: Data synthesis).

After six months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children were statistically significantly taller than the non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 1.3cm; 95% CI: 0.25-2.35; p=0.01; Analysis 1.1; Figure 4).

Data collected three months after a three-month supplementation period showed no statistically significant difference in height between the supplemented and non-supplemented children who were moderately underweight with moderate stunting (Heikens 1989; 1 study; N=82; mean difference: 2.3cm; 95% CI: -0.86-5.46; p=0.15; Analysis 1.1; Figure 4).

**Height-for-age z score**
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in height-for-age z score between the supplemented and the non-supplemented children (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012; 3 studies; N=545; mean difference: 0.08 z scores; 95% CI: -0.10-0.26; p=0.38; I²=73%; Analysis 1.2; Figure 5). The I² results indicate substantial heterogeneity between the studies included in the meta-analysis. In the meta-analysis, endpoint height-for-age z score data from Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012 was combined with change in height-for-age z score data from Kuusipalo 2006. The data from the two intervention arms in each of the studies was combined to create a single pair-wise comparison in each study (Kuusipalo 2006: 50g milk-based fortified spread and 50g soy-based fortified spread; Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012: lipid-based nutrient supplements and corn-soy blend; see Methods: Data synthesis).

Weight-for-height z score
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in weight-for-height z score of supplemented and non-supplemented children (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012; 3 studies; N=545; mean difference: 0.09 z score; 95% CI: -0.03-0.22; p=0.15; I²=0%; Analysis 1.3; Figure 6). The I² results indicate no heterogeneity between the meta-analysed studies. The data from the two intervention arms in each of the studies was combined to create a single pair-wise comparison in each study (Kuusipalo 2006: 50g milk-based fortified spread and 50g soy-based fortified spread; Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012: lipid-based nutrient supplements and corn-soy blend; see Methods: Data synthesis).

After six months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in weight-for-height z score of supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.0 z score; 95% CI: -0.39-0.39; p=1.0; Analysis 1.3; Figure 6).

Weight-for-age z score
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in weight-for-age z score of supplemented and non-supplemented children (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012; 3 studies; N=545; mean difference: 0.09 z score; 95% CI: -0.02-0.20; p=0.11; I²=10%; Analysis 1.4; Figure 7). The I² results indicate minimal heterogeneity between the meta-analysed studies. The data from the two intervention arms in each of the studies was combined to create a single pair-wise comparison in each study (Kuusipalo 2006: 50g milk-based fortified spread and 50g soy-based fortified spread; Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012: lipid-based nutrient supplements and corn-soy blend; see Methods: Data synthesis).

Weight (kg)
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children weighed
significantly more than the non-supplemented children (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012; 3 studies; N=545; mean difference: 0.1 kg; 95% CI: 0.03-0.17; p=0.005; I^2=0%; Analysis 1.5; Figure 8). The I^2 results indicate no heterogeneity between the combined studies. The data from the two intervention arms in each of the studies was combined to create a single pair-wise comparison in each study (Kuusipalo 2006: 50g milk-based fortified spread and 50g soy-based fortified spread; Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012: lipid-based nutrient supplements and corn-soy blend; see Methods: Data synthesis).

After six months supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in the weight of the supplemented and the non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.21 kg; 95% CI: -0.27-0.69; p=0.39; Analysis 1.5; Figure 8)

**Body mass index (BMI; kg.m^(-1))**

After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in the BMI of supplemented and non-supplemented children (Heikens 1989; 1 study; N=82; mean difference: 0.5 kg.m^(-1); 95% CI: -0.01-1.01; p=0.06; Analysis 1.6; Figure 9).

BMI data collected three months after the intervention indicates no difference in this outcome between the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Heikens 1989; 1 study; N=82; mean difference: -0.2 kg.m^(-1); 95% CI: -0.7-0.3; p=0.43; Analysis 1.6; Figure 9).

**Mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC, cm)**

After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in MUAC between supplemented and non-supplemented children (Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012; 2 studies; N=491; mean difference: 0.05 kg; 95% CI: -0.09-0.19; p=0.48; I^2=0%; Analysis 1.7; Figure 10). The I^2 results indicate no heterogeneity between the combined studies. The data from the two intervention arms in each of the studies was combined to create a single pair-wise comparison in each study (Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012: lipid-based nutrient supplements and corn-soy blend; see Methods: Data synthesis).

After six months supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in MUAC of the supplemented and the non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.20 kg; 95% CI: -0.29-0.69; p=0.42; Analysis 1.7; Figure 10).

**Body fatness measures**

Tricep skinfold thickness (mm) and subscapular skinfold thickness (mm) are both measures of body fatness. After six month of supplementation in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no difference in tricep skinfold thickness (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.0 mm; 95%CI: -0.64-0.64; p=1.0; Analysis 1.8; Figure 11) and
subscapular skinfold thickness ([Walker 1991]; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.2 mm; 95%CI: -0.34-0.74; p=0.46; [Analysis 1.8]; Figure 11) of supplemented and non-supplemented children.

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:
1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
1.1.2. Age: 24-59 months

**Height (cm)**
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (36-59 months old) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children were significantly taller than the non-supplemented children ([Lopriore 2004]; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 2.4 cm; 95% CI: 0.06-4.74; p=0.04; see [Analysis 2.1]; Figure 12).

After six months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (36-59 months old) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children were significantly taller than the non-supplemented children ([Lopriore 2004]; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 2.4 cm; 95% CI: 0.10-4.70; p=0.04; [Analysis 2.1]; Figure 12).

After 12 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (30-59 months old) with moderate stunting, there was a statistically significant difference in the height of the supplemented and non-supplemented children ([Walker 1991]; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 1.3 cm; 95% CI: 0.03-2.57; p=0.04; [Analysis 2.1]; Figure 12).

After 24 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (18-42 months old) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in the height of the supplemented and non-supplemented children ([Walker 1991]; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 1.2cm; 95% CI: -0.78-3.18; p=0.23; [Analysis 2.1]; Figure 12).

**Height-for-age (z score)**
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (36-59 months old) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children's height-for-age z score was significantly higher than the non-supplemented children ([Lopriore 2004]; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 0.3 z score; 95% CI: 0.07-0.53; p=0.01; [Analysis 2.2]; Figure 13).

After six months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (36-59 months old) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children's height-for-age z score was significantly higher than the non-supplemented children ([Lopriore 2004]; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 0.32 z score; 95% CI: 0.09-0.55; p=0.006; [Analysis 2.2]; Figure 13).

After 24 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in height-for-age z score of the supplemented and non-supplemented children
Weight-for-height (z score)
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children's weight-for-height z score was significantly higher than the non-supplemented children (Lopriore 2004; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 0.31 z score; 95% CI: 0.01-0.59; p=0.04; Analysis 2.3, Figure 14).

After six months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children's weight-for-height z score was significantly higher than the non-supplemented children (Lopriore 2004; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 0.30 z score; 95% CI: 0.01-0.59; p=0.04; Analysis 2.3, Figure 14).

After 12 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in weight-for-height z score of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.0 z score; 95% CI: -0.39-0.39; p=1.0; Analysis 2.3, Figure 14).

Weight (kg)
After three months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children weighed significantly more than the non-supplemented children (Lopriore 2004; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 1 kg; 95% CI: 0.32-1.68; p=0.004; see analysis 2.4.1 Figure 15).

After six months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, the supplemented children weighed significantly more than the non-supplemented children (Lopriore 2004; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 0.9 kg; 95% CI: 0.25-1.55; p=0.007; see analysis 2.4.2 Figure 15).

After 12 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in weight of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.29 kg; 95% CI: -0.29-0.87; p=0.33; Analysis 2.4, Figure 15).

After 24 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in
weight of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.25 kg; 95% CI: -0.53-1.03; p=0.53; Analysis 2.4, Figure 15).

**Weight-for-age z score**

Moderately underweight children older than 24 months, with moderate stunting who received supplementary food had a significantly higher weight-for-age z score than the children who did not receive food after supplementation for three months (Lopriore 2004; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 0.35 z score; 95% CI: 0.09-0.61; p=0.008; Analysis 2.5, Figure 16) and six months (Lopriore 2004; 1 study; N=148; mean difference: 0.34 z score; 95% CI: 0.1-0.58; p=0.005; Analysis 2.5, Figure 16).

**Body fatness measures (mm)**

Tricep skinfold thickness (mm) and subscapular skinfold thickness (mm) are both measures of body fatness. In moderately underweight children older than 24 months, with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference between supplemented and non-supplemented children's tricep skinfold thickness or subscapular skinfold thickness after supplementation for 12 month (Triceps skinfold thickness: Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.2 mm; 95% CI: -0.51-0.91; p=0.58; Analysis 2.7, Figure 17; Subcapular skinfold thickness: Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.2 mm; 95% CI: -0.34-0.74; p=0.46; Analysis 2.7, Figure 17) and 24 months (Triceps skinfold thickness: Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.1 mm; 95% CI: -0.57-0.77; p=0.77; Analysis 2.7, Figure 17; Subcapular skinfold thickness: Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.1 mm; 95% CI: -0.35-0.55; p=0.66; Analysis 2.7, Figure 17).

**Mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC, cm)**

After 12 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in MUAC of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=65; mean difference: 0.2 cm; 95% CI: -0.29-0.69; p=0.42; Analysis 2.8, Figure 18).

After 24 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children (older than 24 months) with moderate stunting, there was no significant difference in MUAC of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.1 cm; 95% CI: -0.45-0.65; p=0.72; Analysis 2.8, Figure 18).

**1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:**

**1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting**

**1.1.3. Age: outcomes in children 5-10 years old**

**Height (cm)**

After 12 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 5-10 years old, there was no significant difference in height of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Krahenbuhl 1998; 1 study; N=88; mean difference: 0.05 cm; 95% CI: -0.62-0.72; p=0.88; Analysis 3.1, Figure 19). The data from the two intervention arms in Krahenbuhl 1998 (high fat biscuit
and high carbohydrate biscuit) was combined to create a single pair-wise comparison (see **Methods**: Data synthesis).

Data collected four years after a two year supplementation period in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, shows no significant difference in height between the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.9 cm; 95% CI: -1.50-3.30; p=0.46; Analysis 3.1, Figure 19). The children were 7-8 years old at this time.

**Height-for-age z score**
Data collected four years after a two year supplementation period in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, shows no significant difference in height-for-age z score of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.2 z score; 95% CI: -0.22-0.62; p=0.35; Analysis 3.2, Figure 20). The children were 7-8 years old at this time.

**Weight-for-height z score**
Data collected four years after a two year supplementation period in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, shows no significant difference in weight-for-height z score of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.1 z score; 95% CI: -0.27-0.47; p=0.60; Analysis 3.3, Figure 21). The children were 7-8 years old at this time.

**Weight**
After 12 months of supplementation in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 5-10 years old, there was no significant difference in weight of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Krahenbuhl 1998; 1 study; N=88; mean difference: 0.05 kg; 95% CI: -0.17-0.27; p=0.65; Analysis 3.4, Figure 22). The data from the two intervention arms in Krahenbuhl 1998 (high fat biscuit and high carbohydrate biscuit) was combined to create a single pair-wise comparison (see **Methods**: Data synthesis).

Data collected four years after a two year supplementation period in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, shows no significant difference in weight of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.8 kg; 95% CI: -0.65-2.25; p=0.28; Analysis 3.4, Figure 22). The children were 7-8 years old at this time.

**Body fatness measures (mm)**
Tricep skinfold thickness (mm) and subscapular skinfold thickness (mm) are both measures of body fatness. In moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 18-42 months old, there was no significant difference between supplemented and non-supplemented children's tricep skinfold thickness or subscapular skinfold thickness measured four years post supplementation (Triceps skinfold thickness: Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.6 mm; 95% CI: -0.39-1.59; p=0.23; Analysis 3.7, Figure 23; Subscapular skinfold thickness: Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.5 mm; 95% CI: -0.22-1.22; p=0.17; Analysis 3.7, Figure 23).
The sum of four skinfold thickness is also a measure of body fatness. In moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 5-10 years old, there was no significant difference between supplemented and non-supplemented children’s sum of four skinfold measurement after supplementation for 12 month (Krahenbuhl 1998; 1 study; N=88; mean difference: 0.74 mm; 95% CI: -0.31-1.79; p=0.17; Analysis 3.7, Figure 23).

**Mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC, cm)**

In moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 5-10 years old, there was no significant difference between supplemented and non-supplemented children’s MUAC measurement after supplementation for 12 month (Krahenbuhl 1998; 1 study; N=88; mean difference: 0.2 cm; 95% CI: -0.29-0.69; p=0.43; Analysis 3.8, Figure 24). The data from the two intervention arms in Krahenbuhl 1998 (high fat biscuit and high carbohydrate biscuit) was combined to create a single pair-wise comparison for this study (see Methods: Data synthesis).

Data collected four years after a two year supplementation period in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, shows no significant difference in MUAC measurements of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=63; mean difference: 0.5 cm; 95% CI: -0.27-1.27; p=0.20; Analysis 3.8, Figure 24). The children were 7-8 years old at this time.

**Blood pressure (mmHg)**

Blood pressure data was collected four years after a two-year supplementation period in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting. There was no significant difference in systolic blood pressure between the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=108; mean difference: -0.2 mmHg; 95% CI: -3.12-2.72; p=0.89; Analysis 3.9, Figure 25). For this outcome data from the supplemented group and supplemented + stimulated group (supplemented) were combined and compared to the combined control and stimulated only (non-supplemented group). The study authors did not find any significant differences between two supplemented or non-supplemented groups, therefore felt justified in combining the respective groups.

1. **Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:**

1.1. **Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting**

1.1.4. **Age: outcomes in Adolescents (10-18 years old)**

Only one study provides long-term data for this comparison. In Walker 1991 moderately underweight children (18 months old) with moderate stunting, were randomized to receive a milk-based food supplement, stimulation, supplement plus stimulation or weekly visits only (control). Length (cm), weight (kg), head circumference (cm), mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC; cm), tricep skinfold (TSF; mm), subscapular skinfold (SSF; mm) and weight for length Z-score were reported after 6, 12 and 24 months of supplementation. Follow up assessments were conducted when the study population was 7-8 years old (four years post supplementation), 11-12 years old and 17-18 years old.

Data collected 13 years after a two year supplementation period in moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, shows no significant difference in
height-for-age z score of the supplemented and non-supplemented children (Walker 1991; 1 study; N=55; mean difference: 0.2 z score; 95% CI: -0.3-0.70; p=0.44; Analysis 4.1, Figure 26). The children were 17-18 years old at this time.

Blood pressure (Walker 2001), BMI, fatness and fat distribution (Walker 2002), anthropometry, serum glucose and lipid concentrations (Bennett 2002) were all assessed when the study population was 11-12 years old (approximately 8 years post intervention). Unfortunately none of these important long-term outcomes are reported per intervention group. Instead the four stunted groups (control, supplementation, stimulation and both supplementation and stimulation) were combined and compared with the non-stunted children. The outcomes are reported for stunted versus non-stunted children. The study authors justify this based on the finding that there was no long-term effect of supplementation on growth in stunted children four years post intervention (Walker 1996). In addition to this, the study authors’ state that there was no effect of supplementation on blood pressure in the study population at 7-8 years of age (Gaskin 2000), therefore the effect of supplementation was not considered further in the analyses (Walker 2001).

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:
   1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
      1.1.5. Age: Adults (older than 18 years)
      We did not find any studies that provided information on the long-term health outcomes in adulthood of moderately underweight children with moderate stunting who either did or did not receive supplementary food in childhood.

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food:
   1.2. Moderately underweight children
   1.2.1. Age: 1-5 years

   Rao 1977 reported the weight and height gain in a subgroup of moderately underweight children (60-75% of weight for age median based on NCHS growth reference standards) aged 1-5 years who received daily sweet cakes (310 kcal and 3 g protein per day) or no supplement for 14 months. The standard deviations were not provided in the published paper so the results will be described in the narrative below. The supplemented children gained significantly more height (8.9 cm, 118 supplemented children vs 7.64 cm, 41 non-supplemented children; p<0.001; as reported in study) and weight (2.06 kg, 118 supplemented children vs 1.75 kg, 41 non-supplemented children; p<0.01; as reported in study) compared to those who did not receive supplementary food.

2. Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus nutritional advice:
   2.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate wasting (MAM)
   2.1.1. Age: 6-24 months

   Change in weight (g/kg/day)
   In moderately underweight children with MAM aged 6 to 24 months, three months of supplementation with fortified corn soy blend or ready-to-use supplementary
food resulted in a significant increase in daily weight gain in the supplemented children compared to the children who received child-centered counselling only (Nikiema 2014; 1 study; N=1974; mean difference: 0.55 g/kg/day; 95% CI: 0.27-0.83; p=0.0001; Analysis 6.1, Figure 27). The authors stated that their sample size calculation was adjusted for the cluster effect (ICC=0.01) but do not state specifically on which anthropometric outcomes the ICC was based upon. However an analysis of national data from developing countries reported the median ICC for wasting and stunting as 0.032 and 0.054, respectively (Fenn 2004).

**Change in height (mm/day)**
In moderately underweight children with MAM aged 6 to 24 months, there was no significant difference in daily height gain between children who received three months of supplementation with fortified corn soy blend or ready-to-use supplementary food and children who received child-centered counselling only (Nikiema 2014; 1 study; N=1974; mean difference: 0.02 mm/day; 95% CI: 0.01-0.05; p=0.12; Analysis 6.2, Figure 28) The authors stated that their sample size calculation was adjusted for the cluster effect (ICC=0.01) but do not state specifically on which anthropometric outcomes the ICC was based upon. However an analysis of national data from developing countries reported the median ICC for wasting and stunting as 0.032 and 0.054, respectively (Fenn 2004).

**Change in mid-upper arm circumference**
In moderately underweight children with MAM aged 6 to 24 months, there was a significant increase in daily change in MUAC in children who received three months of supplementation with fortified corn soy blend or ready-to-use supplementary food compared to the children who received child-centered counselling only (Nikiema 2014; 1 study; N=1974; mean difference: 0.04 mm/day; 95% CI: 0.01-0.07; p=0.01; Analysis 6.3, Figure 29) The authors stated that their sample size calculation was adjusted for the cluster effect (ICC=0.01) but do not state specifically on which anthropometric outcomes the ICC was based upon. However an analysis of national data from developing countries reported the median ICC for wasting and stunting as 0.032 and 0.054, respectively (Fenn 2004).

**Height-for-age z score**
In moderately underweight children with MAM aged 6 to 24 months, three months of supplementation with fortified corn soy blend or ready-to-use supplementary food resulted in a significant increase in height-for-age z score in the supplemented children compared to the children who received child-centered counselling only (Nikiema 2014; 1 study; N=1974; mean difference: 0.40 z score; 95% CI: 0.14-0.66; p=0.003; Analysis 6.4, Figure 30). The authors stated that their sample size calculation was adjusted for the cluster effect (ICC=0.01) but do not state specifically on which anthropometric outcomes the ICC was based upon. However an analysis of national data from developing countries reported the median ICC for wasting and stunting as 0.032 and 0.054, respectively (Fenn 2004).

**Weight-for-height z score**
In moderately underweight children with MAM aged 6 to 24 months, there was no significant difference in weight-for-height z score between children who received three months of supplementation with fortified corn soy blend or ready-to-use
supplementary food and children who received child-centered counselling only (Nikiema 2014; 1 study; N=1974; mean difference: 0.02 mm/day; 95% CI: 0.01-0.05; p=0.12; Analysis 6.5, Figure 31) The authors stated that their sample size calculation was adjusted for the cluster effect (ICC=0.01) but do not state specifically on which anthropometric outcomes the ICC was based upon. However an analysis of national data from developing countries reported the median ICC for wasting and stunting as 0.032 and 0.054, respectively (Fenn 2004).

2. Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus nutritional advice:
2.2. Moderately underweight children
2.2.1. Age: 6-59 months

In a study of moderately underweight pre-school children (49% of whom were 3 years old), six months of supplementation with a rice/soy/nut-based supplement (nutritional bolus) reduced the proportion of children with grade I and II underweight (Indian Academy of Pediatrics classification) by 40%, compared to a reduction of 3% among those who received nutritional advice only (Missiriya 2014). The definitions for stunting and wasting used by the author were unclear, so we felt it best not to report these results in the review.

In a cluster RCT, Roy 2005 compared the effect of three months intensive nutrition education twice a week (INE group) with intensive nutrition education plus supplementary food (INE + SF group: rice/pulse-based supplement containing 300kcal and 9g protein per day) on the nutritional status of moderately underweight (between 61% and 75% of median NCHS standard) children 6-24 months old. The authors state that although that there was an improvement in weight-for-age z scores from baseline in both groups, there was no statistically significant difference in weight-for-age z-scores between the groups at any time point during the 3-month supplementation period or the 3-month follow-up observational period. After 3 months supplementation the weight-for-age was reported as -2.36 in the INE+SF group, compared to -2.51 in the INE group. After 6 months the mean weight-for-age z score was reported as -2.15 in the INE+S group compared to -2.41 in the INE group. The mean weight-for-age at baseline is only graphically presented in the published study and standard deviations were not provided.

Roy 2005 also compared the effect of intensive nutrition education twice a week (INE group) with nutrition education every two weeks (control group; in line with the routine service provided by the Bangladesh Integrated Nutrition Project, BINP) on the nutritional status of moderately underweight children 6-24 months old. At baseline the children in both groups were moderately underweight and were borderline moderately wasted (INE group: -2.0 ± 0.8 weight-for-height z score; Control group: -2.2 ± 0.8 weight-for-height z score) with moderate stunting (INE group: -2.2 ± 1.1 length-for-age z score; Control group: -2.1 ± 1.2 length-for-age z score).

The authors report that there was a significant improvement in weight-for-age z scores after 3 months in both groups; however the mean weight-for-age z scores at
baseline are only graphically presented in the published study. After supplementation for 3 months as well as the 3-month observational period the mean weight-for-age z-scores were significantly higher in the INE group, compared to the control group (At 3 months: INE group: -2.51 Control group -2.84; p<0.001 At 6 months: INE group: -2.41 Control group: -2.84; P<0.001). Standard deviations were not reported.

The authors stated that their sample size calculation was adjusted for the cluster effect (ICC=0.015) but do not state specifically on which anthropometric outcomes the ICC was based upon. However an analysis of national data from developing countries reported the median ICC for wasting and stunting as 0.032 and 0.054, respectively (Fenn 2004).

3. *Nutritional advice versus no nutritional advice:*

3.1. *Moderately underweight children*

3.1.1. *Age: 7-36 months*

In a RCT, Richter-Strydom 1985 investigated the effect of a home-based nutrition education programme versus no education on growth and psychological performance of moderately underweight (72% or less of expected weight for age without oedema or 79% or less of expected weight for age with oedema) children 7-36 months old. The study authors state that the nutrition education programme was provided to the mothers for a few months but do not specifically state how many months. The authors do not report on the short-term outcomes of the investigation. Instead the study authors follow up the children three years later and present data on the growth and psychological functioning of the children (aged 3.5-6 years old). The study authors state that there were no statistically significant differences in physical growth or psychological functioning of the children whose mothers received the nutrition education programme and the children whose mothers had not. The authors present the weight, height, arm circumference after 3 years for both of the groups combined, therefore no further analyses could be conducted on these outcomes.

4. *Supplementary food versus placebo*

4.1. *Nutritionally at risk children*

4.1.1. *Age: 0-7 years*

The INCAP study investigated the effect of providing supplementary food to nutritionally at risk children on growth and psychological development. The primary trial was conducted from 1969-1977. Carefully selected villages were randomly assigned to receive Atole, a high-protein high-energy supplement or Fresco, a protein-free low-energy supplement. Pregnant and lactating mothers and children from birth to 7 years of age were provided either Atole or Fresco, depending on their resident village. Ingestion of the supplements was voluntary, although less than 2% of the families refused participation. The study participants of the original trial were followed up on three occasions, in 1988-1989, 1997-1998 and 2002-2004.
Growth outcomes
Participants receiving high-protein high-energy supplement (Atole) had significantly higher energy intakes from the supplement compared to those receiving protein-free low-energy supplement (Fresco). Differences in energy intake from the supplement between the two groups were statistically significant at all age intervals (up to 84 months). In participants aged less than 12 months, the mean energy intake from the Atole supplement was 90±92 kcal/day, compared to 7±9 kcal daily for those receiving the Fresco supplement (p<0.001). In participants aged 12 to 24 months the mean energy intake from Atole supplement was 143±99 kcal/day, compared to the mean energy intake from Fresco supplement of 14±13 kcal/day (p<0.001; Schroeder 1995).

Children, aged 12 to 24 months, receiving Atole gained significantly more length (9.2 versus 8.2 cm/year; p<0.001) and weight (2.17 vs. 1.74 kg/year; p<0.001) per year compared to children aged 12 to 24 months receiving Fresco. In children aged 24 to 36 months, only the length gain (8.5 versus 8.1 cm/year; p<0.01) and not weight gain (2.22 versus 2.09 kg/year; NS) was significantly higher in the Atole group compared to the Fresco group. For children older than 36 months there was no significant difference in length or weight gain between the two groups (Schroeder 1995).

Supplementary feeding with Atole was more effective than a Fresco in the reversal of wasting among children aged 6 to 24 months with mild to moderate wasting. The proportion of wasted children in the Atole villages who recovered (i.e. weight-for-length was ≥ 90% of the NCHS-WHO references at the end of three-month interval) was significantly greater than the proportion of wasted children in the Fresco villages who recovered (i.e. weight-for-length was ≥ 90% of the NCHS-WHO references at the end of three-month interval; mean house hold recovery rate Atole versus Fresco: 0.50 versus 0.38; p<0.05) (Rivera 1991).

In the Atole villages recovery rates of the supplemented children were similar between the age categories (recovery rate in 6-24 month old: 0.78; recovery rate in 24-48 month old: 0.73). The beneficial effect due to supplementation with Atole was greater in children aged 6-24 months (N=77; attributable benefit: 0.37, 95% CI: 0.18-0.55) compared to children aged 24-48 months (N=104; attributable benefit: 0.08 95% CI: -0.09-0.25; p<0.05). Furthermore, the beneficial effect of supplementation with Atole increased with the duration of supplementation [attributable benefit after three months supplementation: 0.18 (95% CI: 0.05-0.30); attributable benefit after six months supplementation: 0.25 (95% CI: 0.11-0.39); attributable benefit after nine months supplementation: 0.37 (95% CI:0.18-0.55)][Rivera 1996a].

Although supplementation with Atole increased the length of 3-y-old children and reduced prevalence of severe stunting (height-for-age z score ≤ -3) by half, chronic under-nutrition remained common, and the children remained stunted compared to reference standards (Martorell 1995).

4. Supplementary food versus placebo
4.1. Nutritionally at risk children
4.1.2. Age: Adolescents (10-18 years old)

Growth outcomes
In the first follow up study conducted in 1988-1989 height, weight and fat free mass of the original study participants (children who received either Atole or Fresco for the first three years of life, had anthropometric measurements at three years of age) was assessed (Rivera 1995). The participants included in the follow up study were between 14 and 20 years old. In this study cohort, at three years of age both male and female children supplemented with Atole were significantly taller (length at 3 years in males receiving Atole: N=118; 86.9 ± 3.8 cm versus length at 3 years in males receiving Fresco: N=127; 85.3 ± 4.0; p<0.05; length at 3 years in females receiving Atole: N=116; 86.3 ± 3.5 cm versus length at 3 years in females receiving Fresco: N=99; 83.6 ± 3.6; p<0.05) and heavier (weight at 3 years in males receiving Atole: N=118; 12.5 ± 1.2 kg versus weight at 3 years in males receiving Fresco: N=127; 11.8 ±1.3 kg; p<0.05; weight at 3 years in females receiving Atole: N=116; 12.1 ± 1.3 kg versus weight at 3 years in females receiving Fresco: N=99, 10.9 ± 1.1 kg; p<0.05) than male and female children of the same age who received Fresco. At adolescence, female participants who received the Atole supplement were significantly taller (height at adolescence in Atole group: N=116; 150.5 ± 5.3 cm; height at adolescence in Fresco group: N=99; 148.8 ± 4.7 cm; p<0.05) and heavier (weight at adolescence in Atole group: N=116; 48.3 ± 6.7 kg; weight at adolescence in Fresco group: N=99; 46.0 ± 5.7 kg; p<0.05) and had significantly greater fat-free mass (fat-free mass at adolescence in Atole group: N=116; 37.3 ± 5.3 kg; fat-free mass at adolescence in Fresco group: N=99; 35.2 ± 4.6 kg; p<0.05) than adolescent females who received Fresco. There was no significant difference in height, weight or fat-free mass between the Atole and Fresco adolescent males. After adjusting for the weight and height of each participant at 3 years of age, the differences between the two groups in these outcomes at adolescence were no longer significant.

4. Supplementary food versus placebo
4.1. Nutritionally at risk children
4.1.3. Age: Adults (older than 18 years)

In the second follow up study conducted in 1997-1998 the blood pressure and fasting plasma glucose concentration of adults who were born in one of the original study villages between 1969 and 1977 and who were still living in one of the four study villages or in Guatemala City was assessed. Eligible participants had to have had their birth weight recorded and a history of at least one year of growth monitoring in childhood. Sixty-seven percent of the study participants included in the follow up study were stunted (height-for-age z score < -2) by 24 months of age. Six percent of the study participants had a birth weight ≤ 2500 g (Conlisk 2004; Webb 2005).

Blood pressure
At follow-up the age range of the study participants was 20-29 years. Of the 450 participants included in this analysis, less than 2% of the men and 9% of the women were obese (BMI: ≥ 30kg/m2) and 8% of men and 20% of women were overweight (BMI: 25-29.9 kg/m2). Twenty percent of men and 17% of women had
central obesity (waist:hip ratio men: > 0.90; waist:hip ratio women: > 0.85) (Webb 2005).

None of the participants had systolic blood pressure (SBP) >140 mmHg and/or diastolic blood pressure (DBP) > 90 mmHg at the time of follow-up. There was no independent effect of supplement type (Atole versus Fresco) on SBP (β=0.17 mm Hg; 95% CI: -1.68-2.02; p=0.86) or DBP (β=0.69 mm Hg 95% CI: -0.82-2.19; p=0.37). The association between postnatal supplement intake (MJ/day) from birth to 24 months and SBP and DBP in adults from either Atole (DBP: 0.97, 95% CI: -2.6-4.6; p=0.59; SBP: 6.2x10^{-3}, 95% CI: -3.8-3.9; p=0.97) or Fresco groups (DBP: -10.7, 95% CI: -50.7-29.3; p=0.60; SBP: 0.71, 95% CI: -50.6-52.1; p=0.98) was not significant. There was also no significant association between early child growth (from birth to 24 months) and adult blood pressure in either the Atole (DBP: 0.48, 95% CI: -0.74-1.71; p=0.48; SBP: 0.82, 95% CI: -0.39-2.03; p=0.18) or the Fresco group (DBP: -0.59, 95% CI: -1.62-0.44; p=0.26; SBP: -0.21, 95% CI: -1.91-1.48; p=0.8).

Adults born in the Atole villages had greater birth weight (3.17 kg vs 3.03 kg; p=0.002), ponderal indices (25.3 vs. 24.3; p=0.005) and greater height-for-age at 24 months (-2.08 vs -2.51; p=0.001) compared to adults from the Fresco villages. Adults from the Atole villages were significantly taller than adults from the Fresco villages (159.2 cm versus 157.0 cm; p=0.007). There were no differences in adult Body Mass Index (BMI) or adult Waist-hip-ratio (WHR) between the participants from the Atole and Fresco villages (Data not provided).

**Fasting plasma glucose concentration**

One of the objectives of the 1997-1998 follow-up study was to assess the effect of childhood nutritional status (i.e. birth weight, length and ponderal index; height-for-age z score at 24 months; supplementation from 0-24 months) on fasting plasma glucose concentration in adulthood (Conlisk 2004). The fasting plasma glucose concentration of 209 men and 220 women (mean age 24.4 years; age range: 20-29 years) were included in the analyses.

Ten participants (6 men, 4 women) had impaired fasting blood glucose (fasting plasma glucose concentration ≥ 6.1 mmol/L but < 7.0 mmol/L) and one woman had diabetes (fasting plasma glucose concentration ≥ 7.0 mmol/L). Ten percent of men and 20% of women were overweight (BMI: 25-29.9 kg/m2). One percent of men and 9% of women were obese (BMI: ≥ 30kg/m2). Twenty-four percent of men and 20% of women had central obesity (waist:hip ratio men: > 0.90; waist:hip ratio women: > 0.85).

Supplement type (Atole versus Fresco) had no main effect on fasting plasma glucose concentration in men (β, mmol/L ± SE: -0.024 ± 0.078; p>0.05). However, in women, exposure to Atole was associated with a 0.29 mmol/L lower adult fasting plasma glucose concentration (β, mmol/L ± SE: 0.29 ± 0.13; p=0.03). After adjusting for adult body size this association was no longer significant (β, mmol/L ± SE: -0.30 ± 0.16; p=0.07).
In men, an increase in postnatal energy intake from supplement was associated with a steep decrease in adult fasting plasma glucose concentration (inverse logarithmic association, p=0.02). There was no interaction with supplement type this beneficial effect of increased postnatal energy intake on adult fasting plasma glucose concentration only appeared to be evident between energy intakes of 0.1 to 0.2 MJ/day, with no added benefit above this level. Men who ingested greater volumes of supplement in childhood had lower adult fasting plasma glucose concentrations (inverse linear association; β ± SE: -1.5 ± 0.49 mmol/L per L/day of supplement; p=0.002). In contrast, postnatal energy intake had no linear main effect on adult fasting plasma glucose concentration.

Birth size (weight, length and ponderal index) modified the association between postnatal supplementation and adult fasting plasma glucose concentration in men and women. In women who were born small (birth weight < 2750g) an increase in postnatal energy intake from supplementation was associated with a decrease in adult fasting plasma glucose concentration (Figure 3). In women who were born big (birth weight > 3375g) an increase in postnatal energy intake from supplementation was associated with an increase in adult fasting plasma glucose concentration. In men who were born small (birth weight < 2750g) increased postnatal supplement intake was associated with greater decrease in adult fasting plasma glucose concentration compared to men who were born bigger (birth weight ≥ 2750g).

Birth weight modified the association between postnatal growth and adult fasting plasma glucose concentration in men (interaction P=0.008) but not in women. In men who were born small (birth weight ≤ 3000g) a decrease in height-for-age at 24 months was associated with an increased adult fasting plasma glucose concentration. In men who were born big (birth weight > 3375g) an increase in height-for-age at 24 months was associated with an increase in adult fasting plasma glucose concentration.

The third follow-study, conducted from 2002-2004, investigated exposure to nutritional supplementation and the risk of cardiovascular risk factors in adulthood (25-42 years old) among the original study participants. During this follow-up study an intent-to-treat analysis was used in which persons were considered exposed to the randomly assigned supplement, regardless of actual intakes (Stein 2006). In men, but even more so in women, ingestion of Atole in childhood was associated with lowered fasting glucose levels. In women, the older they were when first exposed to Atole the greater the beneficial effect of exposure to the supplement on fasting plasma glucose concentration (effect size for exposure in the age range of gestation through 24 months: -4.0 mg/dl; 95% CI: -11.1- 3.1; effect size for exposure in the age range 36–72 months: -10.5 mg/dl; 95% CI: -21.4- 0.3). Exposure to Atole at 24-60 months of age was significantly associated with lowered systolic blood pressure in the men (-4.2 mmHg, 95% CI: -7.9, -0.4) and in the pooled data for men and women (-3.0 mmHg, 95% CI: -5.6, -0.4). There was no association between exposure to Atole and total cholesterol or low density lipoprotein cholesterol at any of the age ranges in both men and women. In men there was a significant association between increased high density lipoprotein cholesterol and exposure to Atole at age ranges of gestational and
postnatal 0-24 months (5.4 mg/dl, 95% CI: 2.3, 8.5) and postnatal 0-36 months (4.7 mg/dl, 95% CI: 1.5, 7.9). A similar significant effect of exposure to Atole was noted in the pooled sex data for age ranges of gestational and postnatal 0-24 months (27 mg/dl, 95% CI: 0.3, 5.0). In women exposure to Atole during gestation and postnatal 0-24 months was associated with a significantly lowered triglyceride level (-34.2 mg/dl, 95% CI: -61.6, -6.8). A similar significant effect was noted during gestation and postnatal 0-24 months (-27.2 mg/dl, 95% CI: -49.1,-5.4) and postnatal 0-36 months (-22.2 mg/dl, 95% CI: -44.1,-0.4) when the data from both sexes was pooled.

**Quality of the evidence: GRADE assessment**

Based on input from the WHO, linear growth (measured by attained length/height-for-age z score and rate of change of length/height-for-age z score was an IMPORTANT outcome. Overweight/obesity (measured by weight-for-height z score or body mass index-for-age) and cardiovascular events or diabetes mellitus and risk factors for cardiovascular disease or diabetes mellitus were CRITICAL outcomes.

Relevant outcomes were assessed at various time points in the different studies. For the sake of clarity we decided not to GRADE every time point for each outcome. Instead we have GRADEd the outcomes of highest importance and where there are multiple time points for these outcomes we chose to GRADE the most clinically meaningful time point with the most data available.

1. **Supplementary food versus no supplementary food**

1.1. **Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting**

1.1.1. **Outcomes in children aged 6 to 24 months**

See Summary of Findings Table 1 for complete assessment and rationale for ratings.

There was moderate quality evidence for the effect of providing three months of supplementary food to moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) on weight-for-height z score, weight-for-age z score, weight and MUAC.

There was low quality evidence for the effect of providing three months of supplementary food to moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) on height and height-for-age z score. Combining the height outcomes of the four studies and the height-for-age z scores from three studies resulted in high heterogeneity (height: I²=58%; height-for-age z score: I²=73%) despite the fact that the nutritional status of the participants and composition of the interventions in the studies were similar.

There was very low quality evidence for the effect of providing three months of supplementary food to moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) on body mass index (BMI). Only one small study (N=82; Heikens) reported on this outcome.
No evidence was available to inform the effect of supplementary food on health outcomes (stature and presence of or risk factors for overweight/obesity, diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease) in adolescents or adults who were moderately underweight children (6 to 24 months old) with moderate stunting.

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
1.1.2 Outcomes in children aged 24-59 months

See Summary of Findings Table 2 for complete assessment and rationale for ratings.

There was **low** quality evidence for the effect of providing **six months of supplementary food** to moderately underweight children moderate stunting (24-59 months old) on height, height-for-age z score, weight-for-height z score, weight and weight-for-age z score.

There was **very low** quality evidence for the effect of providing **6 months of supplementary food** to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting (24-59 months old) on mid-upper arm circumference.

There was **no evidence** available on the effect of providing **supplementary food** to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting (24-59 months old) on body mass index.

No evidence was available to inform the effect of supplementary food on health outcomes (stature and presence of or risk factors for overweight/obesity, diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease) in adolescents or adults who were moderately underweight children (24-59 months old) with moderate stunting.

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
1.1.3. Outcomes in children aged 5-10 years.

See Summary of Findings Table 3 for complete assessment and rationale for ratings.

There was **very low** quality evidence for the effect of providing **24 months of supplementary food** to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting from the age of 18-42 months on outcomes (systolic blood pressure, height, height-for-age z score, weight-for-height z score, weight, MUAC and triceps skinfold thickness) measured 4 years post supplementation, when the children were 7-8 years old.

There was **no evidence** available on the effect of providing **24 months of supplementary food** to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting from the age of 18-42 months on body mass index measured 4 years post supplementation, when the children were 7-8 years old.
1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
1.1.4. Outcomes in adolescents (ages 10-18 years)

See Summary of Findings Table 4 for complete assessment and rationale for ratings.

There was low quality evidence for the effect of providing 24 months of supplementary food to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting from the age of 18-42 months on height-for-age z score measured 13 years post supplementation, when the children were 17-18 years old.

There is no evidence available on the effect of providing supplementary food to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting on other outcomes (stature and presence of or risk factors for overweight/obesity, diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease) assessed when the children reached adolescence.

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food
1.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting
1.1.5. Outcomes in adults (older than 18 years).

See Summary of Findings Table 5 for complete assessment and rationale for ratings.

There is no evidence available on the effect of providing supplementary food to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting on any of the relevant outcomes (stature and presence of or risk factors for overweight/obesity, diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease) assessed when the children reached adulthood.

2. Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice compared to nutritional advice
2.1. Moderately underweight children with moderate wasting
2.1.1. Outcomes in children aged 6 to 24 months

See Summary of Findings Table 6 for complete assessment and rationale for ratings.

There was moderate quality evidence, from one study, for the effect of providing three months of supplementary food with or without nutritional advice to moderately underweight children (6 to 24 months) with moderate wasting on changes in length (mm/day), weight (g/kg/day), height-for-age z-score, weight-for-height z-score and MUAC (mm/day).

Discussion

Summary of main results
This review evaluated the evidence on the short-term and long-term benefits and harms of providing supplementary food to moderately undernourished children
below the age of 5 years. Although thirteen studies met the inclusion criteria of the review only two of the studies provided information on the long-term health effects, in adulthood and adolescence, of providing moderately undernourished children with supplementary food (Habicht 1992; Walker 1991) provided a milk-based formula to moderately stunted children for two years and followed the participants up to late adolescence. Over a period of eight years Habicht 1992 provided either a high-protein high-energy supplement or a protein-free, low-energy supplement to children aged 0 to 7 years living in the study villages. The study participants were followed up to adolescence and adulthood. The remainder of the studies provide information on the anthropometry and nutritional status of moderately underweight children after three, six and 12 months of supplementary food.

Health outcomes in adulthood
The findings of one study (Conlisk 2004) provided information on the effect of providing supplementary food to undernourished children (0-7 years old) on health outcomes in adulthood. Boys whose daily energy intake from supplements was higher had lower fasting plasma glucose concentrations in adulthood. The inverse logarithmic nature of the association suggests that only small amounts of increased energy intake from supplementary food (0.10 to 0.20 MJ/d) were needed to achieve maximum beneficial effects on adult fasting plasma glucose concentrations. In the girls, only those who were born small had lowered fasting plasma glucose concentrations in adulthood with increased daily energy intake of supplement in childhood. In girls who were born big, increased daily energy intake of supplement in childhood resulted in raised fasting plasma glucose concentrations in adulthood (Conlisk 2004). In this same cohort of study participants no significant associations were noted between daily energy intake from supplementary food (MJ/day) in childhood and blood pressure in adulthood. In fact none of the study participants had raised blood pressure (SBP > 140 mmHg and/or DBP > 90 mmHg; Webb 2005).

It is important to note that the data on daily energy intake from supplementary food was obtained during the first two years of the child’s life. Data from Adair 2013 suggest that rapid weight gain in children older than 2 years may be associated with increased risk for non-communicable diseases in adulthood. The question remains regarding the effect of supplementary food intake in moderate underweight children older than two years on health outcomes such as blood pressure and fasting plasma glucose concentrations in later life. Data from Stein 2006, in which the association between the exposure to Atole at different age ranges and cardiovascular risk factors in adulthood was investigated, goes some way to answering this question. While there was no significant association between DBP, total cholesterol and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol at any of the age ranges, exposure to Atole at various age ranges was significantly associated with lowered plasma glucose concentration, SBP and triglyceride levels and increased high density lipoprotein cholesterol levels. Women who were older when exposed to Atole experienced a greater beneficial effect of exposure on fasting plasma glucose concentration. In men exposure to Atole during gestation and the first 36 months of life was significantly associated with increased high-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels.
Health and growth outcomes in adolescence

Results from the first follow up study conducted in 1988-1989 of the Habicht 1992 study show those adolescent females who received Atole (high protein, high energy supplementary food) as children were significantly taller and heavier and had a significantly greater fat-free mass than adolescent females who received Fresco (protein free, low energy supplementary food) as children (Rivera 1995). However, after these outcomes were adjusted for the weight and height of each participant at 3 years of age the differences between the two groups in these outcomes at adolescence were no longer significant (Rivera 1995). This suggests that beyond the age of three there was no further beneficial effect of high protein, high carbohydrate supplementary food on these anthropometric outcomes. In adolescent males, there was no significant difference in height, weight or fat-free mass between the two groups (Rivera 1995).

In Walker 1991 moderately underweight children (9-24 months old) with moderate stunting, were randomized to receive a milk-based food supplement or weekly visits only (control). Follow up assessments were conducted when the study population was 7-8 years old (four years post supplementation), 11-12 years old and 17-18 years old. Based on low quality evidence from one small study, there was no statistically significant effect of providing supplementary food to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting from the age of 18-42 months on linear growth (assessed as height-for-age z score) measured when the children were 17-18 years old (13 years post supplementation; Walker 2006a).

There is no evidence available to inform the effect of providing supplementary food to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting on other outcomes (stature and presence of or risk factors for overweight/obesity, diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease) assessed when the children reached adolescence. Although blood pressure (Walker 2001), BMI, fatness and fat distribution (Walker 2002), anthropometry, serum glucose and lipid concentrations (Bennet 2002) were all assessed when the study population in Walker 1991 was 11-12 years old (approximately 8 years post supplementation intervention), none of these important long-term outcomes are reported per intervention group. Instead the four stunted groups (control, supplementation, stimulation and both supplementation and stimulation) were combined and compared with the non-stunted children. The outcomes are reported for stunted versus non-stunted children. The study authors justify this based on the finding that there was no long-term effect of supplementation on growth in stunted children four years post intervention (Walker 1996). In addition to this, the study authors’ state that there was no effect of supplementation on blood pressure in the study population at 7-8 years (Gaskin 2000) therefore the intervention was not considered further in the later analyses (Walker 2001).

Anthropometry, nutritional status and health outcomes in childhood

Based on the findings of three relatively small RCTs (Kuusipalo 2006; Thakwalakwa 2010; Thakwalakwa 2012) there is moderate quality evidence that the provision of three months of supplementary food to moderately underweight
children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting significantly improves the children’s weight compared to non-supplemented children. The provision of supplementary food to moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting may not lead to any differences in children’s weight-for-height z score, weight-for-age z score and MUAC compared to the non-supplemented children. Low quality evidence suggests that three months of supplementary food in moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate stunting may not lead to any differences in supplemented children’s height and height-for-age z score compared to the non-supplemented children. Data from one small study provides very low quality evidence for the effect of three months of high-energy supplementary food on children’s body mass index in the supplemented children (Heikens 1989).

In moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, aged 24-59 months old, there is low quality evidence to suggest that six months of supplementary food may significantly improve linear growth (measured by height, height-for-age z score), weight, weight-for-height z score and weight-for-age z score compared to non-supplemented children (Lopriore 2004). This information is based on data from one study with 148 participants.

Providing supplementary food for 12 to 24 months to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, aged 24-59 months, may not lead to significantly improvements in height, weight, weight-for-height z score, body fatness measures or MUAC of supplemented children compared to the non-supplemented children. Data for these outcomes is based on the findings of two relatively small studies with a combined total of less than 200 participants (Krahenbuhl 1998; Walker 1991).

Providing moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, aged 18 months with two years of supplementary food may not lead to any difference in systolic blood pressure and linear growth (measured by height and height-for-age z score) and body fatness measures (measured by weight, weight–for-height z score, weight-for-age z score, MUAC and triceps skinfold thickness) assessed when the children are 7-8 years old (four years post supplementation; Walker 1991).

The provision of high-protein high-energy supplement (Atole) to nutritionally at risk children resulted in significantly higher energy intakes from the supplement at all age intervals (up to 84 months) compared to those receiving protein-free low-energy supplement (Fresco). Children, aged 12 to 24 months, receiving Atole gained significantly more length (9.2 versus 8.2 cm/year; p<0.001) and weight (2.17 vs. 1.74 kg/year; p<0.001) per year compared to children aged 12 to 24 months receiving Fresco. In children aged 24 to 36 months, only the length gain (8.5 versus 8.1 cm/year; p<0.01) and not weight gain (2.22 versus 2.09 kg/year; NS) was significantly higher in the Atole group compared to the Fresco group. For children older than 36 months there was no significant difference in length or weight gain between the two groups (Schroeder 1995).

Supplementary feeding with a high-protein high-energy supplement (Atole) was more effective than a protein-free low-energy supplement (Fresco) in the reversal
of wasting among children aged 6 to 24 months with mild to moderate wasting (Rivera 1991a). The beneficial effect due to supplementation with Atole was greater in children aged 6-24 months (N=77; attributable benefit: 0.37, 95% CI: 0.18-0.55) compared to children aged 24-48 months (N=104; attributable benefit: 0.08 95% CI: -0.09-0.25; p<0.05). Furthermore, the beneficial effect of supplementation with Atole increased with the duration of supplementation [attributable benefit after three months supplementation: 0.18 (95% CI: 0.05-0.30); attributable benefit after six months supplementation: 0.25 (95% CI: 0.11-0.39); attributable benefit after nine months supplementation: 0.37 (95% CI:0.18-0.55)] (Rivera 1996). Although supplementation with Atole increased the length of 3-y-old children by 2.5 cm and reduced prevalence of severe stunting (height-for-age z score <-3) by half, chronic under-nutrition remained common, and the children remained stunted compared to reference standards (Martorell 1995).

Providing three months of supplementary food together with child-centered counseling to moderately underweight children (6-24 months old) with moderate acute malnutrition probably improves weight gain, mid-upper arm circumference and height-for-age z score compared with children who received child-centred counseling only (Nikiema 2014). Two small studies provide some information on the effectiveness of supplementary food with nutritional advice versus nutritional advice alone in moderately underweight children (6-24 months).

A small RCT, Richter-Strydom 1985 investigated the effect of a home-based nutrition education programme versus no education on growth and psychological performance of moderately underweight (72% or less of expected weight for age without oedema or 79% or less of expected weight for age with oedema) children 7-36 months old. The study authors reported that there were no statistically significant differences in physical growth or psychological functioning of the children whose mothers received the nutrition education programme and the children whose mothers had not.

**Overall completeness and applicability of evidence**

All of the included studies were conducted in low/middle income countries therefore the results of this review are specific to the country settings we are interested in. We were careful to include only the studies that investigated the specific interventions set out in the review question. We did not include studies in which two or three different supplementary foods were compared with each other. We have however made a note of these studies in the table of excluded studies for future reference. Although there are 13 included studies, most of the studies are small and even with a meta-analysis they do not provide sufficient power to answer the review question.

**Quality of the evidence**

There was no evidence available to answer the review question with regards to the majority of the critical outcomes. In most of the important outcomes the quality of the evidence was based on data from small RCTs. In most cases the quality of the evidence was downgraded for concerns around potential risk of bias and imprecision of the data.
Potential biases in the review process
Biases in the review process were minimised by performing a comprehensive search of the literature, independently selecting and appraising the studies, and extracting the data in duplicate. We also used a validated method of analysis for the review. In addition where data was missing, we sought additional information and data directly from authors where this was possible to do so. Although an extensive hand-search for grey literature was not conducted, it is unlikely that important trials have been missed given the high profile nature of the topic and the close partnership established with agencies and organizations working in this area. However, the review remains at risk of publication bias from less prominent trials. We attempted to reduce this risk by identifying relevant conference abstracts.

The search of the trials registry, www.clinicaltrials.gov, to identify trial protocols and on-going trials yielded three potentially relevant trials protocols. These will require further assessment and exploration to either 1) link them to trials already included in the review, or 2) if not included, to attempt to obtain the completed trial reports.

It is possible that there is some loss of data integrity related to our decision to combine data from the different interventions of certain studies and hence calculating a combined mean and standard deviation using a validated formula.

Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews
Two Cochrane systematic reviews have investigated the effectiveness of various supplementary foods in moderately underweight children below the age of five. Sguassero 2012 assessed the effectiveness of supplementary feeding to promote growth in children in low- and middle-income countries (Sguassero 2012). Based on the findings of eight randomized controlled trials, deemed to have high risk of bias, supplementary food appeared to have a negligible effect on growth of children in low- and middle-income countries. This review included studies conducted in children who were at risk of becoming undernourished (nutritionally at risk); whereas our review focuses on studies conducted in children who were already moderately undernourished.

Lazzerini 2013 found there to be moderate to high quality evidence for the effectiveness of supplementary food in treating moderate acute malnutrition in children from low- and middle-income countries (Lazzerini 2013). In our review we only found one eligible study that investigated moderate acute malnutrition in moderately underweight children. Lazzerini 2013 included studies that compared the effectiveness of two or more supplementary foods. We excluded these studies from our review as the control/comparison group was no supplement.

Authors’ conclusions
Thirteen studies were included in this review. Only two studies provide information regarding the effect of providing supplementary food to moderately underweight children on linear growth, overweight/obesity and presence of or risk for cardiovascular disease and diabetes mellitus. Providing supplementary food to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting may not lead to any differences in linear growth measured in adolescence (Walker 1991). It is not
known whether providing supplementary food to moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, aged 18 months, improves linear growth, blood pressure or measures of body fatness in late childhood (7-8 years old; Walker 1991). Ingestion of a high-energy, high-protein supplement to nutritionally at risk children (67% of whom were moderately stunted) was associated with lowered fasting plasma glucose concentrations in adult males and adult females who were born small (Habicht 1992). In this same cohort of participants ingestion of Atole was not significantly associated with blood pressure in adulthood. Adolescent females who received Atole (high protein, high energy supplementary food) as children were significantly taller and heavier and had a significantly greater fat-free mass than those who received Fresco (protein free, low energy supplementary food; Habicht 1992) as children. However, after these outcomes were adjusted for the weight and height of each participant at 3 years of age the differences between the two groups in these outcomes at adolescence were no longer significant. This suggests that beyond the age of three there was no further beneficial effect of high protein, high carbohydrate supplementary food on these anthropometric outcomes. In adolescent males, there was no significant difference in height, weight or fat-free mass between the Atole and Fresco groups (Habicht 1992).

Three months of supplementary food may improve weight of young children (6-24 months) who are moderately underweight with moderate stunting; whereas it may not result in any difference in linear growth of the children compared to non-supplemented children.

Six months of supplementary food may improve linear growth and measures of body fatness of children aged 24-59 months, who are moderately underweight with moderate stunting (Walker 1991).

Three months of supplementary food probably slightly improves the linear growth and weight of young children (6-24 months) who are moderately underweight with moderate acute malnutrition (Nikiema 2014).
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## Tables

### Summary of findings tables

**Table 1:**
Supplementary food compared to Non-supplementary food for moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 6 to 24 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>No of Participants (studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumed risk</td>
<td>Corresponding risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-supplementary food</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supplementary food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm) - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>The mean height (cm) - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.32 higher (0.1 lower to 0.73 higher)</td>
<td>627 (4 studies)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊕ low*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height-for-age Z-score - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>The mean height-for-age z-score - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.08 higher (0.1 lower to 0.26 higher)</td>
<td>545 (3 studies)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊕ low*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight-for-height Z-score - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>The mean weight-for-height z-score - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.09 higher (0.03 lower to 0.22 higher)</td>
<td>545 (3 studies)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕ moderate*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight-for-age Z-score - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>The mean weight-for-age z-score - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.09 higher (0.02 lower to 0.2 higher)</td>
<td>545 (3 studies)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕ moderate*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg) - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>The mean weight (kg) - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.1 higher (0.03 to 0.17 higher)</td>
<td>545 (3 studies)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕ moderate*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Mass Index (BMI) kg/m2 - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>The mean body mass index (bmi) kg/m2 - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.5 higher (0.01 lower to 1.01 higher)</td>
<td>82 (1 study)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕ very low*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-upper arm circumference (cm) - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>The mean mid-upper arm circumference (cm) - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.05 higher (0.09 lower to 0.19 higher)</td>
<td>491 (2 studies)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕ moderate*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The basis for the **assumed risk** (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The **corresponding risk** (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the **relative effect** of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval;
GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

---

1. Height (cm) after supplementation for 6 months reported by Walker 1991 [N=65; MD 1.3 higher (0.25 higher to 2.35 higher)]
2. Height (cm) three months post-supplementation reported by Heikens 1989 [N= 82; MD 2.30 higher (0.86 lower to 5.46 higher)]
3. Generation of randomisation sequence was unclear for 2 studies (Heikens 1989, Thakwalakwa 2010); allocation concealment was unclear for 2 studies (Heikens 1989, Kuusipalo 2006) and binding of participants and investigators was unclear for all 4 studies. Three studies stated binding of outcome assessors (Kuusipalo 2006, Thakwalakwa 2010, Thakwalakwa 2012).
4. Heterogeneity (I²=58% representing moderate heterogeneity). The total daily supplementary intake of participants was greater in the study by Heikens 1989 (750 kcal, 20g protein), compared to the other 3 studies (Kuusipalo 2006, Thakwalakwa 2010, Thakwalakwa 2012; 219kcal-282 kcal, 6-10g protein). The heterogeneity between Kuusipalo 2006, Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012 could not be explained by either differences in the participants baseline nutritional status or the total daily supplementary intake of participants.
5. Generation of randomisation sequence was unclear for one study (Thakwalakwa 2010); allocation concealment was unclear for one study (Kuusipalo 2006) and binding of participants and investigators was unclear for all three studies. All three studies stated binding of outcome assessors.
6. Heterogeneity (I²=73% representing substantial heterogeneity) between Kuusipalo 2006, Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012 could not be explained by either differences in the participants baseline nutritional status or the total daily supplemental intake of participants. Change in height-for-age z score data in Kuusipalo 2006 was combined with height-for-age z score endpoint data from Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012.
7. Weight-for-height Z-score after supplementation for 6 months reported by Walker 1991 [N=65; MD 0.00 higher (-0.39 lower to 0.39 higher)].
8. Weight (kg) after supplementation for 6 months reported by Walker 1991 [N=65; MD 0.21 higher (0.27 lower to 0.69 higher)].
9. BMI three months post-supplementation reported by Heikens 1989 [N=82; MD 0.20 lower (0.70 lower to 0.30 higher)].
10. Randomisation sequence generation, allocation concealment and binding of participants, investigators and outcome assessors unclear in the study by Heikens 1989.
11. Wide confidence interval that crosses the line of no effect. Upper and lower confidence intervals include an effect size > 0.5.
12. Total number of participants less than 400.
13. MUAC (cm) after supplementation for 6 months reported by Walker 1991 [N=65; MD 0.20 higher (0.29 lower to 0.69 higher)].
14. Generation of randomisation sequence unclear for Thakwalakwa 2010 and binding of participants and investigators not stated for Thakwalakwa 2010 and Thakwalakwa 2012. For both studies, it was stated that outcome assessors were blinded.
Table 2:
Supplementary food compared to No supplementary food for Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 24-59 months

Patient or population: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 24-59 months
Settings: No supplementary food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>No of Participants (studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No supplementary food</td>
<td>Supplementary food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height (cm) - Supplementation for 6 months</strong></td>
<td>The mean height (cm) - supplementation for 6 months in the intervention groups was 2.4 higher (0.1 to 4.7 higher)</td>
<td>148 (1 study(^1))</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊕ low(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height-for-age z-score - Supplementation for 6 months</strong></td>
<td>The mean height-for-age z-score - supplementation for 6 months in the intervention groups was 0.32 higher (0.09 to 0.55 higher)</td>
<td>148 (1 study(^2))</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊕ low(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-for-height z-score - Supplementation for 6 months</strong></td>
<td>The mean weight-for-height z-score - supplementation for 6 months in the intervention groups was 0.3 higher (0.01 to 0.59 higher)</td>
<td>148 (1 study(^3))</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊕ low(^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body Mass Index (kg/m(^2))</th>
<th>Study population</th>
<th>Not estimable</th>
<th>0 (0)</th>
<th>See comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Weight (kg) - Supplementation for 6 months | The mean weight (kg) - supplementation for 6 months in the intervention groups was 0.9 higher (0.25 to 1.55 higher) | 148 (1 study\(^4\)) | ⊕⊕⊕⊕ low\(^4\) |                                |          |
| Follow-up: 6 months               |                                        |                          |                              |                                |          |

| Weight-for-age z-score - Supplementation for 6 months | The mean weight-for-age z-score - supplementation for 6 months in the intervention groups was 0.34 higher (0.1 to 0.58 higher) | 148 (1 study\(^5\)) | ⊕⊕⊕⊕ low\(^5\) |                                |          |
| Follow-up: 6 months               |                                        |                          |                              |                                |          |

| Mid-upper arm circumference (cm) - Supplementation for 24 months | The mean mid-upper arm circumference (cm) - supplementation for 24 months in the intervention groups was 0.1 higher (0.46 lower to 0.65 higher) | 63 (1 study\(^6\)) | ⊕⊕⊕⊕ very low\(^6\) |                                |          |
| Follow-up: 24 months             |                                        |                          |                              |                                |          |

*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio;
GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

\(^1\)Height (cm) after supplementation for 12 and 24 months reported by Walker 1991. [12 months: N=65; MD 1.30 higher (0.03 higher to 2.57 higher) and 24 months: N=63; MD 1.20 higher (0.78 lower to 3.18 higher)].
2 Height (cm) after supplementation for 3 months reported by Lopriore 2004 [N=148; MD 2.4 higher (0.06 higher to 4.74 higher)].
3 High risk of attrition bias (attrition rate > 10%) within groups and allocation concealment and blinding of participants and investigators were unclear for Lopriore 2004.
4 Total number of participants less than 400.
5 Height-for-age z-score after supplementation for 3 months reported by Lopriore 2004 [N=148; MD 0.30 higher (0.07 higher to 0.53 higher)].
6 Weight-for-height z-score after supplementation for 12 and 24 months reported by Walker 1991 [12 months: N=65; MD 0.00 higher (0.39 lower to 0.39 higher) and 24 months: N=63; MD 0.00 higher (0.42 lower to 0.42 higher)].
7 Weight-for-height z-score after supplementation for 3 months reported by Lopriore 2004 [N=148; MD 0.31 higher (0.00 higher to 0.62 higher)].
8 Weight after supplementation for 3 months reported by Lopriore 2004 [N=148; MD1.00 higher (0.32 higher to 1.68 higher)].
9 Weight (kg) after supplementation for 12 and 24 months reported by Walker 1991 (12 months: N=65; MD 0.29 higher (0.29 lower to 0.87 higher) and 24 months: N=63; MD 0.25 higher (0.53 lower to 1.03 higher)].
10 Weight-for-age z-score after supplementation for 3 months reported by Lopriore 2004 [N=148; MD 0.35 higher (0.09 higher to 0.61 higher)].
11 MUAC (cm) after supplementation for 12 months reported by Walker 1991 [N=65; MD 0.20 higher (0.29 lower to 0.69 higher)].
12 Triceps and subscapular skinfolds (mm) after supplementation for 12 and 24 months reported by Walker 1991. [Triceps skinfold at 12 months: N=65; MD 0.20 higher (0.51 lower to 0.91 higher) and at 24 months: N=63; MD 0.10 higher (0.57 lower to 0.77 higher). Subscapular skinfold at 12 months: N=65; MD 0.20 higher (0.34 lower to 0.74 higher) and at 24 months: N=63; MD 0.10 higher (0.35 lower to 0.55 higher)].
13 Allocation concealment and blinding of participants, caregivers and outcomes assessors unclear for Walker 1991.
14 Wide confidence interval that crosses the line of no effect. Upper and lower limits of confidence interval include effect size > 0.5.
Table 3:
Supplementary food compared to no supplementary food for moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>No of Participants (studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure (mmHg) - Systolic blood pressure 4 years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old) Follow-up: 6 years</td>
<td>The mean blood pressure (mmhg) - systolic blood pressure 4 years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old) in the intervention groups was 0.2 lower (3.12 lower to 2.72 higher)</td>
<td></td>
<td>108 (1 study)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊕ very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Height (cm) - Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old) Follow-up: 6 years | The mean height (cm) - four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old) in the intervention groups was 0.9 higher (1.5 lower to 3.3 higher) |                          | 63 (1 study)

| Height-for-age z-score - Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old) Follow-up: 6 years | The mean height-for-age z-score - four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old) in the intervention groups was 0.2 higher (0.22 lower to 0.62 higher) |                          | 63 (1 study)                | ⊕⊕⊕⊕ very low                    |          |
| Body Mass Index (kg/m2)                                                                 | Study population                                                                                     | Assumed risk Corresponding risk |                           |                                |          |
| Body fatness measures - Triceps skinfold (mm) 4 years post-supplementation (children 7-8 years old) Follow-up: 6 years | The mean body fatness measures - triceps skinfold (mm) 4 years post-supplementation (children 7-8 years old) in the intervention groups was 0.6 higher (0.39 lower to 1.59 higher) |                          | 63 (1 study)

*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).
CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio;
GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

1 Allocation concealment and blinding of participants, caregivers and outcomes assessors unclear for Walker 1991.
2 Wide confidence interval that crosses the line of no effect. Upper and lower limits of confidence interval include effect size > 0.5.
3 Total number of participants less than 400.
4 Change in height (cm) after supplementation for 12 months (mean age of participants: 68±22 months) reported by Krahenbuhl 1998 [N=88; MD 0.05 higher (0.62 lower to 0.72 higher)].
5 Change in weight (kg) after supplementation for 12 months (mean age of participants: 68 ± 22 months) reported by Krahenbuhl 1998 [N=88; MD 0.05 higher (0.17 lower to 0.27 higher)].
6 Change in MUAC (cm) after supplementation for 12 months (mean age of participants: 68 ± 22 months) reported by Krahenbuhl 1998 [N=88; MD 0.20 higher (0.29 lower to 0.69 higher)].
7 Subscapular skinfold measurement (mm) 4 years post-supplementation reported by Walker 1991 [N=63; MD 0.50 higher (0.22 lower to 1.22 higher)].
8 Change in sum of 4 skinfold measurements (mm) after supplementation for 12 months (mean age of participants: 68 ± 22 months) reported by Krahenbuhl 1998 [N=88; MD 0.74 higher (0.31 lower to 1.79 higher)].
### Table 4:
Supplementary food compared to No supplementary food for Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting: Outcomes in Adolescents (10-18 years)

**Patient or population:** Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting: Outcomes in Adolescents (10-18 years)

**Settings:**

**Intervention:** Supplementary food

**Comparison:** No supplementary food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>No of Participants (studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height-for-age z-score</strong> - Thirteen years post-supplementation (17-18 years old) Follow-up: 15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No supplementary food</td>
<td>The mean height-for-age z-score - thirteen years post-supplementation (17-18 years old) in the intervention groups was <strong>0.2 higher</strong> (0.3 lower to 0.7 higher)</td>
<td>55 (1 study)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊕ low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body mass index (kg/m²)</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LDL cholesterol level</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HDL cholesterol level</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cholesterol level</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fasting blood glucose</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of participants that are pre-diabetic</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of participants with diabetes</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of participants with cardiovascular events (myocardial infarction, stroke)</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of participants with hypertension</strong></td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g., the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).*

CI: Confidence interval;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

1 Allocation concealment and blinding of participants, caregivers and outcomes assessors unclear for Walker 1991.

2 Total number of participants less than 400.
Table 5:
Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Adults (aged 18 years and older) who were moderately underweight children with moderate stunting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>No of Participants (studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body mass index (kg/m2)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting blood glucose</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL cholesterol level</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL cholesterol level</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cholesterol level</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of participants with hypertension</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of participants that are pre-diabetic</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of participants with diabetes</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of participants with cardiovascular events (myocardial infarction, stroke)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval;
GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.
### Table 6

**Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice compared to No nutritional advice for Children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate acute malnutrition (MAM)**

**Patient or population:** Children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate acute malnutrition (MAM)

**Settings:**

**Intervention:** Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice

**Comparison:** No nutritional advice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>No of Participants (studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in length (mm/day) -</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementation for 3 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td>The mean change in length (mm/day) - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was <strong>0.02 higher</strong> (0.01 lower to 0.05 higher)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 (1 study)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊝ moderate i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height-for-age z-score -</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementation for 3 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td>The mean height-for-age z-score - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was <strong>0.4 higher</strong> (0.14 to 0.66 higher)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 (1 study)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊝ moderate i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in weight (g/kg/day) -</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementation for 3 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td>The mean change in weight (g/kg/day) - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was <strong>0.55 higher</strong> (0.27 to 0.83 higher)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 (1 study)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊝ moderate i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-for-height z-score -</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementation for 3 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td>The mean weight-for-height z-score - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was <strong>0.2 higher</strong> (0.03 lower to 0.43 higher)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 (1 study)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊝ moderate i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in MUAC (mm/day) -</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementation for 3 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: 3 months</td>
<td>The mean change in muac (mm/day) - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was <strong>0.04 higher</strong> (0.01 to 0.07 higher)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974 (1 study)</td>
<td>⊕⊕⊕⊝ moderate i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

1 High risk of differential attrition bias between groups and blinding of participants, caregivers and outcomes assessors unclear for Nikiema 2014.
### Characteristics of studies

#### Characteristics of included studies

**Habicht 1992**

| Methods | **Study design:** Prospective cluster randomised trial (INCAP Longitudinal Study)  
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|         | **Country and location of study:** Rural villages, Guatemala  
|         | **Total number of villages randomised:** 4 (2 pairs)  
|         | **Study duration:** INCAP trial: 8 years (1969-1977); INCAP Follow-up surveys conducted 1988-1989; 1997-1999  
|         | **Frequency of follow-up (INCAP trial):** research personnel conducted home visits twice a month during the main trial period.  
|         | **Type of assessment at each follow up (INCAP trial):** Morbidity, dietary recall during home visits. Anthropometric assessments were conducted at the clinic every 3 months for children up to the age of 24 months; 6 monthly up to the age of 48 months and annual assessments up 84 months. Other assessments conducted include mental development (6, 15, 24 months; thereafter annually up to the age of 84 months) and physical examination (15 days, 3 months and 1, 3 and 7 years),  
|         | **Duration of follow-up (INCAP trial):** 84 months (7 years)  
|         | **Type of assessments conducted during INCAP follow-up survey (1997-1999):** Anthropometrical measurements, blood pressure, capillary blood samples for glucose and blood lipids, dietary recall, physical activity assessment, socio-economic data  
|         | **Study design:** Prospective cluster randomised trial (INCAP Longitudinal Study)  
|         | **Country and location of study:** Rural villages, Guatemala  
|         | **Total number of villages randomised:** 4 (2 pairs)  
|         | **Study duration:** INCAP trial: 8 years (1969-1977); INCAP Follow-up surveys conducted 1988-1989; 1997-1999  
|         | **Frequency of follow-up (INCAP trial):** research personnel conducted home visits twice a month during the main trial period.  
|         | **Type of assessment at each follow up (INCAP trial):** Morbidity, dietary recall during home visits. Anthropometric assessments were conducted at the clinic every 3 months for children up to the age of 24 months; 6 monthly up to the age of 48 months and annual assessments up 84 months. Other assessments conducted include mental development (6, 15, 24 months; thereafter annually up to the age of 84 months) and physical examination (15 days, 3 months and 1, 3 and 7 years),  
|         | **Duration of follow-up (INCAP trial):** 84 months  
|         | **Type of assessments conducted during INCAP follow-up survey (1997-1999):** Anthropometrical measurements, blood pressure, capillary blood samples for glucose and blood lipids, dietary recall, physical activity assessment, socio-economic data  

| Participants | **Inclusion criteria for the INCAP trial:** Children aged 0-7 years, pregnant and lactating women living in selected villages  
|              | **Exclusion criteria for the INCAP trial:** Children identified with marasmus or kwashiorkor during the study period received special care and were excluded from the main trial analyses  
|              | **Inclusion criteria for the 1997-1998 INCAP follow-up survey:** Participants from the INCAP trial who were born between 1969 and 1997, had a recorded birth weight and a history of at least one year of growth monitoring in childhood. Participants were eligible for inclusion if they were living in the study villages or in Guatemala City.  

## Baseline characteristics of participants

### Group 1 (Atole group)
- **No. of participants:** 223
- **Participants gender:** 110 F/113 M

### Group 2 (Fresco group)
- **No. of participants:** 206
- **Participants gender:** 110F/96M

### Participants age (both treatment groups):
- 21.5 ± 2.8 years (women) and 21.7 ± 2.9 years (men)

### Childhood nutritional status (at 24 months) for both treatment groups:
- HAZ -2.3 ± 1.0 (women) and -2.3 ± 1.0 (men)

### Inclusion criteria for the INCAP trial:
- Children aged 0-7 years, pregnant and lactating women living in selected villages

### Exclusion criteria for the INCAP trial:
- Children identified with marasmus or kwashiorkor during the study period received special care and were excluded from the main trial analyses

### Inclusion criteria for the 1997-1998 INCAP follow-up survey:
- Participants from the INCAP trial who were born between 1969 and 1997, had a recorded birth weight and a history of at least one year of growth monitoring in childhood. Participants were eligible for inclusion if they were living in the study villages or in Guatemala City.

## Baseline comparability:
Women and men in the Fresco group were significantly more stunted by the age of 24 months, compared to those in the Atole group (Mean difference 0.40SD; (95%CI: 0.14,0.66))

## Interventions

### Group 1 (Atole group)
- **Description:** Community-based administration of a hot maize gruel at centrally located feeding stations in villages
- **Amount and frequency:** twice daily
- **Nutritional composition of supplement:** Incaparina (ground cooked corn, cotton-seed flour, torula yeast, skim milk powder, sugar, micronutrients, flavouring
- **Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 326 kcal and 23 g protein per day for 2 servings of 180ml each
- **Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** Curative medical care at clinic adjacent to feeding centre.

### Group 2 (Fresco group)
- **Description:** Community based administration of a fruit-flavored drink at centrally located feeding stations in villages
- **Amount and frequency:** twice daily
- **Nutritional composition of supplement:** Prior to 1971 it contained sugar, flavouring and colouring, thereafter micronutrients were added
- **Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 118 kcal 0 g protein per day (2 servings of 180ml each)
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Curative medical care at clinic adjacent to feeding centre.

**Group 1 (Atole group)**

**Description:** Community-based administration of a hot maize gruel at centrally located feeding stations in villages

**Amount and frequency:** twice daily

**Nutritional composition of supplement:** Incaparina (ground cooked corn, cotton-seed flour, torula yeast, skim milk powder, sugar, micronutrients, flavouring)

**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 326 kcal and 23 g protein per day for 2 servings of 180ml each

Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Curative medical care at clinic adjacent to feeding centre.

**Group 2 (Fresco group)**

**Description:** Community based administration of a fruit-flavored drink at centrally located feeding stations in villages

**Amount and frequency:** twice daily

**Nutritional composition of supplement:** Prior to 1971 it contained sugar, flavouring and colouring, thereafter micronutrients were added

**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 118 kcal 0 g protein per day (2 servings of 180ml each)

Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Curative medical care at clinic adjacent to feeding centre.

**Outcomes**

**Primary outcomes:** Plasma glucose concentration

**Secondary outcomes:** Body Mass Index, Waist-to-hip ratio, dietary energy intake, physical activity level

**Adverse events related to supplementary food:** Not reported

**Adherence to intervention:** Attendance at supplement feeding station was recorded for all participants. Intakes of supplementary foods (to the nearest 10ml) by each participant were recorded daily by research staff.

Mean daily recorded supplementary intakes (birth to 2 years) (as reported by Webb 2005):

- Atole group: 95±69kcal (women) and 119± 98 kcal(men)
- Fresco group: 10kcal±10 kcal(women) and 10±8kcal(men)

**Primary outcomes:** Diastolic and systolic blood pressure

**Secondary outcomes:** Body Mass Index, Waist-to-Hip ratio, physical activity, smoking, alcohol use

**Adverse events related to supplementary food:** Not reported

**Adherence to intervention:** Intakes of supplementary foods by each participant were recorded daily by research staff.

Mean daily recorded supplementary intakes (birth to 2 years):

- Atole group: 95±69kcal (women) and 119± 98 kcal(men)
- Fresco group: 10kcal±10 kcal(women) and 10±8kcal(men)

**Notes**

**Links to other studies (specify study ID):** Habicht 1992; Martorell 1995; Webb 2005

**Trial registration details:** Not registered

**Funders:** Nestle Foundation, National Institutes of Health and the American Heart Association

**Ethics:** Institutional review boards at INCAP and Emory University

**Informed consent:** Written informed consent

**Conflict of interest statement:** Not reported

**Reference standard used for anthropometrical data:** NCHS reference
Quality of anthropometrical measurements: Measurements were performed in triplicate and the mean value was used for analysis. Weighing scales were calibrated periodically and steel measuring tapes were used.

Links to other studies (specify study ID): Habicht 1992; Martorell 1995; Conlisk 2004

Trial registration details: Not registered

Funders: Nestle Foundation, National Institutes of Health and the American Heart Association

Ethics: Institutional review boards at INCAP and Emory University

Informed consent: Written informed consent

Conflict of interest statement: Not reported

Reference standard used for anthropometrical data: NCHS reference standard

Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Although it is stated that the 2 pairs of villages were randomised, no details were provided regarding the generation of the random sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>No details were provided regarding the allocation of treatment to the 2 pairs of villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Due to the nature of the interventions participants and researchers were not blinded. Atole was a hot maize gruel, whereas Fresco was a fruit-flavoured drink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Research personnel involved in supplementation, home visits, anthropometric and psychological assessments, medical care and contact with village leadership were rotated through all the study villages for equal periods of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Conlisk 2004: 429 participants (73%) were included in the analysis (585 participants eligible for inclusion in follow-up survey) Differential loss to follow-up: Data not stated for each supplement group Webb 2005: Of the 585 participants who were eligible for inclusion in follow-up survey, 450 participants (77%) were included in the analysis. Differential loss to follow-up: More eligible non-participants were from the Fresno group (52% of the eligible non-participants were from Fresno group vs. 48% of eligible non-participants were from the Atole group) Participants did not differ from non-participants with respect to supplement intake in early childhood regardless of supplement group (data not shown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Study protocol available for INCAP trial but not for 1997-1998 follow-up survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Baseline comparability: Participants in the Fresco group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were more stunted by 24 months than those in the Atole group.  
Conflict of interest: Not reported.  
Non-conflicting funding resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment bias</th>
<th>Low risk</th>
<th>All eligible participants living in the selected villages were included in the study so recruitment was judged as adequate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline imbalance</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Baseline comparability of villages was similar so baseline balance was judged as adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of clusters</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Although the number of participants varied throughout the various follow up analyses, the four villages initially randomised to the treatment groups were maintained throughout the follow up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heikens 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Study design: RCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country and location of study: Tropical Metabolism Research Unit (TMRU) outpatient clinic, Kingston, Jamaica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of trial sites: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study dates: April-November 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study duration: 6 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Frequency of follow-up and variables collected: Weight, morbidity history, appetite and nutritional history for the preceding 14 days collected during fortnightly home visits by community health assistants (CHA) or at monthly clinic follow-up visits.  
Recumbent length; morbidity history; clinical assessment and treatment performed monthly by CHAs and the paediatric resident at the TMRU outpatient clinic. |
| Duration of follow-up: 6 months |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Malnourished children referred by 40 public health clinics in the Kingston metropolitan area were assessed by project staff for study inclusion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Children aged 3-36 months who were inhabitants of the Kingston metropolitan area with less than 80% expected weight-for-age, without oedema or profound anorexia preventing normal home feeding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Clinical apparent congenital abnormalities or severe acute or chronic infection requiring hospitalization, siblings participating in the study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number randomized: 82 children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline characteristics of participants

| Group 1: High energy supplement group (HES) |
| Number of participants: 39 |
| Participants age: 1.24±0.59 years |
| Participants gender: Not reported |
| Nutritional status (% of NCHS reference value): Weight-for-age: 66.79±6.05; Length-for-age: 90.42±3.67(even though only borderline moderately stunted we have included these children in the moderately underweight and moderately stunted analysis); Weight-for-length: 82.51±7.73 |

| Group 2: Control group (HC) |
| Number of participants: 43 |
| Participants age: 1.17±0.61 years |
### Participants

**gender:** Not reported  
**Nutritional status (% of NCHS reference value):**  
- Weight-for-age: 65.48±7.47; Length-for-age: 89.69±4.39; Weight-for-length: 83.36±5.89  

**Baseline comparability:** Study reports no difference in nutritional status or any of the other variables measured between the two groups.

### Interventions

#### Group 1: High energy supplement (HES group)

**Description:** Home-based administration of a High energy supplement (HES) for 3 months; thereafter the provision of standard community health care for another 3 months  
**Amount and frequency:** Daily ration of two measuring cups (150 g) of HES preparation with 500 ml of boiled water to form a gruel of approximately 590 ml  
**Nutritional composition of supplement:** Full cream milk powder, sugar, soya oil (526 kcal/100 g dry weight; 13.75g/100g)  
**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 790 kcal/day; 20.6 g protein/day  
**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** Both groups received the same health care from clinical staff in the TMRU outpatient clinic and were visited fortnightly at home by community health aides supervised by the TMRU research team. Health care included provision of multivitamins and folic acid for all children, outpatient treatment of minor illnesses or infections, and nutritional advice on breastfeeding and weaning. All guardians were advised to continue feeding the child during any period of illness.

#### Group 2: Control (HC group)

**Description:** Provision of standard community health care for 6 months  
**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** None  
**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** Both groups received the same health care from clinical staff in the TMRU outpatient clinic and were visited fortnightly at home by community health aides supervised by the TMRU research team. Health care included provision of multivitamins and folic acid for all children, outpatient treatment of minor illnesses or infections, and nutritional advice on breastfeeding and weaning. All guardians were advised to continue feeding the child during any period of illness.

### Outcomes

Outcomes were not defined as primary or secondary  

Outcomes reported in the study:  
- Mean weight during 6 month follow up (table with mean and SD values missing from the document)  
- Percentage Expected Weight-for-age after 6 months  
  - *The value for the HC group was 65.5 per cent on enrolment and 69.5 per cent 6 months later, and comparable figures for the HES group were 66.8 and 72.5 percent respectively.*  
- Weight change 0-3 months, 3-6 months  
- Mean (SD) recumbent length each month  
  - *There is less immediate response and the strongest effect is seen shortly after supplementation ceased. This finding of catch up growth in length following an increase in weight for the group receiving the HES supplementation was matched in analyses of length when related to the NCHS reference values. However, the significance levels for group*
Comparisons differed to some extent because the un-supplemented group faltered when compared with the standard particularly during the early months.

Length change 0-3 months, 3-6 months

Mean (SD) BMI each month - this data used for analysis

BMI change 0-3 months, 3-6 months

**Adverse events related to the supplementary food:** Reported no adverse events.

**Adherence to intervention:** Actual intake was monitored by the CHAs, using the food frequency method. Random visits were made to check container contents. Supplements were delivered in 2 litre containers with markers. Both container and cup were exchanged each week for those left the previous week and were taken back to the research unit, where the container was weighed. However, adherence data not was reported.

**Notes**

**Links to other studies (specify study ID):** NA

**Trial registration details:** Trial protocol not registered

**Ethics:** The research protocol received the approval of the Ministry of Health, Kingston, Jamaica, and the Medical Ethics Committee of the University Hospital of the West Indies.

**Informed consent:** Written consent by parents or guardians

**Funding source:** Ministry of Development Cooperation, Netherlands

**Conflict of interest statement:** No statement provided

**Reference standard used for anthropometrical data:** NCHS reference values

**Quality of anthropometrical measurements:** Quality control in anthropometry was performed regularly to ensure intra and inter observer reliability. The accuracy of the SECA Scales (15 kg, graduated at 10 g) and length boards (120 cm graduated at 0.1 cm) were checked weekly.

### Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors’ judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Although it is reported that the children were randomly allocated to the treatments, the study authors do not report how the random sequence was generated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study authors do not describe how the children were allocated to the treatments and if person allocating the children to the treatments was blinded to the treatment being allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is unlikely that the participants were blinded to the treatment. It would be difficult to do so as one group received food and the other did not. It seems that the personnel were also not blinded to the treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is unclear if the outcome assessors were blinded to the treatment group of the children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Krahenbuhl 1998

#### Methods

**Study design:** RCT

**Country and location of study:** Dunn Nutrition Group’s study villages of Keneba, Manduar and Kanton Kunda, The Gambia (West Africa).

**No. of trial sites:** 3 villages

**Study dates and duration:** 1993 - 3 months to complete baseline measurements (Jan-March 1994) and 12 months of supplementation

**Type of assessment and frequency of follow-up:**
- Anthropometry - 0, 3, 6, 9 and 12 months
- Daily food intake - pre and post 3, 6, 12 months
- RMR and RQ - pre and post 6, 12 months

#### Participants

**Inclusion criteria:**
Children aged 3 to 9 years with a height for age z score < -2 (severely or moderately stunted)

**Exclusion criteria:**
Weight for height z-score < -2 (severely or moderately wasted)

**Total number randomized:** 90

1993: CS anthropometric survey, 638 children assessed (70% of children in that age group listed in 1993 consensus). 90 stunted but not wasted children. The preselected children were categorised by village, sex, age and degree of stunting. The children in each category were randomly attributed to one of the three groups, which were therefore matched for the criteria mentioned.

Baseline characteristics of participants

**Group 1: High fat supplement (F)**

- **Number of participants:** 29
- **Participants age:** 68±21 months
- **Participants gender:** 17M/12F

**Nutritional status:**
**WAZ -2.1±0.4; HAZ -2.2±0.4; WHZ -1.1±0.6**

**Group 2: High carbohydrate supplement (C)**
- **Number of participants:** 30
- **Participants age:** 68±22 months
- **Participants gender:** 18M/12F
- **Nutritional status:**
  - WAZ -2.2±0.4; HAZ -2.3±0.4; WHZ -1.2±0.6

**Baseline comparability:**
The baseline characteristics of the treatment groups were similar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Group 1: High fat supplement (F)</th>
<th>Group 2: High carbohydrate supplement (C)</th>
<th>Group 3: No supplement (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>Community-based administration of a high fat biscuit.</td>
<td>Community-based administration of a high carbohydrate biscuit.</td>
<td>No nutritional supplementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount and frequency:</strong></td>
<td>65g of high fat biscuit daily, 5 days a week for 1 year</td>
<td>90g of high carbohydrate biscuit, 5 days a week for 1 year</td>
<td>Clinical assessment (frequency not stated) and access to medical care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutritional composition of supplement:</strong></td>
<td>Rice, flour, roasted groundnuts, sugar, vegetable oil and honey. % of total energy from fat = 63%. Biscuits were similar regarding micronutrient and vitamin constituents with the exception that the high fat biscuit contained notably more vitamin E.</td>
<td>Rice, flour, roasted groundnuts, sugar, vegetable oil and honey. % of total energy from fat = 25%. Biscuits were similar regarding micronutrient and vitamin constituents with the exception that the high fat biscuit contained notably more vitamin E.</td>
<td>Clinical assessment (frequency not stated) and access to medical care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total daily supplementary intake:</strong></td>
<td>1448 kJ (345 kcal); 8.4 g protein; 24.4 g fat and 25.3 g carbohydrate</td>
<td>1361 kJ (324 kcal); 6.3 g protein; 9 g fat and 58.3 g carbohydrate</td>
<td>Clinical assessment (frequency not stated) and access to medical care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional co-interventions/treatment received:</strong></td>
<td>Clinical assessment (frequency not stated) and access to medical care</td>
<td>Clinical assessment (frequency not stated) and access to medical care</td>
<td>Clinical assessment (frequency not stated) and access to medical care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes**

- **Reported outcomes:**
  - Primary and secondary outcomes not specifically stated
  - Anthropometry (weight, height and MUAC gain and the change in the sum of 4 skinfolds (pg 218) at 12 months), dietary intake, calorimetry and bioelectrical impedance assessed at various time points.

- **Adverse events related to the supplementary food:** Not reported

- **Adherence to intervention:** Supplementation was closely observed by
Field assistants who recorded the exact amount of supplement eaten each day.
Mean compliance: 96% (group F) vs 95% (group C)

**Recorded daily supplementary intakes:** 1551±12kJ vs 1659 ± 15kJ
(higher intakes in group C; high fat biscuit more crumbly and a lot lost as crumbs in packaging)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors’ judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study does not describe how the randomisation sequence was generated. Preselected children were categorised by village, sex, age and degree of stunting. The children in each category were randomly attributed to one of the three groups which were therefore matched for the criteria mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study does not describe how the randomisation procedure was carried out and if any attempt was made to conceal the allocation of the children to the different treatment groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study does not describe if the participants or personnel were blinded to the treatment allocation of the children. It is not clear if the biscuits looked the same or tasted the same. The fact that the biscuits were made of different proportions of the same ingredients leads one to believe that the biscuits probably looked the same. Although the biscuits were different weights and it is stated that the high fat biscuits were more friable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study does not describe if the outcome assessors (such as the principal investigator who performed the anthropometric measurements) were blinded to the treatment allocation of the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>One child in the control group died. One child in the high fat group stopped taking the supplement biscuit after 4 months (reason for stopping was not provided).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Study protocol not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: None Conflict of interest: Conflict of interest was not declared. Funding: Source was stated; however status of funding source remain unclear since conflict of interest was not declared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recruitment bias
- **Unclear risk**

### Baseline imbalance
- **Unclear risk**

### Loss of clusters
- **Unclear risk**

#### Kuusipalo 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Study design: Randomized controlled trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country and location of study: Rural Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of trial sites: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study dates and duration: November 2002-March 2003 (5 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of Follow-up: every 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of assessment at each follow up: morbidity, recording of any adverse events, collection of empty supplement sachets, weight and height measurements conducted at final follow-up visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of follow-up: 12 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria: Children aged 6 to 17 months with WAZ &lt; -2 SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Children with weight &lt; 5.5 kg, WHZ &lt; -3 SD, severe medical condition requiring hospitalization, adverse reaction after test dose of fortified spread and likelihood to move out of study area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of children randomised: 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stratified randomisation was used. Children weighing more than 7.7 kg were randomized to any of the treatment groups, whereas those weighing between 5.5 and 7 kg could not be randomised to treatment groups receiving 75 g FS, since this would result in them receiving more than 50% of their daily energy requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline characteristics of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (Milk-based FS 5g)</td>
<td>Number of participants: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants age: 13.5 ± 3.3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants gender: 10F/3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritional status: WAZ -2.4 ± 0.7 ; HAZ -2.3 ± 1.0 ; WHZ -1.1 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Group 2 (Milk-based FS 25g) | Number of participants: 20 |
|                           | Participants age: 13.9 ± 2.4 months |
|                           | Participants gender: 12F/8M |
|                           | Nutritional status: WAZ -2.7 ± 0.9 ; HAZ -2.9 ± 1.4 ; WHZ -1.0 ± 0.7 |

| Group 3 (Milk-based FS 50g) | Number of participants: 18 |
|                           | Participants age: 12.4 ± 4 months |
|                           | Participants gender: 10F/8M |
|                           | Nutritional status: WAZ -2.3 ± 0.8 ; HAZ -2.2 ± 0.9 ; WHZ -1.0 ± 0.9 |

| Group 4 (Milk-based FS 75g) | Number of participants: 9 |
|                           | Participants age: 14.8 ± 2.3 months |
|                           | Participants gender: 6F/3M |
|                           | Nutritional status: WAZ -2.4 ± 0.6 ; HAZ -2.3 ± 0.7 ; WHZ -1.3 ± 0.6 |

| Group 5 (Soy-based FS 25g) | Number of participants: 21 |
|                           | Participants age: 13.8 ± 3.1 months |
|                           | Participants gender: 15F/6M |
|                           | Nutritional status: WAZ -2.3 ± 1.0 ; HAZ -2.5 ± 1.2 ; WHZ -0.9 ± 0.8 |

| Group 6 (Soy-based FS 50g) | Number of participants: 18 |
|                           | Participants age: 13.2 ± 3.4 months |
|                           | Participants gender: 13F/5M |
|                           | Nutritional status: WAZ -2.3 ± 0.5 ; HAZ -2.4 ± 0.6 ; WHZ -1.0 ± 0.4 |

| Group 7 (Soy-based FS 75g) | Number of participants: 9 |
Participants age: 12.9 ± 1.7 months
Participants gender: 4F/5M
Nutritional status: WAZ -2.3 ± 0.5 ; HAZ -2.3 ± 0.6 ; WHZ -1.0 ± 0.7

Group 8 (Control)
Number of participants: 18
Participants age: 13.5 ± 3.1 months
Participants gender: 13F/5M
Nutritional status: WAZ -2.1 ± 0.6 ; HAZ -2.3 ± 1.0 ; WHZ -0.7 ± 0.7

Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount and frequency</th>
<th>Nutritional composition of supplement</th>
<th>Total daily supplementary nutrient intake</th>
<th>Additional co-interventions/treatment received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Home-based administration of a milk based fortified spread (FS) for 12 weeks</td>
<td>5g daily</td>
<td>Dried skimmed milk, peanut butter, oil and sugar, micronutrients (recommended daily intakes for normal infants)</td>
<td>23 kcal (96 KJ) and 1g protein per day</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Home-based administration of a milk based fortified spread (FS) for 12 weeks</td>
<td>25g daily</td>
<td>Dried skimmed milk, peanut butter, oil and sugar, micronutrients (recommended daily intakes for normal infants)</td>
<td>130 kcal (544 KJ) and 4 g protein per day</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Home-based administration of a milk based fortified spread (FS) for 12 weeks</td>
<td>50g daily</td>
<td>Dried skimmed milk, peanut butter, oil and sugar, micronutrients (recommended daily intakes for normal infants)</td>
<td>263 kcal (1105 KJ) and 8g protein per day</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Home-based administration of a milk based fortified spread (FS) for 12 weeks</td>
<td>75g daily</td>
<td>Dried skimmed milk, peanut butter, oil and sugar, micronutrients (recommended daily intakes for normal infants)</td>
<td>395 kcal (1661 KJ) and 11g protein per day</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Home-based administration of a soy based fortified spread (FS) for 12 weeks</td>
<td>25g daily</td>
<td>Soy flour, peanut butter, oil and sugar, micronutrients (recommended daily intakes for normal infants)</td>
<td>126 kcal (531 KJ) and 3 g protein per day</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group 6 (Soy-based FS 50g)
Description: Home-based administration of a soy based fortified spread (FS) for 12 weeks
Amount and frequency: 50g daily
Nutritional composition of supplement: Soy flour, peanut butter, oil and sugar, micronutrients (recommended daily intakes for normal infants)
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 255 kcal (1071 kJ) and 7 g protein
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: None

Group 7 (Soy-based FS 75g)
Description: Home-based administration of a soy based fortified spread (FS) for 12 weeks
Amount and frequency: 75g daily
Nutritional composition of supplement: Soy flour, peanut butter, oil and sugar, micronutrients (recommended daily intakes for normal infants)
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 384 kcal (1615 kJ) and 10g protein per day
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: None

Group 8
Description: Control group
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: None
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: None

Outcomes
Primary outcomes: Changes in weight, length, blood haemoglobin concentrations
Secondary outcomes: Changes in WAZ, LAZ and WHZ scores
Adverse events related to supplementary food: None
Adherence to intervention: Not reported for trial participants overall or for each treatment group

Notes
Links to other studies (specify study ID): NA
Trial registration details: Not reported
Funders: Research grants from Academy of Finland, Foundation for Paediatric research in Finland and Medical Research Fund, Tampere University Hospital
Ethics: Ethics committees at the College of Medicine, University of Malawi and Tampere University Hospital, Tampere, Finland
Informed consent: Written
Conflict of interest statement: André Briend is a former consultant to Nutriset (provided products free of charge for the study)
Reference standard used for anthropometrical data: NCHS growth reference standard (EPI-Info 2002)
Quality of anthropometrical measurements:
Three measurements were performed by the study nutritionist for weight and length and the average value recorded for each. Weight was measured with an electronic paediatric weighing scale (SECA, model 834) to the nearest 10g. Length was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm with an infantometer (Kiddimeter. Raven equipment, UK). At baseline the standard error was recorded as 39g for weight and 2.8 mm for height.

Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors’ judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Two computer –generated random number lists were used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(selection bias)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is stated that an office assistant performed the randomisation and food allocations, but details are not provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(selection bias)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is unclear whether participants were blinded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The researchers and the laboratory assistant measuring the outcome variables were blinded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>No loss to follow-up occurred in 7 of the 8 treatment groups. Loss to follow-up in the milk-based FS 50g group: 28% (5/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study protocol is not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict of interest: One of the authors is a former consultant to Nutriset (company who provided products free of charge for the trial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding: Non-conflicting sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline imbalance</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of clusters</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lopriore 2004**

**Methods**

- **Study design:** randomized controlled trial
- **Country and location of study:** Refugee camps, Algeria
- **No. of trial sites:** 6 community feeding centres
- **Study dates and duration:** May 1998-January 1999 (9 months)
- **Frequency and type of assessment at each follow-up:** daily (except Fridays) at community supplementary feeding centres; morbidity data collected every 2 weeks; anthropometric and haematological data collected at 3 and 6 months; faecal stool examinations at 6 months
- **Duration of follow-up:** 6 months

**Participants**

- **Inclusion criteria:** children aged 3-6 years with HAZ < -2
- **Exclusion criteria:** Severe or chronic illness, severe clinical malnutrition, congenital abnormalities
- **Total number randomized:** 374
- **Baseline characteristics of participants**
  - **Group 1 Fortified Spread (FS):**
    - Number of participants: 51
    - Participants age: 50.0 ± 11.7 months
    - Participants gender: 23F/28M
    - Nutritional status: HAZ -2.87 ± 0.56; WAZ -2.1 ± 0.56; WHZ -0.55 ± 0.69
  - **Group 2 Fortified Spread + Metronidazole (FS+M):**
    - Number of participants: 52
    - Participants age: 49.0 ± 12.2 months
    - Participants gender: 25F/27M
    - Nutritional status: HAZ -2.80 ± 0.62; WAZ -2.23 ± 0.69; WHZ -0.77 ± 0.77
  - **Group 3 Unfortified Spread (US):**
    - Number of participants: 52
    - Participants age: 49.7 ± 11.2 months
    - Participants gender: 26F/26M
    - Nutritional status: HAZ -2.73 ± 0.55; WAZ -2.19 ± 0.56; WHZ -0.79 ± 0.67
  - **Group 4 Unfortified Spread + Metronidazole (US+M):**
    - Number of participants: 54
    - Participants age: 50.0 ± 10.6 months
Participants gender: 29F/25M
Nutritional status: HAZ -2.97 ± 0.84; WAZ-2.33± 0.68; WHZ -0.81±0.65
Group 5 (Control):
Number of participants: 45
Participants age: 47.4 ± 11.8 months
Participants gender: 21F/24M
Nutritional status: HAZ -3.00 ± 0.71; WAZ -2.42± 0.75; WHZ -0.96±0.87
Baseline comparability: No differences were reported between treatment groups in terms of main characteristics

Interventions

Group 1 (FS):
Description: Community-based administration of Fortified spread (FS) for 6 months
Amount and frequency: 50g daily
Nutritional composition of supplement: peanut, whey powder, soy bean flour, vegetable fat, sugar, vitamin-mineral mixture
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 319 kcal, 5.8 g protein and 27.4g fat per day
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Placebo tablet

Group 2 (FS+ M):
Description: Community-based administration of a Fortified spread for 6 months plus a full course of Metronidazole treatment (FS + M)
Amount and frequency: 50g daily
Nutritional composition of supplement: peanut, whey powder, soy bean flour, vegetable fat, sugar, vitamin-mineral mixture
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 319 kcal, 5.8 g protein and 27.4g fat per day
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Metronidazole (250mg twice daily for 5 days) with Mebendazole (200mg twice daily for 3 days) to for children positive for helminth.

Group 3 (US):
Description: Community-based administration of an unfortified spread (US) for 6 months
Amount and frequency: 50g daily
Nutritional composition of supplement: peanut, whey powder, soy bean flour, vegetable fat, sugar
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 319 kcal, 5.8 g protein and 27.4g fat per day
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Placebo tablet

Group 4 (US + M):
Description: Community-based administration of an unfortified spread for 6 months and a full course of Metronidazole treatment (US + M)
Amount and frequency: 50g daily
Nutritional composition of supplement: peanut, whey powder, soy bean flour, vegetable fat, sugar
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 319 kcal, 5.8 g protein and 27.4g fat per day
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Metronidazole (250mg twice daily for 5 days) with Mebendazole (200mg twice daily for 3 days) to for children positive for helminth.

Group 5 (Control):
Description: Control group
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: None
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: None

Outcomes
Primary outcome:
HAZ at 3 and 6 months
Secondary outcomes:
WAZ, WHZ at 3 and 6 months
Adverse events related to supplementary food: Not reported
Adherence to intervention: 80 ± 16% reported for participants in groups 1 to 4

Notes

Links to other studies (specify study ID): NA

Trial registration details: Not stated

Funding: Italian nongovernmental organization Comitato Internazionale per lo Sviluppo dei Popoli (CISP) as part of a grant from the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO)

Ethics: Ethical review committees of the Ministry of Health and the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic

Informed consent: oral

Conflicts of interest statement: André Briend was a consultant for Nutriset (manufacturer of fortified spreads). Other authors had no conflict of interest to declare.

Reference standard used for anthropometrical data:
NCFS growth reference standards (EPI-INFO 2000; version 1.0)

Quality of anthropometrical measurements:
Measurements were performed in duplicate by the same investigator. Weight was measured by means of a digital scale with 100g precision (Soehnle) and height to the nearest mm using a metallic portable measuring board (PROMES).

Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors’ judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Use of a simple computer-generated randomization method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Not described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Supplementary foods were colour coded by manufacturer, therefore participants and personnel were blinded. However, mothers and children in the control group were told that they would receive the supplementary food at the end of the trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The investigator and field assistants performing the outcome measurements were not aware of the group allocation of the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Attrition for each treatment group at 6 months: FS group: 31% (23/75) FS+M group: 28% (21/75) US group: 32% (24/75) US+M group: 31% (23/75) Control group: 39% (29/75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Study protocol was not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other bias                                         | Low risk           | Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: None Conflict of interest: One of the authors was a consultant for Nutriset (manufacturer of fortified spreads). Other authors had no conflict of interest to declare.
| Funding: non-conflicting funding sources        |
| Recruitment bias                                  | Unclear risk       |                                                                                       |
| Baseline imbalance                                | Unclear risk       |                                                                                       |
| Loss of clusters                                  | Unclear risk       |                                                                                       |
### Methods

**Study design:** Randomised controlled trial

**Country and location of study:** Urban slums, Chennai

**No. of trial sites:** 1

**Study dates and duration:** Not reported

**Frequency of Follow-up:** Not reported

**Type of assessment at each follow up:** Not reported

**Duration of follow-up:** 6 months

### Participants

**Inclusion criteria:** Pre-school children with grade I and II underweight according to the Indian Academy of Pediatrics (IAP) classification (61-80% of expected weight-for-age)

**Exclusion criteria:** None stated

**Total number of children randomised:** 342

**Baseline characteristics of participants**

**Group 1 (Nutritional bolus)**

- **Number of participants:** 174
- **Participants age:** 53% (92/174) were aged 3 years
- **Participants gender:** 85F/89M

**Nutritional status**

- **Proportion of participants with underweight:** grade I (71-80% of expected weight-for-age): 80%; grade II (61-70% of expected weight-for-age): 20%
- **Proportion of participants with stunting:** grade I (definition unclear): 60%
- **Proportion of participants with wasting:** grade I (definition unclear): 53%; grade II (definition unclear): 22%

**Group 2 (Control)**

- **Number of participants:** 168
- **Participants age:** 49% (82/168) were aged 3 years
- **Participants gender:** 74F/94M

**Nutritional status**

- **Proportion of participants with underweight:** grade I (71-80% expected weight-for-age): 75%; grade II (61-70% expected weight-for-age): 25%
- **Proportion of participants with stunting:** grade I (definition unclear): 64%
- **Proportion of participants with wasting:** grade I (definition unclear): 43%; grade II (definition unclear): 12%

### Interventions

**Group 1 (Nutritional bolus)**

- **Description:** Community/home-based administration of a nutritional bolus for 6 months
- **Amount and frequency:** 100g daily
- **Nutritional composition of supplement:** ground rice, soya, groundnut, Bengal gram and jaggery
- **Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 345 kcal (KJ) and 17g protein per day
- **Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** None

**Group 2 (Control)**

- **Description:** Nutritional advice
- **Amount and frequency:** Not reported
- **Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** None
- **Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** None

### Outcomes

**Primary outcomes:**

Changes in proportions of underweight, stunting and wasting

Changes in weight, height and MUAC

**Adverse events related to supplementary food:** Not reported

**Adherence to intervention:**
Not reported for trial participants overall or for each treatment group

Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>A simple random sampling technique was used to select participants. Author only referred to a randomized interventional study. Details regarding the randomisation process were not provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Method of allocation was not described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>No information provided regarding blinding of participants or study personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>No information provided regarding blinding of assessors performing the outcome anthropometric measurements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is unclear whether any loss to follow-up occurred during the trial period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Study protocol is not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict of interest: Not declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding: Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline imbalance</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of clusters</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nikiema 2014

Methods

| Study design: cluster randomized trial                              |                     |
| Country and location of study: Rural health centres, Burkina Faso   |                     |
| No. of trial sites: 18                                              |                     |
| Study dates and duration: July 2010-November 2011 (18 months)       |                     |
| Frequency of Follow-up: every week                                  |                     |
| Type of assessment at each follow up: weight, length, MUAC          |                     |
| Duration of follow-up: 3 months                                     |                     |

Participants

| Inclusion criteria: Children aged 6 to 24 months with uncomplicated MAM (WHZ < -2 and ≥ -3) |                     |
| Exclusion criteria: Children with SAM (WHZ < -3 and oedema)          |                     |
| Total number of clusters randomised: 18                               |                     |
| Total number of children included: 1824                               |                     |
| Baseline characteristics of participants                              |                     |
| Group 1 (CCC) | **Number of participants:** 567  
**Participants age:** 13.5 ± 4.5 months  
**Participants gender:** 252F/315M  
**Nutritional status:** WHZ -2.5 ± 0.3; HAZ 2.8 ± 1.2; MUAC(cm): 11.7 ± 0.7 |
| Group 2 (CSB++) | **Number of participants:** 620  
**Participants age:** 13.1 ± 4.7 months  
**Participants gender:** 301F/319M  
**Nutritional status:** WHZ -2.5 ± 0.3; HAZ 2.7 ± 1.3; MUAC(cm): 11.6 ± 0.7 |
| Group 3 (RUSF) | **Number of participants:** 637  
**Participants age:** 13.4 ± 4.5 months  
**Participants gender:** 300F/337M  
**Nutritional status:** WHZ -2.5 ± 0.3; HAZ 2.4 ± 1.2; MUAC(cm): 12.0 ± 0.6 |
| **Baseline comparability:** Author report "slightly better nutritional status as indicated by HAZ and MUAC in the RUSF group" (no statistics provided) |

### Interventions

| Group 1 (CCC) | **Description:** Child-centered counselling (CCC) for 12 weeks  
**Amount:** 1.5 hours (first session), 45 minutes (follow-up sessions)  
**Frequency:** weekly  
**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** None  
**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** Routine vitamin A supplementation; deworming treatment (Mebendazole for 3 days) vaccinations; anaemic children received iron and folic acid syrup for 4 weeks |
| Group 2 (CSB++) | **Description:** Corn soy blend Plus (CSB++) for 12 weeks  
**Dose and frequency:** 65g daily  
**Nutritional composition of supplement:** maize (57-62%), soya beans (15-20%), sugar (9%), dried skim milk (8%), soybean oil (3%), vitamins and minerals  
**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 273 kcal and 10.4 g protein per day  
**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** Generic dietary advice (continue breastfeeding, increase dietary diversity, provision of nutrient-dense snacks); Routine vitamin A supplementation; deworming treatment (Mebendazole for 3 days) vaccinations; anaemic children received iron and folic acid syrup for 4 weeks |
| Group 3 (RUSF) | **Description:** Ready-to-use-supplementary food (RUSF)  
**Dose and frequency:** 50g (3 tablespoons) daily  
**Nutritional composition of supplement:** peanut butter (26%), vegetable oil (12.5%), sugar (25%), soy flour (33%), shea butter (2%) and multiple micronutrients (1.5%)  
**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 258 kcal and 8.7 g protein per day  
**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** Generic dietary advice (continue breastfeeding, increase dietary diversity, provision of nutrient-dense snacks); Routine vitamin A supplementation; deworming treatment (Mebendazole for 3 days) vaccinations; anaemic children received iron and folic acid syrup for 4 weeks |

### Outcomes

| **Primary outcomes:**  
Recovery (WHZ ≥ -2), defaulter, mortality, proportion of children with MAM, SAM  
**Secondary outcomes:**  
Changes in weight, length and MUAC  
**Adverse events related to supplementary food:** Not reported |
Adherence:
Attendance rates (number of actual visits divided by the number expected) CCC group: 74.1 ± 26.7; CSB++ group: 86.5 ± 20.4 and RUSF group: 87 ± 2.1 (P <0.0001)

Notes
 Links to other studies (specify study ID): NA
 Trial registration details: NCT01115647
 Funders:
 Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition, World Food Programme, Nutrition Third World
 Ethics: Research Ethical committee of Burkina Faso, Ethical committee of Antwerp University, Belgium
 Informed consent: type of consent not stated
 Conflict of interest statement: yes
 Reference standard used for anthropometrical data: WHO growth reference standard
 Quality of anthropometrical measurements:
 Measurements performed twice and average recorded. Weight was measured by means of an electronic scale with 100g precision (Seca, model -345), length measured to the nearest mm using a rigid length board (Short Productions) and MUAC with a nonstretchable insertion tape (SECA model 201) to the nearest mm.

Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors’ judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Performed in public by each head of a rural health centre drawing a paper from a basket containing 18 pieces of paper, representing 18 health centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Performed in public by each head of a rural health centre drawing a paper from a basket containing 18 pieces of paper, representing 18 health centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Each rural health centre was assigned to a particular treatment group. Therefore personnel not blinded. It is unclear whether participants were blinded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Unclear whether personnel performing the anthropometric outcome measures were blinded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Attrition for each group at 3 months: CCC group: 18.5% (112/605) CSB++ group: 4% (27/675) RUSF group: 6.8% (47/694) Differential attrition in CCC vs. RUSF or CSB++ groups &gt; 10%: high risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The primary and secondary outcomes as reported is consistent with the trial protocol from <a href="http://www.clinicaltrials.gov">www.clinicaltrials.gov</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: None Conflict of interest: Declared no conflict of interest. Funding: non-conflicted funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment bias</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Recruitment of participants occurred after randomization of rural health centres and therefore recruitment was judged as inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline imbalance</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Baseline characteristics of the clusters were not reported so baseline imbalance was judged as unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of clusters</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>There was no loss of cluster but there was missing data on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individuals. The number lost to follow up and the defaulters were reported and the number randomized was the same number analyzed so Intention-to-treat analysis was performed. Therefore, we judged that there was a low risk of loss of cluster

**Methods**

**Study design:** Cluster Controlled trial  
**Country and location of study:** Rural villages near Hyderabad, India  
**No. of trial sites:** 9 villages  
**Date recruitment initiated:** Not stated  
**Study dates and duration:** 14 months (dates not reported)  
**Frequency of Follow-up:** every 3 months  
**Type of assessment at each follow up:** weight, height, clinical assessment of nutritional status  
**Duration of follow-up:** 14 months  

**Participants**

**Inclusion criteria:** Children aged 1 to 5 years living in selected villages were matched for sex, height and weight and allocated to receive supplementary food or no supplementary food  
**Total number included in trial:** 415 (316 received supplementary food; 109 received no supplementary food)  
**Baseline characteristics of participants:** Authors report no differences in the mean heights and weights and prevalence of nutritional deficiency signs among children between the two treatment groups (Data not shown)  

**Interventions**

**Group 1 (Supplementary food)**  
**Description:** Community-based administration of supplementary food for 14 months  
**Amount and frequency:** administered as sweet cakes daily for 6 days a week  
**Nutritional composition of supplement:** Wheat flour (23g), sugar (35g) and edible oil (10g)  
**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 310 kcal and 3 g protein per day  
**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** None  

**Group 2 (Control)**  
**Description:** No intervention (control group)  
**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** None  
**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** None  

**Outcomes**

**Primary outcomes:** Changes in height and weight  
**Adverse events related to supplementary food:** Not reported  
**Adherence to intervention:** 85% attendance among children receiving the supplementary food. Adherence was ensured among those children who attended feeding sessions.  

**Notes**

**Links to other studies (specify study ID):** Gopalan 1973  
**Trial registration details:** Not reported  
**Funding:** Not reported  
**Ethics:** Not reported  
**Informed consent:** Not reported  
**Conflict of interest statement:** Not reported  
**Reference standard used for anthropometrical data:** NCHS growth reference standards  

**Risk of bias table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors’ judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

Rao 1977
Random sequence generation (selection bias) | Unclear risk | Although it is stated that nine villages were randomly selected to participate in the trial, it was not stated that the villages were randomly assigned to the intervention or control groups.

Allocation concealment (selection bias) | Unclear risk | It is not clear how the villages were allocated to the intervention or control groups.

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | Unclear risk | No information was provided regarding the blinding of the study participants and personnel.

Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) | Unclear risk | No information was provided regarding the blinding of the person who measured the anthropometrical outcomes.

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) | High risk | Attrition rate for each group:
- Supplemented group: 95/306 (31%)
- Non-supplemented group: 27/109 (25%)

Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Unclear risk | Study protocol not available.

Other bias | Unclear risk | Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: None
Conflict of interest: Conflict of interest was not declared.
Funding: Unclear as funding sources not described.

Recruitment bias | Unclear risk |
Baseline imbalance | Unclear risk |
Loss of clusters | Unclear risk |

Richter-Strydom 1985

**Methods**

**Study design:** Randomised Controlled Trial

**Country and location of study:** Outpatient department, Ga-Rankuwa Hospital, South Africa

**No. of trial sites:** 1

**Study dates and duration:** 1980-1983/4 (4 years)

**Frequency of Follow-up:** Not reported

**Type of assessment at each follow up:** Psychological assessment and growth measurements

**Duration of follow-up:** 3 years

**Participants**

**Inclusion criteria:**
Children aged 7-36 months of age with 72% or less expected weight for age without oedema or 79% of less expected weight for age with oedema, provided that expected weight for height was not more than 95%. All children were close to the 3rd percentile for weight based on Boston or NCHS reference standards.

**Exclusion criteria:**
Not stated

**Total number randomized:** Not stated

**Baseline characteristics of participants:**
Not reported. A total number of 61 trial participants were followed up 3 years post-intervention. At this time, the children were 3.5-6 years old.

**Interventions**

**Group 1: (Nutrition education group)**

**Description:** Mothers of children randomized to this group received 6 home-based nutrition education sessions over a period of a few months.

**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** All children were treated for protein energy malnutrition and received medical care and high protein supplementary food where judged necessary.
Group 2: (Control group)
Description: Usual care
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: All children were treated for protein energy malnutrition and received medical care and high protein supplementary food where judged necessary.

Outcomes
Psychological assessment and physical growth measurements. Primary and secondary outcomes were not defined in the study. Weight, height, Arm circumference, triceps and subscapular skinfold measurements are reported for 61 malnourished participants. Statistical analysis was conducted on 21 children from the intervention group and 21 control children, who were matched for sex and age, in terms of physical growth (details and data not provided).
Adverse events related to the supplementary food: Not reported
Adherence to intervention: Not reported

Notes
Links to other studies (specify study ID): NA
Trial registration details: Not registered
Ethics and informed consent: Not described
Conflict of interest statement: No statement provided
Funding source: Not described
Reference standard used for anthropometrical data: Boston and NCHS reference standards
Quality of anthropometrical measurements: Not described

Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is not described how the randomisation sequence was generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is not clear how the randomisation process was conducted. It only states that the children were randomly assigned to groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is not clear if the control mothers were aware of the fact that some of the other mothers received nutrition education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The nursing sister who assessed the physical growth of the children did not know which group the children were assigned to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is not clear how many children were initially randomised to each group. Only 21 children from the intervention group and 21 from the control group were included in the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Study protocol not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of interest: Conflict of interest was not declared. Funding: Unclear as funding sources not described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roy 2005
### Methods

**Study design:** Cluster RCT; children in each community nutrition center as a group were allocated randomly to either of the three study groups according to a random number table.

**Country and location of study:** Sub-district in Chandpur district, Bangladesh

**No. of trial sites:** 15 community nutrition centres

**Study duration:** 9 months

**Study dates:** January-March 1999 (intervention); April to September 1999 (follow up).

**Frequency of follow-up:** Every week

**Type of assessment at each follow up:** Anthropometric measurements every 2 weeks, weekly morbidity and dietary intake data,

**Duration of follow-up:** 9 months

### Participants

**Inclusion criteria:** Moderate underweight children aged 6-24 months (weight for age between 61% and 75% of median of the NCHS standard) and their mothers/caregivers

**Exclusion criteria:** Not described

**Total number randomised:** 282 (15 centres)

**Baseline characteristics of participants**

**Group 1: (INE)**

- **Number of participants:** 93
- **Participants age:** 14± 4 months
- **Participant gender:** 35M/58F
- **Nutritional status:**
  - Weight for age (% of NCHS median) 69±4
  - Weight for length (% of NCHS median) 81.9±7.0
  - WLZ -2.0±0.8; LAZ -2.2±1.1

**Group 2: (INE+SF)**

- **Number of participants:** 99
- **Participants age:** 14±5 months
- **Participants gender:** 48M/51F
- **Nutritional status:**
  - Weight for age (% of NCHS median) 69±4
  - Weight for length (% of NCHS median) 83.0±7.7
  - WLZ -1.9±0.9; LAZ -2.3±1.2

**Group 3: (C)**

- **Number of participants:** 90
- **Participants age:** 15±5 months
- **Participants gender:** 41M/59F?
- **Nutritional status:**
  - Weight for age (% of NCHS median) 69±4
  - Weight for length (% of NCHS median) 80.4±6.6
  - WLZ -2.2±0.8; LAZ -2.1±1.2

**Baseline comparability:** baseline characteristics comparable except that comparison group had better socio-economic status

### Interventions

**Group 1: Intensive nutrition education (INE)**

**Description:** Community based intensive nutrition education provided to groups of 10-12 mothers/caregivers twice a week by a trained nutritionist. (Nutrition education sessions included aspects such as food security, breastfeeding, nutritional properties of food, personal hygiene, caring practices and disease control, as well as cooking demonstrations on how to prepare nutritionally sound complementary food)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of intervention:</th>
<th>3 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional co-interventions/treatment received:</td>
<td>Advice for referral to local health facility for any illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group 2: Intensive nutrition education + supplementary food (INE+SF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Community based intensive nutrition education provided to groups of 10-12 mothers/caregivers in their village twice a week by a trained nutritionist plus supplementary food for 6 days a week. (Nutrition education sessions included aspects such as food security, breastfeeding, nutritional properties of food, personal hygiene, caring practices and disease control, as well as cooking demonstrations on how to prepare nutritionally sound complementary food)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of intervention:</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritional composition of supplementary food:</td>
<td>40g roasted and powdered rice, 20g roasted and powdered pulse, 10g molasses, 6g oil), mixed with water to prepare paste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:</td>
<td>300kcal/day and 8-9g protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional co-interventions/treatment received:</td>
<td>Advice for referral to local health facility for any illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group 3: Control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Nutrition education provided every two weeks by community nutrition promoters of the Bangladesh Integrated Nutrition Project (BINP) as part of its usual programme activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of intervention:</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional co-interventions/treatment received:</td>
<td>Advice for referral to local health facility for any illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study did not state primary or secondary outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reported outcomes:**
- Improved nutritional status of the child (anthropometry) at 3 and 9 months.
- Morbidity after 3 months of intervention
- Growth (weight-for-age z score) after 3 and 6 months
- Change in feeding behaviour of mothers/caregivers

**Outcomes relevant to our review:**
- Mean weight for age z score at end of 3 month intervention and 3 months observation (data for other time points in Fig 3)

**Adverse events related to the supplementary food:** Not reported

**Adherence to intervention:**
- **Adherence to supplementary food:** Not described.
- **Adherence to nutrition education:** Attendance at sessions=Adherence (this was not reported)

**Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links to other studies (specify study ID):</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trial registration details:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and informed consent:</td>
<td>Not described. Study conducted at ICDDR,B: Centre for Health and Population Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest statement:</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Funding:** Grant from Bangladesh Integrated Nutrition Project (BINP) and World Bank

**Reference standard used for anthropometrical data:** NCHS reference standard

**Quality of anthropometrical measurements:**
The recollected data of the project supervisor on 25% of randomly selected cases matched those of the research assistant. Anthropometric measurement techniques were standardized every two weeks. Quality control programme run by experienced nutritionist for ICDDR,B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The children in each community nutrition centre as a group were allocated randomly to either of the three study groups according to a random number table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Not described in the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Fifteen community centres were identified alternatively from three unions to avoid contamination of the intervention methods. It is possible that participants in each group were blinded. Blinding of personnel not described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study does not describe if the outcome assessors (such as the field assistants who performed the anthropometric measurements) were blinded to the treatment allocation of the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is unclear whether any attrition occurred during the study period. It was reported that 94 children were selected from 5 community nutrition centres. However the number of participants stated in the results were: 93 (INE group); 99 (INE+SF group) and 90 (Comparison group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study protocol was not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: Children in the comparison group had better socio-economic status but nutritional status was similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict of interest: Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fundining: Non-conflicting funding source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment bias</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Children were recruited into the study before the centres were randomized, therefore recruitment was judged as adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline imbalance</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Baseline characteristics of the clusters were not reported so baseline imbalance was judged as unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of clusters</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study does not report on missing individual data so bias due to loss of cluster was judged unclear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thakwalakwa 2010**

**Methods**

**Study design:** Randomised controlled trial

**Country and location of study:** Lungwena, Mangochi district, Malawi.

**No. of trial sites:** 1

**Duration of trial:** 6 months (December 2006 to May 2007)

**Frequency of follow-up:** every week
**Type of assessment at each follow up:** Research assistants collected information regarding any adverse events at weekly home visits. Any recorded adverse event was reviewed by a trial physician (blinded in terms of treatment allocation) during a follow-up visit at the health centre. Anthropometric and medical assessments were conducted at baseline and again at 12 weeks.

**Duration of follow-up:** 12 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria:</th>
<th>Total number of children randomised:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children aged 6 to 15 months with WAZ&lt;-2SD (NCHS reference), availability during the period of the study and permanent residence in the catchment area</td>
<td>WLZ &lt;-3SD or presence of oedema, history of peanut allergy, history of any serious allergic reaction to any substance requiring emergency medical care, history of anaphylaxis, severe illness warranting hospital referral and concurrent participation in another clinical trial with intervention to the child</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Baseline characteristics of participants**

**Group 1 (LNS group)**
- **No. of participants:** 66
- **Participants age:** 11.3 ± 2.5 months
- **Participants gender:** 53%F/47%M
- **Nutritional status:** WAZ -2.83 ±0.78; HAZ -2.67±0.94; WHZ -0.56± 0.73 (NCHS growth standard)

**Group 2 (CSB group)**
- **Number of participants:** 67
- **Participants age:** 11.2 ± 2.7 months
- **Participants gender:** 55%F/45%M
- **Nutritional status:** WAZ -3.06±1.08; HAZ -2.81±1.13; WHZ -0.67±0.79 (NCHS growth standard)

**Group 3 (Control group)**
- **Number of participants:** 59
- **Participants age:** 11.3 ± 2.5 months
- **Participants gender:** 42%F/58%M
- **Nutritional status:** WAZ -2.98±0.86; HAZ -2.80±0.97; WHZ -0.69±0.78 (NCHS growth standard)

Baseline comparability:
At enrollment, there were slightly more children in the LNS (66) and CSB (67) groups compared with the control group (59), but the baseline characteristics of the groups were comparable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Group 1 (LNS group)</th>
<th>Group 2 (CSB group)</th>
<th>Group 3 (Control group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>Lipid-nutrient supplement</td>
<td>Corn-soy blend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount and frequency:</strong></td>
<td>300g LNS given weekly to guardian by research assistant. To be administered as 3 spoon servings (43g) twice daily.</td>
<td>500g CSB given weekly to guardian by research assistant. To be administered as 5 spoon servings (71g) twice daily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutritional composition of supplement:</strong></td>
<td>peanut butter (26 %), dried skimmed milk (25 %), vegetable oil (20 %), icing sugar (27.5 %) and a mineral and vitamin mix (Project Peanut Butter, Blantyre, Malawi)</td>
<td>Corn, soya and sugar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:</strong></td>
<td>43g; 921 kJ (219 kcal) and 6g protein</td>
<td>71g; 1189 kJ (282 kcal) and 10.4 g protein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional co-interventions/treatment received:</strong></td>
<td>Breastfeeding was encouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional co-interventions/treatment received:** Breastfeeding was encouraged
Group 3 (Control group)

Description: No food supplementation

Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: None

Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Breastfeeding was encouraged

Outcomes

Primary outcomes: Mean change in weight (g)

Secondary outcomes: Mean changes in length (mm), blood Hb concentration (g/l), anthropometric indices (WAZ, WLZ and length-for-age Z-score (LAZ)), mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC), head circumference, incidence of adverse events and serious adverse events.

Adverse events related to supplementary food:
No differences reported for adverse events such as abdominal discomfort, vomiting symptoms and diarrhoea between the study groups. LNS participants vomited more than others (LNS group: 6 (9%) vs. CSB group: 2 (3%) vs. Control group: 0; P=0.03)

Adherence to supplementary food:
All mothers reported that their children readily ate the provided supplement and diversion of any portion to anyone other than the intended beneficiary was reported at 2/795 (0.3%) food delivery interviews in CSB and none in LNS delivery interviews. The percentage of weekly visits when leftovers were found, were 4/795 (0.5%) in the CSB and 4/780 (0.5%) in the LNS group.

Notes

Links to other studies (specify study ID):
Trial registration details: NCT00420368 (http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/)

Funders: Supported by the Academy of Finland (grant no. 109796). Chrissie Thakwalakwa and John Phuka received personal stipends from Nestle Foundation.

Ethics: The College of Medicine Research and Ethics Committee and the Ethical Committee of Pirkanmaa Hospital District, Finland, reviewed and approved the protocol. An independent DSMB monitored the incidence of suspected SAE.

Informed consent: Written


Trial funders had no role in the implementation, analysis, or reporting

Reference standard used for anthropometrical data: It is stated that the NCHS growth standards (Epi Info 3.3.2 software) were used to calculate the anthropometric outcome variables. In addition, sensitivity analyses were conducted with baseline anthropometric indices calculated according to the WHO growth standards.

Quality of anthropometrical measurements: Children were weighed without clothing to the nearest 10 g using an electronic infant weighing scale (SECA 735; Chasmsors Ltd, London, UK). Head circumference and MUAC were measured to the nearest 1 mm by a non-stretchable measuring tape (Lasoo-o-tape, Harlow Printing). Length was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm using a length board (infantometer; Child Growth Foundation, London, UK). All anthropometric measurements were done in triplicate by one investigator, assisted by one trained research assistant, both of whom were unaware of the participants’ group allocations.

Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Details regarding how the randomization sequence was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias Type</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The allocation for each consecutive consented participant was sealed in an individual opaque randomization envelope. The envelopes were marked with the trial code and stored in a locked cabinet until use. A consenting guardian of an eligible individual was asked to choose 1 randomization envelope from the remaining unused envelopes at a time. The identification number found in the envelope was recorded in a logbook and on the participant's picture identification card.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is unclear whether participants or personnel were blinded to the treatment allocation. It is unlikely that participants were blinded as the interventions could not be disguised (one received 3 spoons of ready-to-use food and the other received 5 spoons of cereal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The researcher and data collector responsible for collecting the outcome measures were unaware of participants' group allocations. The other research assistants who collected information on the occurrence of adverse events during their weekly home visits, were not blinded. However; the data recorded by these assistants was verified by a physician who was blinded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The deaths and/or losses to follow-up did not differ among the 3 groups. A total of 188/192 participants (98%) completed the intervention. Loss to follow-up in all groups was similarly low (LNS 2%, CSB 2%, Control 3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>The primary and secondary outcome variables reported by the authors are compatible with those stated in the trial protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: The groups appear to be similar. <strong>Conflict of interest: Declared no conflict of interest. Briend worked as Nutriset consultant in 2003. Funding: non-conflicted funding sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline imbalance</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of clusters</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thakwalakwa 2012**

| Study design: Randomised controlled trial |
| Country and location of study: Health centres in Mangochi District, rural Malawi |
| **No. of trial sites:** 4 |
| **Duration of trial:** 6 months (November 2007-April 2008) |
| **Frequency of Follow-up:** every 4 weeks at health centre |
| **Type of assessment at each follow up:** Each participants’ medical condition was checked and their anthropometric measurements taken. |
| **Duration of follow-up:** 12 weeks |

**Participants**

| Inclusion criteria: Children aged 6 to 15 months with WAZ < -2SD, availability during the period of the study and permanent residence in the catchment area |
| Exclusion criteria: WLZ < -3SD or presence of oedema, history of peanut allergy, history of any serious allergic reaction to any substance requiring emergency medical care, history of anaphylaxis, severe illness warranting hospital referral and concurrent participation in another clinical trial with intervention to the child |
**Total number of children randomised**: 299

**Baseline characteristics of participants**

**Group 1 (LNS group)**
- **No. of participants**: 104
- **Participants age**: 10.0 ± 2.4 months
- **Participants gender**: 53F/51M
- **Nutritional status**: WAZ -3.06 ± 0.92; HAZ -2.11 ± 0.92; WHZ -1.61 ± 0.86 (NCHS growth standard)
  - WAZ -2.5 ± 0.77; HAZ -2.49 ± 0.97; WHZ -1.45 ± 0.75 (WHO growth standard)

**Group 2 (CSB group)**
- **Number of participants**: 109
- **Participants age**: 11.1 ± 2.4 months
- **Participants gender**: 49F/60M
- **Nutritional status**: WAZ -2.96 ± 0.79; HAZ -2.16 ± 0.90; WHZ -1.36 ± 0.83 (NCHS growth standard)
  - WAZ -2.31 ± 0.69; HAZ -2.54 ± 0.97; WHZ -1.23 ± 0.72 (WHO growth standard)

**Group 3 (Control group)**
- **Number of participants**: 86
- **Participants age**: 11.6 ± 2.3 months
- **Participants gender**: 48F/38M
- **Nutritional status**: WAZ -3.11 ± 0.82; HAZ -2.36 ± 0.91; WHZ -1.32 ± 0.84 (NCHS growth standard)
  - WAZ -2.42 ± 0.71; HAZ -2.77 ± 0.94; WHZ -1.23 ± 0.68 (WHO growth standard)

**Baseline comparability**: In paper it states: At baseline, children in the LNS group were thinner and shorter compared with children in the CSB and control groups. The data presented in Table 1 does not seem to support this statement. There were more children in the younger age group, 6–9 months, in the LNS group than in the control and CSB groups: 38% v. 15% and 23 % respectively.

**Interventions**

**Group 1 (LNS group)**
- **Description**: Lipid-nutrient supplement
  - **Amount and frequency**: 1.2 kg every 4 weeks (3 times) given to guardian by research assistant. To be administered as 3 spoon servings (43g) twice daily.
  - **Nutritional composition of supplement**: peanut butter (26 %), dried skimmed milk (25 %), vegetable oil (20 %), icing sugar (27.5%) and a mineral and vitamin mix (Project Peanut Butter, Blantyre, Malawi)
  - **Total daily supplementary nutrient intake**: 920 kJ (219 kcal) and 6g protein
  - **Additional co-interventions/treatment received**: Breastfeeding was encouraged

**Group 2 (CSB group)**
- **Description**: Corn-soy blend
  - **Amount and frequency**: 2kg every 4 weeks (3 times) given to guardian by research assistant. To be administered as 5 spoon servings (71g) twice daily.
  - **Nutritional composition of supplement**: Corn, soya and sugar
  - **Total daily supplementary nutrient intake**: 1188 kJ (282 kcal) and 10.4 g protein
  - **Additional co-interventions/treatment received**: Breastfeeding was encouraged

**Group 3 (Control group)**
- **Description**: No food supplementation
  - **Total daily supplementary nutrient intake**: None
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Breastfeeding was encouraged.

Outcomes

- **Primary outcomes:** Mean change in weight (g)
- **Secondary outcomes:** Mean changes in length (mm), blood Hb concentration (g/l), anthropometric indices (WAZ, WLZ and length-for-age Z-score (LAZ)), mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC), head circumference, incidence of adverse events and serious adverse events.

Adverse events related to supplementary food: No differences reported for adverse events such as abdominal discomfort, vomiting symptoms and diarrhoea between the study groups.

Adherence to supplementary food: It is stated that adherence to the supplements was not measured.

Notes

Links to other studies (specify study ID):

**Trial registration details:** NCT00420758 at [http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/)

**Funders:** Academy of Finland, Nestle foundation (research stipend), St Louis Nutrition Project (research stipend)

**Ethics:** College of Medicine Research and Ethics Committee, University of Malawi and the Ethical Committee of Pirkkanmaa Hospital District, Finland.

**Informed consent:** Written

**Conflict of interest statement:** Yes

Reference standard used for anthropometrical data:

It is stated that the NCHS growth standards (Epi Info 3.3.2 software) were used to calculate the anthropometric outcome variables. In addition, baseline anthropometric indices were also calculated according to the WHO growth standards.

Quality of anthropometrical measurements:

Children were weighed without clothing to the nearest 10g using an electronic infant weighing scale (SECA 735; Chasmos Ltd, London, UK). Length was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm using a length board (infantometer; Child Growth Foundation, London, UK). All anthropometric measurements were done in triplicate by one investigator, assisted by one trained research assistant.

---

**Risk of bias table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Statistician developed random list. Block randomization used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>An independent statistician not involved in the study developed the random list, packed and sealed the randomisation codes into envelopes, then handed the sealed envelopes over to the research team. Participants picked an envelope from the remaining reshuffled envelopes which contained the randomisation group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is unclear whether participants or personnel were blinded to the treatment allocation. It is unlikely that participants were blinded as the interventions could not be disguised (one received 3 spoons of food and the other received 5 spoons of cereal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Interventions were handed out by a research assistant not involved in outcome assessment. It states that the study was outcome assessor blinded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Loss to follow-up in all groups was low (LNS 4%, CSB 3%, Control 10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Low risk | The primary and secondary outcome variables reported by the authors are compatible with those stated in the trial protocol.
---|---|---
Other bias | Low risk | Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: The groups appear to be similar
Conflict of interest: Declared no conflict of interest.
Funding: non-conflicted funding sources
---|---|---
Recruitment bias | Unclear risk | ---
Baseline imbalance | Unclear risk | ---
Loss of clusters | Unclear risk | ---

**Walker 1991**

**Methods**
- **Study design:** Randomised controlled trial
- **Country and location of study:** Kingston, Jamaica
- **No. of trial sites:** 1
- **Study dates and duration:** 1986-1988 (main trial); 1992 (Follow-up 4 years post supplementation); 1996 (Follow-up 8 years post supplementation)

**Frequency and type of assessment at each follow up:**
- **Main trial** – A community health aide visited the children in the four stunted groups every week, and a history of the previous week’s illnesses was recorded. Visits to the control group were intended to allow for any extra attention that the supplemented children might receive. Visiting was used instead of a placebo because it was considered unethical for health service personnel to give a true placebo (i.e., a low-calorie supplement) to undernourished children.
- **Dietary intake:** 24 h dietary recalls for each child were done for 2 days at enrolment and after 6 months and 15 months.
- **Anthropometry:** All children’s recumbent length (up until 24 months of age), stature at 24 months, weight, head circumference (HC), mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC), and triceps (TSF) and subscapular (SSF) skinfold thickness were measured on enrollment and every 6 months for 2 years.
- **Psychological assessment:** Development was assessed by means of the Griffiths Mental Development Scales every 6 months

**Four years post supplementation:** Anthropometry, blood pressure, cognitive function, RMR and body composition, motor ability

**Eight years post supplementation:** Anthropometry, blood pressure, serum glucose and lipid concentrations, psychological function, fine motor ability, BMI, fatness and fat distribution and weight status

**Duration of follow-up:**
- 8 years of follow up post intervention

**Participants**
- **Inclusion criteria:** Children aged 9-24 months with recumbent lengths < -2 SD of the NCHS reference (stunted) identified during a house to house survey were eligible if they were singletons, had a birth weight > 1.8kg, no mental or physical handicap, and had maternal education and housing below defined levels.

**Exclusion criteria:** Children with weights-for-length above the NCHS median were excluded because they were considered more likely to be genetically short.
Total number randomized: 129 children

Participants were stratified by age (older than 16 months or 16 months and younger) and sex, and randomly assigned to one of the four treatment groups. Every fourth stunted child was matched with a non-stunted child (length-for-age > -1 SD) who lived nearest and was the same age (±3 mo) and sex (non-stunted group).

Baseline characteristics of participants

Group 1: Control
Number of participants: 33
Participants age: 18.5 ± 4.5 months
Participants gender: 19 M/14 F
Nutritional status: WAZ: -2.4±0.5; WLZ: -0.8±0.7; LAZ: -2.9±0.6

Group 2: Nutritional supplementation
Number of participants: 32
Participants age: 18.8±3.7 months
Participants gender: 18 M/14 F
Nutritional status: WAZ: -2.4±0.6; WLZ: -1.0±0.8; LAZ: -2.9±0.6

Group 3: Stimulation
Number of participants: 30
Participants age: 18.8±4.4 months
Participants gender: 16 M/14 F
Nutritional status: WAZ: -2.6±0.5; WLZ: -1.1±0.6; LAZ: -3.0±0.7

Group 4: Nutritional supplementation plus stimulation
Number of participants: 32
Participants age: 18.7±3.8 months
Participants gender: 18 M/14 F
Nutritional status: WAZ: -2.7±0.6; WLZ: -1.2±0.7; LAZ: -3.1±0.7

Group 5: Non-stunted children
Number of participants: 32
Participants age: 18.8±4.4 months
Participants gender: 18 M/14 F
Nutritional status: WAZ: 0±0.7; WLZ: 0±0.8; LAZ: 0.1±0.6

Baseline comparability: On enrollment, there were no significant differences among the four stunted groups although the lengths and weights of the supplemented and stimulated group tended to be lower than those in the other three groups. The non-stunted children were not only longer and heavier but had significantly greater head and arm circumference (P < 0.001) and triceps skinfold thickness (P < 0.05) than the combined stunted groups.

Interventions

Group 1: Control
Description: Weekly visit by a community health aide, and a history of the previous week’s illnesses was recorded.
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: All groups received free medical care.

Group 2: Nutritional supplementation
Description: Home-based administration of a daily milk-based formula for 2 years. A weekly delivery of one kilogram of a milk-based formula was made to the relevant households by a community health worker who reinforced the
need for the child to be given the milk supplement.

**Nutritional composition of supplement:** 525 kcal/100g; 14 g protein/100 g

**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 750 kcal and 20 g protein per day

Additional co-interventions/treatment received: One kilogram each of skimmed-milk powder and cornmeal per week were provided for other household members to reduce sharing of the target child’s milk supplement. Free medical care was available to all children.

**Group 3: Stimulation**

**Description:** Structured play sessions with the mothers and children. By community health workers who visited the home for 1 hour each week. Toys were left in the home and mothers were encouraged to continue playing with their child between visits.

Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Free medical care was available to all children.

**Group 4: Nutritional supplementation plus stimulation**

**Description:** Home-based administration of a daily milk-based formula for 2 years (see above for description). The children in this group received stimulation as well (see above for description)

**Nutritional composition of supplement:** 525 kcal/100g; 14 g protein/100 g

**Total daily supplementary nutrient intake:** 750 kcal and 20 g protein per day

Additional co-interventions/treatment received: One kilogram each of skimmed-milk powder and cornmeal per week were provided for other household members to reduce sharing of the target child’s milk supplement. Free medical care was available to all children.

**Group 5: Non-stunted children**

**Description:** Weekly visit by a community health aide, and a history of the previous week’s illnesses was recorded for 21 participants in this group.

Additional co-interventions/treatment received: Free medical care was available to all children.

**Outcomes**

The study outcomes were not defined as primary or secondary outcomes.

Reported outcomes included: growth, psychological function, psychosocial behaviour, school achievement, blood pressure, BMI, weight distribution, blood glucose and lipid concentrations. The data for most of the long term health outcomes are not presented for each of the intervention groups.

Reported outcomes relevant to our review:

**Walker 1991 outcomes**

Mean and SD: Length (cm), weight (kg), head circumference (cm), MUAC (cm), TSF (mm), SSF (mm) and weight for length z-score at 6 and 12 months of intervention

Increments from enrollment to 6 mo [1] and from 6 to 12 mo [2]*

Change in length for age (data only presented in Figure 1)

**Walker 1996 outcomes (4 years after the intervention ended)**

For each intervention group mean and SD

Height at end of 2 year intervention

Weight at end of 2 year intervention

Head circumference at end of 2 year intervention
Arm circumference at end of 2 year intervention
TSF at end of 2 year intervention
SSF at end of 2 year intervention
Age, sex and anthropometry at 4 years post intervention (Table 2)
Mean height-for-age and weight-for-height Z-scores at enrollment, at the end of intervention and at follow-up for all intervention groups are shown in Table 4.
Supplementation improved the children’s growth in height, weight and head circumference in the first 6 mo of the study (Walker et al. 1991). No further benefits were seen, but the difference in height gain was maintained until the end of the intervention period. At the end of the intervention, the supplemented group was 1.03 cm taller than the non-supplemented group (P <0.05, multiple regression analysis controlling for initial height, age, sex and maternal height). Stimulation had no effect on growth. The children’s anthropometry at enrollment and at the end of the intervention is summarized in Table 1.

**Grantham-McGregor 1997 outcomes (pg 250 Table 3)**
Age (7 years)
Height for age (z score) mean and SD for each group
Weight for height (z score) mean and SD for each group

**Adverse events related to the supplementary food:** Not reported

**Adherence to the supplementary food:**
It is not stated if and how the community health workers recorded adherence to the milk-based formula during their weekly follow-up visits of participants. After 6 months the mean nutrient intake of the supplemented children is reported as 345kcal±248kcal per day. It is also reported that the energy intake from the home diet was significantly less in the supplemented than in the non-supplemented children (P < 0.001). The net increase in daily energy intake in the supplemented children was 106 kcal after adjusting for initial intakes and child's age and weight.

**Notes**

| **Links to other studies (specify study ID):** | See Table 7 with all relevant references and reported outcomes of the related studies |
| **Trial registration details:** | Trial not registered |
| **Ethics:** | Ethics committee of the University Hospital of the West Indies. |
| **Informed consent:** | Not reported for main trial |
| **Funding source:** | Ford Foundation, USA, with assistance from the Population Council, Wellcome Trust, UK, National Institute of Health. The supplement was donated by Cow & Gate, UK, Grace Kennedy & Co Ltd, Jamaica Commodity Trading Co, and Seprod Ltd, Jamaica. |
| **Conflict of interest statement:** | No conflict of interest statement provided in the earlier publications |
| **Reference standard used for anthropometrical data:** | NCHS reference standards |
| **Quality of anthropometrical measurements:** | Measurements were made using recommended protocols. Triplicate measurements of skinfold thickness were taken and the average was used. All subjects were measured by one of three observers. Inter-observer reliability was established before the study and met or exceeded recommended measures. During the study a second observer repeated 10% of all measurements. Differences between the observers never... |
exceeded the following limits: length 0.5 cm, weight 30 g, HC 0.4 cm, MUAC 0.2 cm, TSF and 5SF 1 mm. Reliabilities of the measurements were reported previously (ref 26 in Walker 1991).

### Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Children were assigned systematically to one of four groups. The initial order of group assignment was determined randomly. For example, every fourth child was assigned to the supplemented and stimulated group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>The study does not report if the person allocating the children to the groups knew what group he/she was allocating them to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel was not clearly described. It is not clear if the control group were aware that the other groups received supplement. All children were visited regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is not clear if the outcome assessors were blinded to the group allocation of the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>There was minimal attrition during the first two years of the study  Control: 0/33  Supplement: 0/32  Stimulation: 2/30  Supplement + stimulation: 0/32  Non-stunted: 0/32  Four years post intervention 122/127 stunted children and all of the non-stunted children were identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Study protocol not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: On enrollment there was no significant difference between the four stunted groups.  Conflict of interest: Not reported  Funding: Non-conflicting funding source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline imbalance</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of clusters</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Characteristics of excluded studies

**Aboud 2008**  
**Reason for exclusion**  
No relevant outcomes

**Aboud 2009**  
**Reason for exclusion**  
Incorrect intervention

**Aboud 2011**  
**Reason for exclusion**  
Incorrect intervention

**Adu-Afarwuah 2007**  
**Reason for exclusion**  
Incorrect intervention

**Adu-Afarwuah 2008**  
**Reason for exclusion**  
Incorrect intervention
Aitchison 2000
Reason for exclusion Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Alarcon 2003
Reason for exclusion Incorrect participants
Aleman 2008
Reason for exclusion Incorrect intervention
Arifeen 2009
Reason for exclusion Incorrect intervention
Arora 1998
Reason for exclusion Incorrect intervention
Ashworth 2009
Reason for exclusion Review
Avula 2011
Reason for exclusion Incorrect intervention
Bachmann 2009
Reason for exclusion Review
Bachmann 2010
Reason for exclusion Review
Bahwere 2014
Reason for exclusion Incorrect intervention
Baker 2014
Reason for exclusion Review
Beghin 1973
Reason for exclusion Incorrect intervention
Benefice 1996
Reason for exclusion Incorrect study design
Bhandari 2001
Reason for exclusion Incorrect participants: nutritionally at risk infants; only present the proportion of participants who are severely or moderately undernourished at baseline
Bhutta 1994
Reason for exclusion Incorrect participants
Bhutta 1997
Reason for exclusion Incorrect participants
Bhutta 2008
Reason for exclusion Review
Bisimwa 2012
Reason for exclusion Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Borja 2013
Reason for exclusion Overview of main findings
Brazionis 2013
Reason for exclusion Incorrect study design
Briend 1999
Reason for exclusion Incorrect study design
Briend 2001
Reason for exclusion Review
Brown 1992
Reason for exclusion Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Cattaneo 2010
Reason for exclusion Review
Caulfield 1995
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Chang 2002
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Chang 2010
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Chaparro 2010
Reason for exclusion  Review
Chaudhuri 2002
Reason for exclusion  Review
Ciliberto 2005
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Ciliberto 2006
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Cohuet 2012
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Colecraft 2004
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Collins 2002
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Cooper 2009
Reason for exclusion  Review
de Pee 2009
Reason for exclusion  Review
de Pee 2010
Reason for exclusion  Review
Defourney 2009
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Desai 2014
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Dewey 2008
Reason for exclusion  Review
Dibari 2013
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants
Dong 2013
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Dube 2009
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention period
Els 2013
Reason for exclusion  Review
Englberger 2003
Reason for exclusion  Review
Ferreira 2008
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Filteau 2011
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Fjeld 1989
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants
Flax 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flax 2010</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedlander 1972</td>
<td>Incorrect comparison group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaboulaud 2007</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner 1995</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghassemi 1992</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden 1981</td>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman 1991</td>
<td>Incorrect participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner 1995</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham-McGregor 1992</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham-McGregor 1994</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grobler 2013</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross 2003</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez 1998</td>
<td>Description of study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habicht 1995</td>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habicht 2010</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamadani 2006</td>
<td>Incorrect comparison group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidkamp 2012</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikens 1993</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks 2003</td>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare 1996</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddinott 2008</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoppe 2008</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hossain 2005</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hossain 2009
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants
Hossain 2010
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Huffman 2011
Reason for exclusion  Review
Husaini 1991
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Huybregts 2012
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Iannotti 2014
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
IAP 2013
Reason for exclusion  Treatment guidelines
Imdad 2011
Reason for exclusion  Review
Inayati 2012
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Isanaka 2009
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Isanaka 2010
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Isanaka 2011
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Ivanovic 2000
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Jukes 2005
Reason for exclusion  Review
Kabir 1994
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants
Kalimbira 2010
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Kerac 2009
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Kerac 2014
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Khan 1995
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Khanum 1998
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Kilaru 2005
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect comparison group
Kim 2009
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
King 2007
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect comparison group
Kouanda 2009
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Kraut 1978
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Krebs 2011
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants
Krebs 2012
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants
Kulwa 2014
Reason for exclusion  Description of study design
Lakkam 2014
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Lartey 1999
Reason for exclusion  Review
Lassi 2013
Reason for exclusion  Review
Li 2003
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Lin 2008
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Long 2012
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Lutter 1989
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Lutter 1990
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Lutter 2008
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Manary 2004
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-severely undernourished
Mangani 2013a
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Mangani 2013b
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
McDonald 2013
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
McKay 1978
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Mora 1981
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Nahar 2012a
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Nga 2013
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention period
Oakley 2010
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Ocloo 1993
Reason for exclusion  Commentary
Ojofeitimi 2001
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Ortiz-Andrellucchi 2009
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Palwala 2009
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Patel 2005
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Patel 2010
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk

Penny 2005
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Pham 2012
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Phuka 2008
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Phuka 2011
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention period

Picot 2012
  Reason for exclusion: Review

Pollitt 1994 b
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Pollitt 1994a
  Reason for exclusion: Review

Pollitt 1995
  Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes

Pollitt 1997
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk

Powell 2004
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Prasanna 1968
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Pretorius 1966
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Prinsloo 1969
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Puett 2013
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Purwestri 2012
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk

Rao 1992
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Rao 2002
  Reason for exclusion: Review

Razafindrakoto 1994
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Reddy 1974
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Rivera 2004
  Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk

Roux 2010
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Roy 1994
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Roy 2007
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Rudolph 2013
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Ruel 2008
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Russell 2010
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Salehi 2004
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Sandige 2004
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Santos 2005
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Scherbaum 2000
Reason for exclusion  Review
Schoonees 2013
Reason for exclusion  Review
Schroeder 1997
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention period
Schultink 2009
Reason for exclusion  Review
Schuch 1995
Reason for exclusion  Review
Sguassero 2012
Reason for exclusion  Review
Shamim 2014
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect study design
Shewade 2013
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
Siega-Riz 2014
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Simondon 1996
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants
Simpore 2006
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect participants-severely undernourished
Sinclair 2011
Reason for exclusion  Review
Stein 2003
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Stein 2004
Reason for exclusion  No relevant outcomes
Sunguya 2013
Reason for exclusion  Review
Super 1990
Reason for exclusion  Incorrect intervention
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalakwa 2009</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalakwa 2014</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trehan 2013</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van der Kam 2012</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasquez-Garibay 2005</td>
<td>Incorrect participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vazir 2013</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitolo 2010</td>
<td>Incorrect participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waber 1981</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walka, 1997</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1992</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 2005</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2013</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weisz 2011</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White 2008</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2009</td>
<td>Incorrect participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang 2013</td>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yebyo 2013</td>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang 2013</td>
<td>Incorrect participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Characteristics of studies awaiting classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ackatia-Armah 2013</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>6-35 months; MAM 1</td>
<td>Lipid-based RUTF; Special CSB++; Misola; locally milled flour+MN powder</td>
<td>Iron and Vit A status</td>
<td>Comparative study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diop 2003</td>
<td>Open-labelled RCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elizabeth 1997

**Methods**
RCT and prospective follow up in both hospital and community setting (2 trials)

**Participants**
6-24 months, mild, moderate, severe PEM (IAP classification)

**Interventions**
STIM vs NUT vs CONTROL. Followed up for 2 years. Not sure if intervention given for this long or if this is just the follow up time.

**Outcomes**
Nutritional status, IQ testing

**Notes**
Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status

### Grellety 2012

**Methods**
Prospective analytical cohort

**Participants**
All children 6-23 months eligible for supplementary food; nutritionally at risk some severely/moderately undernourished

**Interventions**
Plumpy Doz provided to all registered children versus children who failed to register and therefore did not receive supplementary food

**Outcomes**
Anthropometry measured 2 weeks after each monthly ration; proportion died, stunted, wasted

**Notes**
Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status

### Kabahenda 2014

**Methods**
Clinical trial (non-randomised)

**Participants**
100 Child-caregiver dyads where children were aged 6-48 months

**Interventions**
Nutrition education programme for caregivers for 5 weeks versus sewing classes for caregivers

**Outcomes**
Changes in HAZ, WAZ, WHZ, MUAC at 1 year

**Notes**
Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status

### Karakochuk 2012

**Methods**
Cluster RCT

**Participants**
Children aged 6-60 months with MUAC<135, second assessment WFH >70 to <80% (NCHS refs) ie. MAM. Exclusion criteria: children with MUAC<110 mm, bilateral pitting edema, or other complications; 2) children transferred from therapeutic feeding programs; and 3) children with any condition preventing safe ingestion of either food (ie, peanut allergy). Children with complications or severe malnutrition were referred to inpatient facilities.

**Interventions**
RUSF (commercial) daily (92g) for 16 weeks versus CSB plus added oil (300 g CSB and 32 g vegetable oil)

**Outcomes**
WHZ >85% at 16 weeks (Recovery) Child meets the discharge criterion for recovery: 2 consecutive measurements of WFH> 85% within a 16-wk time period

**Notes**
Comparative study

### Kielman 1978
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinra 2008</td>
<td>Non-randomised community trial; Follow-up survey</td>
<td>Children in study villages born between 1 January 1987-31 December 1990; 1165 former Hyderabad trial participants from study villages, aged 13-18 years</td>
<td>Administration of a daily community based cereal-based meal within an integrated child development services programme versus no intervention</td>
<td>Trial outcomes not stated; Height, BMI, skinfold thickness, BP, blood lipids and glucose</td>
<td>Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrone 2012</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial</td>
<td>Children aged 6-60 months with MAM</td>
<td>Soy RUSF (locally produced) or Soy/whey RUSF (commercially produced) daily for up to 12 weeks Fortified CSB (CSB++)</td>
<td>Height, weight, MUAC gain, WHZ at 12 weeks. Adverse events.</td>
<td>Comparative study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleta 2004</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial</td>
<td>Children aged 42-60 months with underweight (WAZ &lt; -2SD) and stunting (HAZ &lt; -2SD); Children with severe wasting (WHZ &lt; -3SD) were excluded</td>
<td>Administration of home-based RTUF (locally produced) 3-4 times daily for 12 weeks versus Maize/soy flour (unfortified) 3-4 times daily for 12 weeks</td>
<td>Height, weight gain, Change in WAZ, HAZ, WHZ monthly during all 3 phases</td>
<td>Comparative study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilsky 2009</td>
<td>Randomised controlled trial</td>
<td>Children aged 6-60 months who were moderately wasted (WHZ &lt; -2SD but ≥ -3SD); Children with severe wasting (WHZ &lt; -3SD) were excluded</td>
<td>Soy/peanut or Milk/peanut food supplement twice daily (provided 50% of daily energy requirement. Locally produced (Project Peanut Butter) versus Fortified corn/soy blend twice daily (Provided 50% of daily energy requirement)</td>
<td>Rates of height, weight, MUAC gain. Rates of reaching WHZ &gt; -2SD</td>
<td>Comparative study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Children aged 6-59 months with MAM and good appetite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Home-based RUTF (commercial) 2 packets (1000 kcal) daily for 16 weeks versus Home-based CSB premix (1231 kcal) daily for 16 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Weight, MUAC gain at 16 weeks, Height gain at 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Comparative study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perez-Escamilla 1995**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>RCT and prospective follow up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Children 3 year old &lt; or = to 3rd percentile of height-for-age &lt; or =to 10th percentile of weight-for-age of the Harvard reference standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>9-month intervention X1=combined treatment 1 (supplementary food and health care); 9-month intervention X2=combined treatment 2; 9-month intervention X3=combined treatment3; 9-month intervention X4=combined treatment 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Growth outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Call Study: not sure if there was a control group who did not receive supplement. Have contacted the authors for more information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phuka 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>RCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Children aged 6-15 months with WAZ &lt; -2SD; Children with SAM were excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Home-based fortified spread (commercial) (50g) daily for 12 weeks versus Home-based maize-soy flour fortified with vitamin/minerals (71g) daily for 12 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Weight, Height, MUAC gain, Change in HAZ, WAZ, WHZ at 12 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Comparative study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Singh 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>RCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Children aged 18-60 months with WAZ &lt; -2 SD but not requiring hospitalization for malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Community based RUTF for 3 months versus Home based fortified cereal milk (&quot;Standard of care&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Weight gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Comparative study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verna 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>RCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Moderately malnourished children between 6 months and 5 years (Weight-for-Height Z score (WHZ) between 70% and 80% were enrolled and randomized into two groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Feeding Program Supplementations (FPS: corn flour, palm oil and milk powder) + Parma Pap versus a control group received only FPS. The clinical follow-up lasted 13 weeks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes | Weight, height and WHZ were checked weekly and children were treated for concomitant infections.
---|---
Notes | Comparative study

**Characteristics of ongoing studies**

**ISRCTN42569496:** Effectiveness of improved diets for children with moderate acute malnutrition: a randomized controlled trial in Province du Passoré, Burkina Faso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>RCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>Children aged 6-23 months with moderate acute malnutrition (MAM). Inclusion criteria: Weight for height z-score (WHZ) ≥ -3 and &lt; -2 (based on the WHO growth standard) or Mid Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) ≥ 115 mm and &lt; 125 mm. Exclusion criteria: Children with severe acute malnutrition defined as a WHZ &lt; -3, and/or a MUAC &lt; 115 mm, and/or bilateral pitting oedema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Randomised to receive one of six different formulations of improved corn-soy blends (iCSBs) or six different lipid-based nutrient supplements (LNS) providing 500 kcal/day for 3 months. No non-intervention or placebo group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Primary outcome: Absolute lean mass increment from baseline to 3 months measured using the deuterium dilution method. Secondary outcomes: Increase of WHZ to &gt; -2 and linear growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Study status: Completed. Friis, H <a href="mailto:hfr@life.ku.dk">hfr@life.ku.dk</a>. Incorrect comparison group (comparative study).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NCT02208531:** Transition to Scale of an Integrated Program of Nutritional Care and Psychosocial Stimulation to Improve Malnourished Children’s Development in Bangladesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>RCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>Children aged 6-24 months with moderate or severe malnutrition (WAZ &lt; -2 SD). Exclusion criteria: Severe Acute Malnutrition with complications requiring close monitoring and/or hospitalization, severe clinical pallor, known chronic diseases like epilepsy, cerebral palsy, mental retardation, Twin/multiple birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Behavioral: Psychosocial Stimulation and Nutritional Care. Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Primary outcome: Anthropometry multiple measures, viz. Weight, length/height and head circumference, behaviour and Cognitive, Language and Motor Composite Scores after 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Study status: Recruiting. Hamadani, JD <a href="mailto:jena@icddrb.org">jena@icddrb.org</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CTRI/2013/09/003962:** Effect of health education for mothers on weight gain of malnourished children in JIPMER Rural Health Centre service areas, Puducherry: An intervention study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Non-RCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>Malnourished children (definition not specified) aged 13-60 months and their mothers and sex-matched controls taken from the Sedarpet Primary Health Centre area Twin/multiple birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Health education on Nutrition: - Health education on nutritional status of the child using growth chart; child feeding practices, on quality, quantity and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
frequency of feeding on factors leading to malnutrition to the mothers on two
sessions
No health education given

Outcomes
Primary outcome: awareness of the mothers on child nutritional status based
on ICDS growth chart; on child feeding practices; factors leading to
malnutrition; Weight for age (Indian Academy of Pediatric Classification) from
November 2013 to January 2014. Secondary outcome: Calorie and protein
intake circumference, behaviour and Cognitive, Language and Motor
Composite Scores after 12 months

Notes
Kumar S ssmsgan@yahoo.com
Study status: recruiting participants
Open to recruitment

Data and analyses

1. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately
underweight children with moderate stunting aged 6-24 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Height (cm)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.32 [-0.10, 0.73]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>1.30 [0.25, 2.35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Three months post-supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>2.30 [-0.86, 5.46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Height-for-age Z-score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.08 [-0.10, 0.26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Weight-for-height Z-score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.09 [-0.03, 0.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.39, 0.39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Weight-for-age Z-score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.09 [-0.02, 0.20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Weight (kg)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.5.1 Supplementation for 3 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10 [0.03, 0.17]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5.2 Supplementation for 6 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2.1 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 [-0.27, 0.69]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.6 Body Mass Index (BMI) kg/m²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50 [-0.01, 1.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2 Three months post-supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.20 [-0.70, 0.30]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.7 Mid-upper arm circumference (cm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05 [-0.09, 0.19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20 [-0.29, 0.69]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.8 Body fatness measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.2 Triceps skinfold (mm) after supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00 [-0.64, 0.64]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8.3 Subscapular skinfold after supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20 [-0.34, 0.74]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 24-59 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Height (cm)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>2.40 [0.06, 4.74]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>2.40 [0.10, 4.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>1.30 [0.03, 2.57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 Supplementation for 24 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>1.20 [-0.78, 3.18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Height-for-age z-score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Random, 95% CI</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.30 [0.07, 0.53]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.32 [0.09, 0.55]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4 Supplementation for 24 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.30 [-0.10, 0.70]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Weight-for-height z-score</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.31 [0.00, 0.62]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.30 [0.01, 0.59]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.39, 0.39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4 Supplementation for 24 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.42, 0.42]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Weight (kg)</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>1.00 [0.32, 1.68]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.90 [0.25, 1.55]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.29 [-0.29, 0.87]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4 Supplementation for 24 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.25 [-0.53, 1.03]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Weight-for-age z-score</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.35 [0.09, 0.61]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.34 [0.10, 0.58]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Body mass index (BMI) kg/m²</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Body fatness measures</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.1 Triceps skinfold (mm) after 12 months supplementation</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.51, 0.91]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2 Subscapular skinfold(mm) after 12 months</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.34, 0.74]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.7 Triceps skinfold (mm) after 24 months supplementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4 Triceps skinfold (mm) after 24 months supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.10 [-0.57, 0.77]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.5 Subscapular skinfold (mm) after 24 months supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.10 [-0.35, 0.55]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.8 Mid-upper arm circumference (cm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.29, 0.69]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2 Supplementation for 24 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.10 [-0.45, 0.65]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Height (cm)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.05 [-0.62, 0.72]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5 Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.90 [-1.50, 3.30]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Height-for-age z-score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5 Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.22, 0.62]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Weight-for-height z-score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.5 Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.10 [-0.27, 0.47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Weight (kg)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.05 [-0.17, 0.27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.5 Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.80 [-0.65, 2.25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Weight-for-age z-score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Body Mass Index (BMI) kg/m²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Body fatness measures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.3 Sum of 4 skinfolds (mm) after 12 months supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.74 [-0.31, 1.79]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.6 Subscapular skinfold (mm) 4 years post-supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.50 [-0.22, 1.22]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.7 Triceps skinfold (mm) 4 years post-supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.60 [-0.39, 1.59]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Mid-upper arm circumference (cm)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.29, 0.69]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3 Four years post-supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.50 [-0.27, 1.27]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Blood pressure (mmHg)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.1 Systolic blood pressure 4 years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>-0.20 [-3.12, 2.72]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 10-18 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Height-for-age z-score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.6 Thirteen years post-supplementation (17-18 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.30, 0.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Blood pressure (mmHg)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 LDL cholesterol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Statistical Method</td>
<td>Effect Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 HDL cholesterol level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Total cholesterol level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Fasting blood glucose level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Proportion of participants that are pre-diabetic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Proportion of participants with diabetes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Proportion of participants with cardiovascular events (myocardial infarction, stroke)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Proportion of participants with hypertension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Height (cm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12 Body mass index (kg/m²)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13 Weight-for-height z-score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14 Weight (kg)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16 Weight-for-age z-score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17 Body fatness measures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18 Mid-upper arm circumference (cm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting older than 18 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Body mass index (kg/m²)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Fasting blood glucose 0 0 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable
5.3 LDL cholesterol level 0 0 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable
5.4 HDL cholesterol level 0 0 Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) Not estimable
5.5 Total cholesterol level 0 0 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable
5.6 Proportion of participants with hypertension 0 0 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable
5.7 Proportion of participants that are pre-diabetic 0 0 Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable
5.8 Proportion of participants with diabetes 0 0 Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable
5.9 Proportion of participants with cardiovascular events (myocardial infarction, stroke) 0 0 Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) Not estimable

6 Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus no nutritional advice: Moderately underweight children with moderate wasting aged 6 to 24 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Change in weight (g/kg/day)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.55 [0.27, 0.83]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Change in length (mm/day)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Change in MUAC (mm/day)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.04 [0.01, 0.07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Height-for-age z-score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.1 Supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.40 [0.14,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>Random, 95% CI</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Weight-for-height z-score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.03, 0.43]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figures

Figure 1
Study flow diagram.

2048 records identified through searching of electronic databases after removing duplicate records

217 records excluded
Reviews/guidelines/commentaries = 39
Description of study design/methods = 3
Ineligible study design = 32
Ineligible participants = 24
Ineligible participants (severely under-nourished) = 2
Ineligible participants (nutritionally at risk) = 26
Ineligible intervention/intervention period = 34
Ineligible intervention period = 6
Ineligible comparison group = 5
Ineligible comparison group (comparative study) = 15
No relevant outcomes = 31

Studies awaiting assessment = 6 studies (7 references)

258 full text articles assessed for eligibility

13 studies (34 references) included in the review
**Figure 2**
Risk of bias graph: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of Bias</th>
<th>Low risk of bias</th>
<th>Unclear risk of bias</th>
<th>High risk of bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment bias</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline imbalance</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of clusters</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Low risk of bias, Unclear risk of bias, High risk of bias.
Figure 3
Risk of bias summary: review authors’ judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</th>
<th>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</th>
<th>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</th>
<th>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</th>
<th>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</th>
<th>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</th>
<th>Other bias</th>
<th>Recruitment bias</th>
<th>Baseline imbalance</th>
<th>Loss of clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habicht 1992</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikens 1989</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krahnenbuhl 1998</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuusipalo 2005</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopriore 2004</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskinova 2014</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikiema 2014</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao 1977</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richter-Strydom 1985</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy 2005</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalakwa 2010</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalakwa 2012</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
<td>☯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 4 (Analysis 1.1)**
Forest plot of comparison: 1 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate stunting, outcome: 1.1 Height (cm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.1 Supplementation for 3 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuusipalo 2006</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.36 (0.16, 1.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalaka 2010</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.21 (0.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalaka 2012</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.26 (0.36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206 100.0% 0.32 [-0.40, 0.73]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterogeneity</strong></td>
<td>Tau² = 0.09; CH² = 7.08, df = 3 (P = 0.07); I² = 58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.49 (P = 0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test for subgroup differences</strong></td>
<td>CH² = 4.22, df = 2 (P = 0.12), I² = 52.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5 (Analysis 1.2)**
Forest plot of comparison: 1 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate stunting, outcome: 1.2 Height-for-age Z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2.1 Supplementation for 3 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuusipalo 2006</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>0.25 [0.04, 0.46]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalaka 2010</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>0.10 [-0.07, 0.28]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalaka 2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>-0.06 [-0.17, 0.05]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td>382</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.08 [-0.16, 0.26]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterogeneity</strong></td>
<td>Tau² = 0.02; CH² = 7.29, df = 2 (P = 0.03); I² = 73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.88 (P = 0.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test for subgroup differences</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6 (Analysis 1.3)**
Forest plot of comparison: 1 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate stunting, outcome: 1.3 Weight-for-height Z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3.1 Supplementation for 3 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuusipalo 2006</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.28, 0.28]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalaka 2010</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>0.09 [-0.14, 0.32]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakwalaka 2012</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>0.13 [-0.05, 0.31]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (95% CI)</strong></td>
<td>382</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.09 [-0.03, 0.22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterogeneity</strong></td>
<td>Tau² = 0.00; CH² = 0.58, df = 2 (P = 0.75); I² = 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.43 (P = 0.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test for subgroup differences</strong></td>
<td>CH² = 0.19, df = 1 (P = 0.66), I² = 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 7 (Analysis 1.4)
Forest plot of comparison: 1 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate stunting, outcome: 1.4 Weight-for-age Z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuusipalo 2006</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakalalika 2010</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02, 0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Tau^2 = 0.00; Chi^2 = 2.23, df = 2 (P = 0.33); I^2 = 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.61 (P = 0.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 8 (Analysis 1.5)
Forest plot of comparison: 1 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate stunting, outcome: 1.5 Weight (kg).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuusipalo 2006</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakalalika 2010</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakalalika 2012</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03, 0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Tau^2 = 0.00; Chi^2 = 1.65, df = 2 (P = 0.44); I^2 = 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 2.82 (P = 0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 0.19, df = 1 (P = 0.67); I^2 = 0%

Figure 9 (Analysis 1.6)
Forest plot of comparison: 1 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate stunting, outcome: 1.6 Body Mass Index (BMI) kg/m².

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuusipalo 1983</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.90 (P = 0.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 3.67, df = 1 (P = 0.06); I^2 = 72.8%
Figure 10 (Analysis 1.7)
Forest plot of comparison: 1 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate stunting, outcome: 1.7 MUAC (cm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thalakoutouk 2010</td>
<td>0.35 0.81 213</td>
<td>0.6 59</td>
<td>0.3 0.8 86</td>
<td>0.8 48.7</td>
<td>0.05 0.015, 0.25</td>
<td>0.05 0.015, 0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.05 0.015, 0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Tau^2 = 0.00; Chi^2 = 0.00, df = 1 (p = 1.00); I^2 = 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.70 (P = 0.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 0.31, df = 1 (P = 0.56), I^2 = 0%

Figure 11 (Analysis 1.8)
Forest plot of comparison: 1 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate stunting, outcome: 1.8 Body fatness measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>7.3 1.1 32</td>
<td>7.3 1.5 33</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00 0.64, 0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00 0.64, 0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 0.22, df = 1 (P = 0.64), I^2 = 0%

Figure 12 (Analysis 2.1)
Forest plot of comparison: 2 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 24-59 months old, outcome: 2.1 Height (cm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loprie 2004</td>
<td>93.5 0.4 103</td>
<td>91.1 6.8 45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.40 0.06, 4.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.40 0.06, 4.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 2.01 (P = 0.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 1.28, df = 3 (P = 0.73), I^2 = 0%
**Figure 13 (Analysis 2.2)**
Forest plot of comparison: 2 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 24-59 months old, outcome: 2.2 Height-for-age z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapiose 2004</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.30 [0.07, 0.53]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.30 [0.07, 0.53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 2.57 (P = 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapiose 2004</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.32 [0.09, 0.55]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.32 [0.09, 0.55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 2.74 (P = 0.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4 Supplementation for 24 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.30 [-0.10, 0.70]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.30 [-0.10, 0.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.49 (P = 0.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: $X^2 = 0.02$, df = 2 (P = 0.99), I² = 0%

**Figure 14 (Analysis 2.3)**
Forest plot of comparison: 2 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 24-59 months old, outcome: 2.3 Weight-for-height z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapiose 2004</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.31 [0.00, 0.62]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.31 [0.00, 0.62]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.96 (P = 0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Supplementation for 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapiose 2004</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.30 [0.01, 0.59]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.30 [0.01, 0.59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 2.01 (P = 0.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.39, 0.39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.39, 0.39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4 Supplementation for 24 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.42, 0.42]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.42, 0.42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: $X^2 = 2.82$, df = 3 (P = 0.42), I² = 0%
Figure 15 (Analysis 2.4)
Forest plot of comparison: 2 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 24-59 months old, outcome: 2.4 Weight (kg).

Figure 16 (Analysis 2.5)
Forest plot of comparison: 2 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 24-59 months old, outcome: 2.5 Weight-for-age z-score.
**Figure 17 (Analysis 2.7)**
Forest plot of comparison: 2 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 24-59 months old, outcome: 2.7 Body fatness measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>No supplement</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7.1 Triceps skinfold (mm) after 12 months supplementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.29 (P = 0.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7.2 Subscapular skinfold (mm) after 12 months supplementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.73 (P = 0.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7.3 Triceps skinfold (mm) after 24 months supplementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.29 (P = 0.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7.4 Subscapular skinfold (mm) after 24 months supplementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.44 (P = 0.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 0.12, df = 3 (P = 0.99), I^2 = 0%

**Figure 18 (Analysis 2.8)**
Forest plot of comparison: 2 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting, 24-59 months old, outcome: 2.8 MUAC (cm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>No supplement</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.8.1 Supplementation for 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.80 (P = 0.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.8.2 Supplementation for 24 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.36 (P = 0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 0.07, df = 1 (P = 0.79), I^2 = 0%

**Figure 19 (Analysis 3.1)**
Forest plot of comparison: 3 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years, outcome: 3.1 Height (cm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>No supplement</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1.3 Supplementation for 12 months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krachambili 1998</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.15 (P = 0.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1.4 Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker 1991</td>
<td>119.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.74 (P = 0.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 20 (Analysis 3.2)
Forest plot of comparison: 3 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years, outcome: 3.2 Height-for-age z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5 Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>-0.9 0.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-1.1 0.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>[-0.22, 0.62]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.93 (P = 0.35)

Figure 21 (Analysis 3.3)
Forest plot of comparison: 3 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years, outcome: 3.3 Weight-for-height z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.5 Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>-0.6 0.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-0.7 0.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[-0.27, 0.47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>[-0.27, 0.47]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (P = 0.60)

Figure 22 (Analysis 3.4)
Forest plot of comparison: 3 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years, outcome: 3.4 Weight (kg).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3 Supplementation for 12 months</td>
<td>1.65 0.45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.6 0.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.17, 0.27]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.5 Four years post supplementation (children 7-8 years old)</td>
<td>21.2 3.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.4 2.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>[-0.65, 2.25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>[-0.65, 2.25]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.08 (P = 0.28)
Figure 23 (Analysis 3.7)
Forest plot of comparison: Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years, outcome: 3.7 Body fatness measures.

Figure 24 (Analysis 3.8)
Forest plot of comparison: Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years, outcome: 3.8 Mid-upper arm circumference (cm).

Figure 25 (Analysis 3.9)
Forest plot of comparison: Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 5-10 years, outcome: 3.9 Blood pressure (mmHg).
Figure 26 (Analysis 4.1)
Forest plot of comparison: 4 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Moderately underweight children with moderate stunting aged 10-18 years, outcome: 4.1 Height-for-age z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.6 Thirteen years post-supplementation (17-18 years old)</td>
<td>-0.6 0.9 28</td>
<td>-0.8 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.30, 0.70]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>28 27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.30, 0.70]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.78 (P = 0.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Figure 27 (Analysis 6.1)
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus no nutritional advice: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate wasting, outcome: 5.1 Change in weight (g/kg/day).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplementary food Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>4.15 1369 3 3.6 2.9 605 100.0%</td>
<td>0.55 [0.27, 0.83]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>1369 605</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.55 [0.27, 0.83]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 3.84 (P = 0.0001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28 (Analysis 6.2)
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus no nutritional advice: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate wasting, outcome: 5.2 Change in length (mm/day).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplementary food Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>0.2 0.3 1369 0.18 0.25 605 100.0%</td>
<td>0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>1369 605</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.54 (P = 0.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29 (Analysis 6.3)
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus no nutritional advice: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate wasting, outcome: 5.3 Change in MUAC (mm/day).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>0.3 0.3 1369 0.26 0.34 605 100.0%</td>
<td>0.04 [0.01, 0.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>1369 605</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.04 [0.01, 0.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 2.50 (P = 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 30 (Analysis 6.4)**
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus no nutritional advice: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate wasting. Outcome: 5.4 Height-for-age z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Counseling Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nikiema 2014</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.40 [-0.14, 0.66]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.14, 0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.00 (P = 0.003)

**Figure 31 (Analysis 6.5)**
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food with or without nutritional advice versus no nutritional advice: Moderately underweight children aged 6 to 24 months with moderate wasting. Outcome: 5.5 Weight-for-height z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Counseling Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nikiema 2014</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.20 [-0.03, 0.43]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.03, 0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.67 (P = 0.09)
Appendices

Appendix 1. Search strategies

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Ovid MEDLINE(R) <1946 to Present>

Search Strategy:

1. Malnutrition/ (7338)
2. Wasting Syndrome/ (884)
3. Kwashiorkor/ (2519)
4. (malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*).ti. or (malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*).ab. (31691)
5. (wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or marasmus or Kwashiorkor).ti. or (wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or marasmus or Kwashiorkor).ab. (20010)
6. Infant Nutrition Disorders/ or Child Nutrition Disorders/ (6315)
7. Protein-Energy Malnutrition/ (6731)
8. (undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*).ti. or (undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*).ab. (7334)
9. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 (63229)
10. (baby or babies or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschol* or pre-school* or schoolchild*).ti. or (baby or babies or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschol* or pre-school* or schoolchild*).ab. (1271299)
11. exp Infant/ (947395)
12. exp Child/ (1565252)
13. 10 or 11 or 12 (2354451)
14. 9 and 13 (24556)
15. Foods, Specialized/ (110)
16. Food, Fortified/ (7755)
17. Food, Formulated/ (5394)
18. Nutrition Therapy/ (902)
19. ((food* or diet*) adj3 (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)).ti. or ((food* or diet*) adj3 (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)).ab. (43934)
20. ((nutrient* or nutrition*) adj3 (complement* or therap* or supplement*)).ti. or ((nutrient* or nutrition*) adj3 (complement* or therap* or supplement*)).ab. (12139)
21. (lipid based or (lipid adj3 supplement*) or LNS).ti. or (lipid based or (lipid adj3 supplement*) or LNS).ab. (4706)
22. ((home adj3 supplement*) or (home adj3 fortif*) or (home adj3 process*)).ti. or ((home adj3 supplement*) or (home adj3 fortif*) or (home adj3 process*)).ab. (662)
23. (RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RUSF).ti. or (RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RUSF).ab. (177)
24. corn soy blend.ti. or corn soy blend.ab. (28)
25. 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 (69814)
26. Health Education/ (52659)
27. Health Promotion/ or Health Communication/ (54432)
28. (randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial).pt. (470295)
29. randomi?ed.ti. or randomi?ed.ab. (391626)
30. (randomly or placebo*).ab. (359988)
31. (trial or groups).ab. (1632018)
32. cohort*,ti. or cohort*.ab. (292598)
33. Cohort Studies/ (172585)
34. Prospective Studies/ (376948)
35. 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 (2531092)
36. ((nutrition* or diet* or food*) adj3 (educat* or counsel* or advice)).ti. or ((nutrition* or diet* or food*) adj3 (educat* or counsel* or advice)).ab. (12239)
37. 26 or 27 or 36 (111696)
38. 14 and 25 and 37 (179)
39. 25 or 37 (179353)
1 Malnutrition/ (42655)
2 Wasting Syndrome/ (3168)
3 Kwashiorkor/ (4307)
4 (malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*).ti. or (malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*).ab. (43215)
5 (wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or marasmus or Kwashiorkor).ti. or (wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or marasmus or Kwashiorkor).ab. (26646)
6 Infant Nutrition Disorders/ or Child Nutrition Disorders/ (14630)
7 Protein-Energy Malnutrition/
8 (undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*).ti. or (undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*).ab. (9693)
9 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 (100244)
10 (baby or babies or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschool* or pre-school* or schoolchild*).ti. or (baby or babies or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschool* or pre-school* or schoolchild*).ab. (1685661)
11 exp Infant/ (928390)
12 exp Child/ (2279378)
13 10 or 11 or 12 (2743937)
14 9 and 13 (34186)
15 Foods, Specialized/ (73712)
16 Food, Fortified/ (54779)
17 Food, Formulated/ (2801)
18 Nutrition Therapy/ (44706)
19 ((food* or diet*) adj3 (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)).ti. or ((food* or diet*) adj3 (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)).ab. (54814)
20 ((nutrient* or nutrition*) adj3 (complement* or therap* or supplement*)).ti. or ((nutrient* or nutrition*) adj3 (complement* or therap* or supplement*)).ab. (15865)
21 (lipid based or (lipid adj3 supplement*) or LNS).ti. or (lipid based or (lipid adj3 supplement*) or LNS).ab. (6323)
22 ((home adj3 supplement*) or (home adj3 fortif*) or (home adj3 process*)).ti. or ((home adj3 supplement*) or (home adj3 fortif*) or (home adj3 process*)).ab. (832)
23 (RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RusF).ti. or (RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RusF).ab. (268)
24 corn soy blend.ti. or corn soy blend.ab. (37)
25 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 (219609)
26 Health Education/ (80896)
27 Health Promotion/ or Health Communication/ (106498)
28 (randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial).pt. (0)
29 randomi?ed.ti. or randomi?ed.ab. (503713)
30 (randomly or placebo*).ab. (451694)
31 (trial or groups).ab. (2153119)
32 cohort*.ti. or cohort*.ab. (413661)
33 Cohort Studies/ (175439)
34 Prospective Studies/ (260157)
35 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 (3014742)
36 ((nutrition* or diet* or food*) adj3 (educat* or counsel* or advice)).ti. or ((nutrition* or diet* or food*) adj3 (educat* or counsel* or advice)).ab. (16225)
37 26 or 27 or 36 (190536)
38 14 and 25 and 37 (362)
39 25 or 37 (402566)
40 14 and 39 (4903)
41 35 and 40 (1250)
42 randomized controlled trial/ (350399)
43 controlled clinical trial/ (386681)
44 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 42 or 43 (3146810)
45 40 and 44 (1304)

**Cochrane Library issue 8 2014**
Date Run: 22/08/14 14:35:33.359

Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Search</th>
<th>Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Malnutrition] explode all trees 1982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Wasting Syndrome] explode all trees 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Kwashiorkor] explode all trees 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 1690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or marasmus or Kwashiorkor:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Child Nutrition Disorders] explode all trees 127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Infant Nutrition Disorders] explode all trees 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Protein-Energy Malnutrition] explode all trees 226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 4162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>baby or babies or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschool* or pre-school* or schoolchild*:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 93565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Infant] explode all trees 13196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Child] explode all trees 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>#11 or #12 or #13 93565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>#10 and #14 1529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Foods, Specialized] explode all trees 2964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Food, Fortified] explode all trees 1203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Food, Formulated] explode all trees 1067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Nutrition Therapy] explode all trees 7033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>(food* or diet*) and (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 22268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>(nutrient* or nutrition*) and (complement* or therap* or supplement*):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 7340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>(lipid based) or (lipid supplement*) or LNS:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 4321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>(home and supplement*) or (home and fortif*) or (home and process*):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 1695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RUSF:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>corn soy blend:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>#16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 33165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Health Education] explode all trees 9910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Health Promotion] explode all trees 3922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>MeSH descriptor: [Health Communication] explode all trees 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td>(nutrition* or diet* or food*) and (educat* or counsel* or advice):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 5227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>#27 or #28 or #29 or #30 16496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>#26 or #31 46753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>#15 and #32 900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cinahl EBSCOHost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query</th>
<th>Limiters/Expanders</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$14 AND $17</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$15 OR $16</td>
<td>331,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16</td>
<td>TX cohort* OR TX prospective OR TX controlled clinical trial</td>
<td>206,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>TX randomized controlled trial OR TX random* OR TX placebo*</td>
<td>159,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>S6 AND S13</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>S7 OR S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12</td>
<td>119,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>TX health education OR TX health promotion OR TX health counseling</td>
<td>109,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>AB ( nutrition* OR diet* OR food* ) AND AB ( educat* OR counsel* OR advice )</td>
<td>9,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>TX ready-to-use OR TX ( RUTF OR RTUF OR RUSF ) OR TX corn soy blend</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>TX lipid based OR TX home supplement* OR TX home fortified</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>TX supplementary food* OR TX nutrition therapy OR TX complementary nutri*</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>TX specialized food* OR TX fortified food* OR TX complementary food*</td>
<td>1,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>S4 AND S5</td>
<td>2,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>TX ( baby OR babies OR infant* OR child* ) OR TX ( toddler* OR preschool* ) OR TX schoolchild*</td>
<td>528,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>S1 OR S2 OR S3</td>
<td>6,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>TX marasmus OR TX undernourish* OR TX growth-falter</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>TX malnourish* OR TX ( stunted or stunting ) OR TX undernutrition</td>
<td>1,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>TX malnutrition OR TX kwashiorkor OR TX wasting syndrome</td>
<td>5,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LILACS**
(tw:(malnutrition OR malnourish* OR kwashiorkor OR undernutrition OR undernourish* OR stunting OR stunted OR marasmus)) AND (tw:(child* OR infant* OR baby OR babies OR toddler* OR preschool* OR schoolchild*)) AND (tw:(specialized food* OR nutrition therapy OR complementary food* OR fortified food* OR supplementary food* OR lipid-based OR ready to use food* OR corn soy blend)) filter: clinical trials

**WHO Global Health library and African index Medicus:**
Malnutrition, undernutrition, kwashiorkor, diet therapy, complementary food, supplementary food, fortified food, blended food, lipid-based food, nutrition therapy.

**Appendix 2: Additional domains for cluster RCTs**

**Domain 1: recruitment bias**
Recruitment bias can occur when individuals are recruited to the trial after the clusters have been randomised (Higgins 2008). The types of participants recruited can be influenced by the knowledge of whether the specific cluster is an intervention or a control cluster.
- Adequate: when no recruiting was done after randomisation.
- Inadequate: when additional recruiting was done after randomisation.
- Unclear: when no reporting was done regarding the timing of recruiting all participants.

**Domain 2: baseline imbalance**
Cluster-randomised trials often randomise all clusters at once, therefore, a lack of allocation concealment should not usually be a problem (Higgins 2008). However, when there is only a small number of clusters, there is a possibility of chance baseline imbalances between the randomised groups. This may affect either the clusters or the individuals.
- Adequate: when the baseline comparability of clusters is sufficient, or when statistical adjustment for baseline characteristics occurred (Higgins 2008).
- Inadequate: when there are significant differences between clusters and no statistical adjustments for baseline characteristics were made accordingly.
- Unclear: when no reporting was done regarding baseline characteristics, or when it is not clear whether the differences between the clusters were significant.

**Domain 3: loss of clusters**
It is possible that complete clusters may be lost from a trial, and have to be omitted from the analysis (Higgins 2008). In the same way as for missing outcome data in individually randomised trials, this may lead to bias in cluster-randomised trials. In addition, missing outcomes for individuals within clusters may also lead to a risk of bias in cluster-randomised trials.

- Adequate: there were no missing data, or the missing data were addressed in the correct manner.
- Inadequate: there were missing data and it was dealt with in a way that could have introduced bias.
- Unclear: when no reporting was done regarding missing data (either complete clusters or individuals within clusters), or when it is unclear whether the authors of the primary study have dealt with the missing data adequately (e.g. acceptable statistical adjustments).

Appendix 3. Newcastle Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale: Cohort studies

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

Selection:
1) Representateness of the exposed cohort
   a) truly representative of the average __________________________ (describe) in the community *
   b) somewhat representative of the average __________________________ in the community *
   c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
   d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Selection of the non exposed cohort
   a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort *
   b) drawn from a different source
   c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort

3) Ascertainment of exposure
   a) secure record (eg surgical records) *
   b) structured interview *
   c) written self report
   d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study
   a) yes *
   b) no

Comparability
1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis
   a) study controls for __________________________ (select the most important factor) *
   b) study controls for any additional factor * (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor).

Outcome
1) Assessment of outcome
   a) independent blind assessment *
   b) record linkage *
   c) self report
   d) no description

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur
   a) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) *
   b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts
   a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for *
   b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - >_____ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost *
   c) follow up rate < ____% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost
   d) no statement

Appendix 4. Formula for combining data from groups in the same study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>( N_1 )</th>
<th>( N_2 )</th>
<th>Combined groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>( M_1 )</td>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td>( \frac{N_1 M_1 + N_2 M_2}{N_1 + N_2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>( SD_1 )</td>
<td>( SD_2 )</td>
<td>( \sqrt{\frac{(N_1 - 1) SD_1^2 + (N_2 - 1) SD_2^2 + \frac{N_1 N_2}{N_1 + N_2} (M_1^2 + M_2^2 - 2M_1 M_2)}{N_1 + N_2 - 1}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background

Description of the condition
During the past decade the prevalence of under-nutrition among young children has decreased significantly (Child Malnutrition Database 2012). Despite this, global estimates in 2012 indicate that 15% (99 million) of children under the age of five years are underweight (weight-for-age z score below -2 standard deviations (SD)). Of the 51 million children (8%) who are wasted (weight-for-height z score below -2SD), at least 19 million of them suffer from severe acute malnutrition (SAM). Stunting (height-for-age below -2SD) also remains a significant public health problem, with 25% (162 million) of children worldwide below the age of five years being classified as stunted (Child Malnutrition Database 2012). The majority of undernourished children are from countries in Africa and Asia (Child Malnutrition Database 2012).

In contrast to this, 7% (44 million) of young children around the world are overweight (weight-for-height z-score above +2SD), corresponding to a 54% increase in childhood obesity over the past ten years (Child Malnutrition Database 2012). The prevalence of childhood obesity is increasing in all regions of the world, including low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) where maternal and child under-nutrition is prevalent, resulting in the so-called double burden of malnutrition (Child Malnutrition Database 2012).

Several anthropometric parameters have been used in the literature to define severe under-nutrition among infants and young children. In 1995 countries worldwide adopted the Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) strategy for the prevention and treatment of mortality and illness in young children (WHO 2005). The IMCI guidelines classify infants or children aged 0 to 5 years with a weight-for-age z-score less than -3 SD as “very low weight” (also referred to as severely underweight or severely undernourished) (de Onis 2003; WHO 2005). Infants or children who are “very low weight” and have bilateral oedema suffer from severe acute malnutrition (SAM). Based on guidelines and classification from a number of resources (WHO 2005; WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group 2006; UNICEF 2014; WHO/UNICEF 2009), any of the following terms and cut-offs is indicative of severe under-nutrition:

- Severely underweight or “very low weight” (weight-for-age z-score < -3SD)
- Severely wasted (weight-for-height z-score < -3SD; MUAC < 115 mm) or uncomplicated severe acute malnutrition (SAM) if bilateral oedema is present
- Severely stunted (height-for-age z-score < -3SD)

Description of the intervention
The World Health Organisation (WHO) currently recommends the provision of community-based nutrient-dense supplementary food to children with uncomplicated severe acute malnutrition in order to meet the child’s extra needs for weight and height gain and functional recovery until they have gained adequate weight (WHO 2007). Ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF) was developed as a home-based alternative to F100 (milk-based therapeutic diet used in hospital settings) and are soft foods that can be consumed easily by children from the age
of six months without adding water, therefore discouraging microbial growth. Current recommendations include the administration of RUTF according to each child’s weight, to be consumed at any time of the day or night, thus replacing the child’s habitual diet (WHO 2007).

In this review, oral supplementary foods are defined as specially formulated foods in ready-to-eat, milled or powdered form which are modified in energy density, protein, fat and/or micronutrient composition to help meet the nutritional requirements of undernourished infants and children. These foods are intended to supplement the home diet, and not to meet total daily nutritional intake requirements of these children. The various types of supplementary foods include, but are not limited to:

- Lipid-based nutrient supplements (LNP), for example ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF) supplement or ready-to-use supplementary food (RUSF), fortified spread
- Fortified blended foods, for example corn-soy or wheat-soy flours with/without sugar/oil
- Fortified powdered supplements, for example fortified milk and or soy-based powder to be reconstituted with water

There are currently three Cochrane systematic reviews investigating the effectiveness of various supplementary foods in malnourished children below the age of five.

Schoonees 2013 specifically assessed the effectiveness of home-based ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF) in children with severe acute malnutrition (Schoonees 2013). This review of four trials, three of which had a high risk of bias, found limited evidence on the effectiveness of RUTF in children with severe acute malnutrition and concluded that both RUTF and standard diet (flour porridge) could be used to treat severe acute malnutrition in children in a home-based setting. RUTF replaced the habitual diet of the children in all of the studies included in this review, except for one study (Manary 2004). In Manary 2004 participants in one of the treatment groups received a RUTF supplement, which provided one third of the recommended daily nutrient requirements for severely malnourished children. The remainder of the participants in this study received the full recommended daily nutrient requirement for severely malnourished children.

Sguassero 2012 assessed the effectiveness of supplementary feeding to promote growth in children in low- and middle-income countries (Sguassero 2012). Based on the findings of eight randomized controlled trials, deemed to have high risk of bias, supplementary food appeared to have a negligible effect on growth of children in low- and middle-income countries.

Lazzerini 2013 found there to be moderate to high quality evidence for the effectiveness of supplementary food in treating moderate acute malnutrition in children from low- and middle-income countries (Lazzerini 2013).

How the intervention might work
Childhood malnutrition, in any form, is associated with poor health outcomes at all stages of an individual’s life. Stunted, underweight and wasted children are at increased risk of death from diarrhoea, pneumonia, measles and other infectious diseases (Black 2013). Undernourished children also have decreased learning capacity in childhood, which may result in decreased work capacity in adulthood (Black 2008). In addition to this, childhood malnutrition is also associated with an increased prevalence of non-communicable diseases in adulthood (Black 2008).

A meta-analysis from five prospective birth cohorts in LMICs investigated the relationship between childhood growth patterns and health and productivity in adulthood (Adair 2013; Richter 2012). A child will weight more if it grows taller and/or gets fatter or more muscular. In order to assess the independent effect of weight gain and height gain, conditional relative weight (weight gain that is separated from change in height) and conditional relative height were calculated for all of the individuals in the cohorts. Conditional weight is the amount by which the weight at the end of a time interval exceeds the predicted weight at the beginning of the interval based on previous weight measurements (Menezes 2011). A positive conditional weight or height indicates growing faster than expected given prior size.

The main findings of the meta-analysis showed that although higher birthweight was associated [OR: 1.28, 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.21–1.35; body mass index (BMI) increased by 0.5 kg/m² per standard deviation (SD) increase in birthweight] with adult overweight (BMI > 25 kg/m²), it was also associated with large gains in human capital (In the meta-analysis attained schooling was used as a proxy for human capital which is "the stock of knowledge, habits, social and personality attributes, including creativity, embodied in the ability to perform labor so as to produce economic value"; birthweight versus "did not complete secondary school": OR: 0.82, 95% CI: 0.78–0.87), with little association with adult cardiovascular risk factors [Birth weight versus elevated blood pressure (systolic blood pressure ≥130 mm Hg or diastolic blood pressure ≥85 mm Hg): OR: 0.93, 95% CI: 0.88–0.99; Adair 2013]. A similar relationship was noted with faster linear growth from 0 to 2 years. Although associated with slightly increased likelihood of adult overweight (mostly related to lean mass; conditional height at age 2 years versus BMI >25 kg/m²: OR=1.24, 95% CI:1.17–1.31) and elevated blood pressure (conditional height at age 2 years versus elevated blood pressure: OR=1.12 95% CI: 1.06–1.19), higher conditional heights at age 2 years and at mid-childhood (4 years of age in 4 of the cohorts and 8 years of age in the Phillipines cohort) were related to lower risk of short stature (Conditional height at age 2 years: OR=0.23 95% CI: 0.20–0.25; Conditional height mid-childhood:OR=0.39 95% CI:0.36–0.43) and poor educational attainment (Conditional height at age 2 years: OR=0.74 95% CI: 0.67–0.78; Conditional height mid-childhood: OR=0.87 95% CI: 0.83–0.92). In contrast, faster weight gain, independent of linear growth, had little benefit for human capital (Adair 2013). After the age of 2 years, faster weight gain was associated with a higher likelihood of overweight (Conditional relative weight at age 2 years: OR=1.51 95% CI: 1.43–1.60) and elevated blood pressure (Conditional relative weight at age 2 years: OR=1.07 95% CI: 1.01–1.13) in adulthood. Higher conditional relative weight in mid-childhood (4 years of age in 4 of the cohorts and 8 years of age in the Phillipines cohort) was associated with higher likelihood of
being overweight (Conditional relative weight mid-childhood: OR=1.76 95% CI: 1.66–1.86) and having elevated blood pressure (Conditional relative weight mid-childhood: OR=1.22 95% CI: 1.15–1.30) as an adult (Adair 2013).

Based on the findings of the meta-analysis, there appears to be a critical period of the under-nourished child’s life when providing supplementary food is beneficial but that beyond this age/stage supplementary food that promotes rapid weight gain independent of a gain in height may be detrimental to the child’s future health. The authors concluded that a review of current practices is necessary in order to avoid the promotion of excess weight gain in children older than 2 years and emphasized the importance of monitoring the linear growth of young children (Adair 2013).

Why it is important to do this review
In the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty and malnutrition, malnourished children grow up to be unhealthy and unproductive adults who are unable to rise out of poverty they were born into. These unhealthy, poor adults give birth to offspring who are predisposed to ill-health as a consequence of genetic alterations in the foetus of malnourished mothers (Adair 2004; Barker 1999) as well as to a sub-optimal nutritional environment in early childhood. Interventions aimed at improving the well-being of women and young children are of vital importance to break this cycle (Barker 2012).

Based on the findings of the COHORT meta-analysis (Adair 2013), there may be a critical period of the under-nourished child’s life when providing supplementary food is beneficial but that beyond this age/stage supplementary food that promotes rapid weight gain independent of a gain in height may be detrimental to the child’s future health. Rapid weight gain in children older than 2 years may be associated with increased risk for non-communicable diseases in adulthood. It is unclear from the COHORT data what caused the rapid increase in weight gain in the children. Energy dense supplementary food is provided to undernourished children to promote weight and height gain. Therefore, it is important to assess the benefits and potential long-term harm of providing supplementary food to severely undernourished children.

Furthermore, in 2012, the WHO Member States endorsed six global targets for improving maternal, infant and young child nutrition and are committed to monitoring progress towards these targets (WHO 2012). The targets are vital for identifying priority areas for action and catalyzing global change. The targets for 2025 include:

- Reduction of childhood stunting
- Reduction of anaemia in women of reproductive age
- Reduction of low birth weight
- No increase in childhood overweight
- Increasing exclusive breastfeeding rates in the first six months of life
- Reduction of wasting in children.

In line with these targets, the WHO Nutrition group is updating its current recommendations on infant and child feeding. This systematic review will form
part of this process and specifically aims to evaluate the evidence on the short
term (childhood) and long term (adulthood) benefits and harms of providing
supplementary food or nutrition counseling or both to undernourished infants and
children below the age of five years.

Objectives
To evaluate the effects of supplementary foods or nutrition counseling or both on
linear growth, becoming overweight or obese, developing risk factors for
cardiovascular disease or diabetes mellitus, and developing cardiovascular disease
or diabetes mellitus later in life in infants and children (6–59m) classified by IMCI as Very Low Weight (weight-for-age < -3 SD z-score).

Methods
Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies
We planned to include randomised controlled trials (RCTs), non-randomised trials
with a control group (CCTs) and prospective analytical cohort studies with
appropriate comparison groups. Eligible trials could be of a parallel or crossover
design. For crossover studies the first period data had to be available. Studies with
follow-up periods of any duration were included.
We excluded prospective cohort studies that included historical comparison
groups. We also excluded retrospective cohort, case-control and case series studies
based on the low quality of interventional evidence provided by these study
designs.

Types of participants
Studies including severely undernourished infants and children (6–12 months, 13-
24 months and 25–59 months) were included in the review. A variety of
anthropometric parameters have been used in the literature to define severe
under-nutrition among infants and young children. Studies that included
participants with at least one of the following anthropometric parameters at study
entry were included in this review:
• Severely underweight or “very low weight” (Weight-for-age z-score <-3SD)
• Severely wasted (Weight-for-height z- score <-3SD; MUAC < 115 mm) or uncomplicated severe acute malnutrition (SAM)
• Severely stunted (Height-for-age z- score <-3SD)

Studies conducted in “nutritionally at risk” children, were excluded from the
review but were flagged accordingly in order to keep track of these studies. Studies
conducted in villages where a proportion of the children were severely or
moderately undernourished were included in the review if the study outcomes
were presented for these specific groups of children. Studies conducted on
children with congenital abnormalities or any other special needs (e.g. have had an
organ transplant) were excluded.
**Types of interventions**

**Intervention:** Provision of any community or home-based oral supplementary foods for at least 4 weeks, nutrition counseling (nutritional counseling or advice is the use of an interactive helping process focusing on the need for diet modification), or both.

In this review oral supplementary foods are defined as specially formulated foods in ready-to-eat, milled or powdered form which are modified in energy density, protein, fat and/or micronutrient composition to help meet the nutritional requirements of undernourished infants and children. These foods are intended to supplement the home diet, and not to meet total daily nutritional intake requirements of these children. Various types of supplementary foods were included in the review:

- Lipid-based nutrient supplements (LNP), for example ready-to-use supplementary food (RUSF) or therapeutic food supplement, also referred to as ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF) supplement or fortified spread
- Fortified blended foods, for example corn-soy or wheat-soy flours with/without sugar and/or oil
- Fortified powdered supplements, for example fortified milk and or soy-based powder to be reconstituted with water

Studies investigating the effect of micronutrient powders, which refer to vitamin and mineral supplements in unit dose forms such as capsules, tablets, powders or solutions, were excluded. Studies investigating the use of different types of complementary foods in infants 6 months of age and older will be excluded.

**Comparison:** Any form of nutrition counseling or standard of care (as defined by the study authors or whatever is determined appropriate for the study setting). If the intervention is stand-alone nutrition counseling then the comparison group should not include nutrition counseling.

Studies comparing different types of supplementary foods were placed in the studies awaiting assessment section of the review.

**Types of outcome measures**

**Primary outcomes**

- Linear growth measured by length/height-for-age and rate of change of length/height-for-age
- Overweight /obesity as measured by weight-for-height or body mass index-for-age in children under 18 years, and body mass index (BMI) for adults
- Risk factors for cardiovascular disease or diabetes (for example, abnormal blood pressure, blood lipids, fasting blood glucose, HbA1c)
- Cardiovascular events or diagnosis of diabetes mellitus

**Secondary outcomes**

- Other anthropometric measures include MUAC, waist circumference, % body fat, fat mass, skinfold thickness, rate of change of weight-for-age, weight-for-height or BMI-for-age up to 59 months; up to 19 years; any time after 19 years.
- Adverse events resulting from the supplementary food such as diarrhoea, vomiting, nausea, constipation, food-related allergies.
- Adherence to the issued supplementary food and attendance at follow-up counseling
Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches

A comprehensive search strategy (see Appendix 1) was used to search the following databases for relevant studies. The search was not limited by language or date of publication:

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), published in The Cochrane Library;
- MEDLINE (OVID);
- EMBASE (OVID);
- LILACS;
- WHO Global Health Library;
- Cumulative Index to Nursing & Allied Health (CINHAL, through EbscoHost);
- African Index Medicus

We searched the following databases for ongoing trials:

- WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) (http://www.who.int/ictrp/en/)
- MetaRegister of Current Controlled Trials (mRCT; http://www.controlled-trials.com/mrct/)
- ClinicalTrials.gov (http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/)

We contacted the author of each trial identified in the trial registries to establish whether the trial had already been published and to find out if he/she was aware of any other relevant studies.

We searched the following web site for additional trials:

- iLiNS project website - The International Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements (iLiNS) Project is a research collaboration that grew out of a shared commitment to accelerate progress in preventing malnutrition (http://www.ilins.org/)

Searching other resources

For assistance in identifying ongoing or unpublished studies, we contacted non-profit organisations and research collaborations [MANA (Mother Administered Nutritive Aid), International Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements (iLiNS) Project], nutrition industry partners (Nutriset and Edesia Global Nutrition Solutions) and international organisations (Home Fortification Technical Advisory Group. We planned to contact other international organisations such as the nutrition section of the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the World Food Programme (WFP), the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), Hellen Keller International (HKI), Sight and Life Foundation, the Department of Nutrition for Health and Development and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

In order to obtain additional references, experts in the field of childhood nutrition were contacted. Reference lists of included studies and appropriate reviews were screened to identify other relevant studies. We also contacted the authors of all
included studies to determine if they were aware of additional trials or studies (published, unpublished or ongoing) in the field.

**Data collection and analysis**

**Selection of studies**
Two reviewers (Liesl Nicol: LN and Marianne Visser: MV) independently screened the titles and abstracts of all records retrieved through searching of the electronic databases. We applied the pre-specified selection criteria to screen studies for potential inclusion. Full-texts of all reports deemed potentially eligible by either of us were retrieved for closer inspection. Full-texts that appeared to meet the inclusion criteria on the first screening but were later deemed unsuitable for inclusion were listed in the table: Characteristics of excluded studies, together with the reasons for their exclusion. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (Nandi Siegfried: NS).

**Data extraction and management**
We (LN and MV) independently extracted relevant data from all eligible studies. A data extraction form was used as a template to guide domains for data extraction. Discrepancies regarding extracted data were resolved by discussion with a third reviewer (NS).

The following information was extracted from each included study:

- Administrative details: Study identification number; author(s); published or unpublished; year of publication; number of studies included in paper; year in which study was conducted; details of other relevant papers cited;
- Details of the study: study design (e.g. RCT, CCT, prospective cohort); type, duration and completeness of follow-up; country and location of study (e.g. higher-income vs. lower-income country); informed consent and ethics approval;
- Details of participants: age, sex, sample size, relevant baseline characteristics including birth weight and length and nutritional status (birth weight, stunted, wasted, very low birth weight);
- Details of intervention and control group: type of supplementary food or nutrition counseling, dosage of supplementary food or nutrition counseling, form and formulation of supplementary food or nutrition counseling, additional co-interventions (such as fortification with micronutrients); description of treatment received by the control group.
- Details of outcomes: all pre-specified outcomes and any additional outcomes reported in the study; adverse events.
- Details of quality assessment: quality assessment of the study based on the Risk of Bias tool.
- Details of data analysis: numbers and reported statistics for each reported outcome.

When study outcomes were reported in more than one reference, all of the study reports will be used to extract data as comprehensively as possible.

**Assessment of risk of bias in included studies**
We (LN and MV) independently assessed the risk of bias of each included study. The Cochrane Risk of Bias tool was used to assess bias in RCTs. In the case of cluster RCTs, the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool was used in combination with the additional domains of recruitment bias, baseline imbalance and loss of clusters (see Appendix 2; Cochrane Handbook: see chapter 16). We planned to use the Newcastle Ottawa Scale to assess the methodological quality of eligible prospective cohort studies.

**Measures of treatment effect**
We summarised the evidence by outcome and study design. For **dichotomous outcomes**, where possible, the risk ratio (RR) from statistical analyses, adjusting for baseline differences (such as poisson regressions or logistic regressions), or the ratio of risk ratios (i.e. the risk ratio post intervention / risk ratio pre intervention) was calculated if possible using generic inverse variance method and then inserted into Review Manager 5.3 (Review 2011). For **continuous outcomes**, where possible, the weighted mean difference (WMD) with 95% confidence intervals was calculated. If only the adjusted analyses [for example, the absolute change from a statistical analysis adjusting for baseline differences (such as regression models, mixed models or hierarchical models) or the relative change adjusted for baseline differences in the outcome measures (i.e. the absolute post-intervention difference between the intervention and control groups minus the absolute pre-intervention difference between the intervention and control groups) / the post-intervention level in the control group]] are provided by the studies then these values will be entered into Review Manager 5.3 using the generic inverse variance method. If necessary, standardisation of continuous outcomes across studies will be done prior to meta-analysis (e.g. as standardised mean differences).

**Unit of analysis issues**
If there is a unit of analysis error in the reported analysis for a study and there is insufficient information to re-analyse the results, the study authors were contacted to obtain necessary data. If these data are not available, we will not report confidence intervals or p-values for which there is a unit of analysis error.

**Dealing with missing data**
Where data was missing or unclear, we contacted study authors wherever possible (see contact log). When percentages were provided without denominators we back-calculated to determine denominators. If only standard errors or 95% confidence intervals are reported for means and no standard deviations, the standard deviations were calculated as follows: $SD = SEM \times \sqrt{\text{sample size}}$. If unable to obtain missing data, we reported the results that were available, provided they were not likely to be misleading (e.g. if there is a unit of analysis error).

**Assessment of heterogeneity**
Due to the limited number of studies included in this review, we were unable to conduct any meta-analysis and therefore it was not possible to assess clinical heterogeneity by examining the variability in the participants, interventions and outcomes. We were therefore also unable to assess statistical heterogeneity, using
the Chi-square test for heterogeneity (significance level p < 0.1), as well as the $I^2$ test and the interpretation thereof (Higgins 2002).

**Data synthesis**
Where studies are sufficiently homogenous we planned to combine the results of the studies using random-effects meta-analysis as we anticipated some heterogeneity. If the results of the included studies were not similar enough to combine then the study results were presented in the narrative.

**Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity**
Where appropriate, we planned to conduct subgroup analyses based on:

- The nutritional status of the children i.e. moderately wasted (weight-for-height < -2 z-score) or stunted (height-for-age < -2 z-score) but not severely wasted (weight-for-height < -3 z-score)
- Relevant anthropometrical parameters (severely stunted, moderately stunted, severely wasted, moderately wasted),
- Age (6-24 months and 24-60 months)
- Duration of supplementary feeding. Outcomes were subgrouped based on the length of exposure to the supplementary food or comparison
- Children with or without co-infections e.g. HIV, TB, malaria
- Categories of oral supplementary foods e.g. Lipid based nutrient supplements, fortified blended foods, fortified powdered supplements, macronutrient composition of supplementary food (i.e. high fat, protein or carbohydrate), solid food versus liquid food, ready to use food versus not ready to use food, with or without micronutrients.

**Quality of the evidence**
The quality of the evidence was assessed using Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE), and GradePro (Grade Profiler) 3.2.2 (GradePro 2008) will be used to create Summary of Findings tables for each comparison using the seven pre-specified outcomes determined as most important to patients by the WHO Guidelines Development Group. In determining the level of evidence for each outcome, both the efficacy results and the assessment of the risk of bias will be integrated into a final assessment of the level of evidence and full details of the decision will be provided.

**Results**
**Description of studies**
**Results of the search**
Searching all of the electronic databases resulted in a yield of 2048 records. At the end of the initial screening phase we assessed 258 full text articles for eligibility. We identified 4 references, pertaining to 2 studies that met the inclusion criteria of the review. The reasons for excluding ineligible studies are outlined in the study flow diagram (Figure 1).

**Included studies**
**Study location and design**
Hossain 2011 (Hossain 2011) was a randomised controlled trial conducted in Bangladesh. Children were randomised to one of five treatment groups
(Supplementary food (SF) group, supplementary food plus psycho-stimulation (SF + PS) group, psycho-stimulation (PS) group, hospital-based control (H-C) group and a community-based (C-C) control group). Standard treatment given to all participants included growth monitoring, health and nutrition education and micronutrient supplementation. Rao 1977 (Rao 1977) was a cluster-controlled trial conducted in India. In this study villages were randomly selected for inclusion but the allocation of the treatment to the different villages does not appear to have been random (Rao 1977).

Study participants
Hossain 2011 included severely underweight (weight-for-age z score: WAZ < -3 SD) children (N=507) aged 6-24 months upon discharge from hospital after resolution of illnesses such as diarrhoea and pneumonia. Children who were severely wasted (WHZ < -3 SD) were excluded from the study. Rao 1977 reported on the effect of supplementary food in a subgroup (N=24) of severely underweight children (< 60% of expected weight for age) aged 1 to 5 years living in the selected study villages.

Interventions
In the two studies the supplementary food provided between 150-310 kcal of energy per day. In Hossain 2011, children aged 6 to 12 months received one packet of supplementary food daily providing 150 kcal, with 11% and 20% of the energy as protein and fat, respectively (4g protein, 3.5 g fat). Children aged 12 to 24 months received 2 packets daily (300 kcal, 8 g protein, 7g fat). Caregivers were instructed to mix each packet with water, resulting in a porridge-like supplement, and administer it in addition to the children’s usual meals. Food packets were provided to caregivers at each follow-up visit and caregivers were requested to return all empty and unused packets at the next follow-up visit. In Rao 1977 the supplement was administered as sweet cakes at a central place in each study village and provided 310 kcal (3g protein, 10g fat) per day. In Hossain 2011 the intervention was provided for 3 months, whereas in Rao 1977 the intervention was provided for 14 months.

Outcomes
Hossain 2011 presents relevant data on the following outcomes at the following time points for the supplemented (SF group) and non-supplemented (C-C group) groups:
Height-for-age after 3 months supplementation and 3 months post supplementation
Weight-for-height after 3 months supplementation and 3 months post supplementation
Weight-for-age after 3 months supplementation and 3 months post supplementation
Weight (kg) after 3 months supplementation (median and interquartile range provided)
Mid-upper arm circumference after 3 months supplementation
Change in mid-upper arm circumference after 3 months supplementation
Rao 1977 presents data on the mean increment in height and weight after 14 months of supplementation in a subgroup of severely underweight children 1-5
years old. No SD values are provided in the paper, therefore these results will be described in the narrative.

Reference standard used
Hossain 2011 used the NCHS growth reference standard to assess eligibility of their participants and the WHO growth reference standard for analysis of the data. Rao 1977 used the NCHS reference standards to determine the nutritional status of the children.

Excluded studies
After screening the full text articles, 248 citations were excluded (Figure 1) for the following reasons:

- Reviews/guidelines/commentaries = 39;
- Description of study design/methods = 3;
- Ineligible study design = 32;
- Ineligible participants (eg. too young or hospitalised)=24;
- Ineligible participants (moderately under-nourished)=46;
- Ineligible participants (nutritionally at risk)=26;
- Ineligible intervention (included 6 studies where food supplementation replaced the habitual diet)=34;
- Ineligible intervention period=6;
- Ineligible comparison group (eg. historical controls)=5;
- Ineligible comparison group (comparative studies)=2;
- No relevant outcomes=31.

There are six references pertaining to five studies awaiting assessment, as we do not yet have sufficient information about the studies to determine their eligibility (Elizabeth 1997; Grellety 2012; Kabahenda 2014; Kielmann 1978; Kinra 2008). The comparative studies (Manary 2004; Simpore 2006) have also been added to the section: Characteristics of studies awaiting classification.

Risk of bias in included studies
We assessed the risk of bias of RCTs using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool. In the case of cluster RCTs, the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool was used in combination with the additional domains of recruitment bias, baseline imbalance and loss of clusters (Cochrane Handbook chapter 16). We provide a full description of the risk of bias for each included study in the Characteristics of included studies table, which is summarised in Figure 2 and Figure 3.

Allocation (selection bias)
Random sequence generation: Hossain 2011 described how the randomization sequence was generated. The method described was adequate and was therefore judged as low risk of bias. Rao 1977 stated that nine villages were randomly selected to participate in the trial. However, it was not stated that the villages were randomly assigned to the the intervention or control group, therefore we judged this study has unclear risk of selection bias. Allocation concealment: Hossain 2011 stated that the person allocating the participants to the treatment groups did not know what group the participants were being assigned to and therefore judged to have a low risk of bias for this
domain. In *Rao 1977* it is not clear how the villages were allocated to the intervention or control group so it was judged as unclear risk of bias for this domain.

**Blinding (performance bias and detection bias)**
The risk of performance and detection bias was unclear in both studies as blinding of the participants, caregivers and outcome assessors were not described (*Hossain 2011; Rao 1977*).

**Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)**
*Hossain 2011* and *Rao 1977* had a high risk of attrition bias (attrition > 10% within study groups and/or between groups in the study).

**Selective reporting (reporting bias)**
We were only able to access the study protocol of *Hossain 2011*. The risk of reporting bias was judged low as the reported outcomes were in line with those stated in the study protocol. We were unable to obtain the study protocol of *Rao 1977* and therefore we judged the study to have unclear risk of reporting bias.

**Other potential sources of bias**
We used baseline comparability, source of funding (conflicted/non-conflicted) and conflict of interest (presence/absence if reported) as other potential sources of bias. *Hossain 2011* were judged to have low risk of bias for this domain based on the fact that the source of funding was non-conflicting; the study authors declared no conflict of interest and the study groups were comparable at baseline. *Rao 1977* did not provide information on one or more of the three criteria so was judged as unclear risk of bias for this domain.
For *Rao 1977* we did not consider the additional domains for the evaluation of bias of cluster randomised trials (Appendix 2), since it appears that it was not a randomised cluster trial.

**Effects of interventions**

*Hossain 2011* investigated the effect of supplementary food compared to no supplementary food in severely underweight children. At baseline the mean age of the children ranged between 12 and 13 months and the nutritional status indicators, in relation to WHO 2006 growth standards, were: weight-for-age z score -3.83±0.6, length-for-age z score -3.46±0.99, weight-for-length z score -2.71±0.76. Sixty-seven percent of these severely underweight children were severely stunted (height-for-age <-3), 27% were moderately stunted and 81% were moderately wasted. The children in the supplementary food (SF) group were marginally more underweight-for-age, compared those in the non-supplemented group (C-G group) (Weight-for-age z score: -3.92 ± 0.55 vs. -3.76 ± 0.59; P=0.049).

At the end of the 3-month intervention there was no significant difference between the supplemented and non-supplemented group in the mean weight-for-age z score (-3.3±0.69 vs -3.37±0.69; Figure 4; Analysis 5.1), weight-for-height z score (-1.8±0.76 vs -1.99±0.83; Figure 5; Analysis 5.2), height-for-age z score (-3.76 ± 0.99 vs -3.69±0.89; Figure 6; Analysis 5.3) or mid-upper arm circumference (mm; 12.6±0.1 vs 12.6±0.8; Figure 7; Analysis 5.4) (*Hossain 2011*). Similarly, there was
no significant difference in the mean weight-for-age z score (-3.4±0.8 vs -3.3±0.8; Figure 4; Analysis 5.1.1), weight-for-height z score (-1.8±0.8 vs -1.8±1.0; Figure 5; Analysis 5.2.1), height-for-age z score (-3.9±1.1 vs -3.9±1.0; Figure 6; Analysis 5.3.1) three months post supplementation between the supplemented and the non-supplemented group.

However, the authors reported that after 3 months of supplementation the supplemented group gained significantly more weight than the non-supplemented group (median; interquartile range: 0.92 kg; 0.59-1.28 vs 0.79 kg; 0.42-1.1; p<0.05). After 3 months of supplementation the length gained by the children in both the supplemented and the non-supplemented group was similar (median; interquartile range: 2.3 cm; 1.4-3.0 vs 2.0 cm; 1.2-3.0). We assumed that this data was not normally distributed, as the study authors specified in their methods section that such data would be reported as means and interquartile ranges. The study authors note that despite the weight and height gains the children were still severely underweight with severe stunting at the end of the treatment period.

Adherence with food supplementation was reported as approximately 90% by the authors (data not provided). Attendance at scheduled follow-up visits was higher in the supplemented group, with a mean of 7.5 ± 1.7 visits, compared to 4.4 ± 2.1 visits in the non-supplemented group during the 3-month supplementation period (P<0.001). No adverse events related to the intake of supplementary food, were recorded.

Rao 1977 reported the weight and height gain in a subgroup of severely underweight children (less than 60% of weight-for-age median) aged 1-5 years who received supplementary food over a period of 14 months or not. The study authors report that the severely underweight children who received supplementary food gained significantly more height (9.38cm; 9.38cm vs 5.08cm; 5 non-supplemented children; p<0.001; as reported in study) and weight (2.77kg; 19 supplemented children vs 1.3kg; 5 non-supplemented children; p<0.001; as reported in study) compared to those who did not receive supplementary food (Rao 1977).

**Quality of the evidence**

**Supplementary food versus no supplementary food for severely underweight children aged 6 to 24 months**

See Summary of Findings table 1: Severely underweight children 6 to 24 months for complete assessment and rationale for ratings.

The evidence for the effect of providing severely underweight children (6-24 months old) with three months of supplementary food on changes in height-for-age z-score, weight-for-age z-score, weight-for-height z-score and MUAC was rated low. The evidence was based on one small study with a high risk of attrition bias within and between study groups. For the outcomes height-for-age z-score, weight-for-age z-score, weight-for-height z-score and MUAC measured three months post-supplementation, the evidence for the effect of providing severely
underweight children (6-24 months old) with three months of supplementary food was low.

No evidence was available to inform the effect of supplementary food on health outcomes (stature and presence of or risk factors for overweight/obesity, diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease) in adolescents or adults who were severely underweight during childhood (0-59 months).

**Discussion**

**Summary of main results**

This review evaluated the evidence on the short-term and long-term benefits and harms of providing supplementary food to severely undernourished children below the age of 5 years. Only two trials (1 RCT, 1 cluster controlled trial) in severely underweight children provided data on short-term outcomes. No trials were identified to inform the effect of supplementary food on health outcomes (stature and presence of or risk factors for overweight/obesity, diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease) in adolescents or adults who were severely underweight during childhood (0-59 months).

Although [Hossain 2011](#) reported a significant increase in weight after supplementation for 3 months, the clinical significance of 0.13 kg gain in weight (approximately 1.4 g/day), is uncertain. In addition, our analysis indicated that there were no differences in the mean z scores for weight-for-age, length-for-age, and weight-for-height, as well as mid-upper arm circumference, between the supplemented (FS group) and the non-supplemented groups (C-C group) after supplementation for 3 months. Similarly, there was no significant difference in the mean z scores for weight-for-age, length-for-age and weight-for-height three months post supplementation between the two groups. The study authors also noted that the children were still severely underweight with severe stunting at the end of the treatment period ([Hossain 2011](#)).

Data from a small post-hoc sub-group of severely underweight children who participated in a cluster controlled trial suggest that those who received supplementary food over a period of 14 months gained significantly more height and weight compared to the children who did not receive supplementary food ([Rao 1977](#)). However, the number of participants who were included in the analysis was very small (N=24) and the results must be viewed with caution.

**Overall completeness and applicability of evidence**

This review provides limited evidence on the short term effect of the provision of supplementary food to severely undernourished children on outcomes such as linear growth and changes in other anthropometric measures such as weight, MUAC and height-for-age, weight-for-height and weight-for-age z scores. The supplementary food in both trials provided a small amount of additional energy in relation to the current daily energy recommendations for children who are recovering from severe malnutrition (150-200 kcal/kg/day) (Ashworth 2006). Despite high adherence to the supplementary food in the trial by [Hossain 2011](#), the authors note that many children remained severely underweight at the end of the supplementation period. This may suggest that a daily energy deficit remained
throughout the supplementation period that was not met by the habitual diet of these children, even though nutrition education was provided to caregivers (Hossain 2011).

No evidence could be identified on the long term effect of the providing supplementary food, with or without dietary counselling, to severely undernourished children on outcomes such as the development of overweight and obesity or the development of and/or risk factors for cardiovascular disease or diabetes, during adolescence or adulthood.

**Quality of the evidence**

The main reasons for downgrading the quality of the evidence was very serious concerns regarding risk of bias and serious concerns regarding imprecision of the data. Also the evidence is based on data from one small study with 162 participants and data from a subgroup of 24 participants from another study.

**Potential biases in the review process**

Biases in the review process were minimised by performing a comprehensive search of the literature, independently selecting and appraising the studies, and extracting the data in duplicate. We also used a validated method of analysis for the review. In addition where data was missing, we sought additional information and data directly from authors where this was possible to do so. Although an extensive hand-search for grey literature was not conducted, it is unlikely that important trials have been missed given the high profile nature of the topic and the close partnership established with agencies and organizations working in this area. However, the review remains at risk of publication bias from less prominent trials. We attempted to reduce this risk by identifying relevant conference abstracts.

The search of the trials registry, www.clinicaltrials.gov, to identify trial protocols and on-going trials yielded seven potentially relevant trial protocols. These will require further assessment and exploration to either 1) link them to trials already included in the review, or 2) if not included, to attempt to obtain the completed trial reports.

**Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews**

The review by Schoonees 2013 in children with severe acute malnutrition included only one study (Manary 2004) that provided supplementary food (RUTF supplement) to participants in one of its treatment arms. The supplementary food provided one third of the recommended daily nutrient requirements for severely malnourished children (Schoonees 2013). Since this study did not have a non-supplemented control group it was not included in our review.

A review by Ashworth 2006 on the effectiveness of community-based nutritional rehabilitation programs with or without the provision of food for severely malnourished children concluded that 11 of the 33 included studies were considered effective (defined as an average weight gain of at least 5g/kg/day and mortality less than 5%) in the rehabilitation of severely malnourished children. The author concluded that high energy and protein intakes were necessary for
successful nutritional rehabilitation of severely malnourished children (Ashworth 2006).

Authors' conclusions
No evidence was identified on the long-term effect of the providing supplementary food, with or without dietary counselling, to severely undernourished children on outcomes such as the development of overweight and obesity or the development of and/or risk factors for cardiovascular disease or diabetes, during adolescence or adulthood. Based on data from two small studies (1 RCT, 1 cluster controlled trial) providing supplementary food to severely underweight children may not improve short-term outcomes such as linear growth or measures of body fatness, compared to non-supplemented children.
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**Hossain 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Study design: Randomised non-blinded trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Country and location of study:</strong> Hospital based outpatient nutrition follow-up unit (HNFU) and 4 community-based nutrition follow-up units (CNFU), Dhaka city, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No. of trial sites:</strong> 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Study dates and duration:</strong> June 2005-June 2007 (2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Frequency of Follow-up:</strong> every 2 weeks for the first 3 months; thereafter monthly up to 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Type of assessment at each follow up:</strong> assess child’s health and nutritional status, provide hospital referral if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Duration of follow-up:</strong> 6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria: children aged 6 to 24 months upon discharge from hospital with resolution of illnesses such as diarrhea and pneumonia and with WAZ &lt;-3 SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> WHZ &lt;-3SD, severe persistent anorexia, edema, congenital disorders, no fixed address, caregivers unable to provide time for child care and/or psychosocial stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total number randomised:</strong> 507 (stratified according to 4 districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baseline characteristics of participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1(HC)</td>
<td>Number of participants: 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants age: 12.5 ± 4.2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants gender: 42 F/60 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritional status: WAZ -3.91 ± 0.56; LAZ-3.55 ± 0.94; WLZ-2.74±0.73; MUAC(mm) 11.5±0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (CC)</td>
<td>Number of participants: 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants age: 12.7 ± 3.8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants gender: 41 F/58 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritional status: WAZ -3.76 ± 0.59; LAZ-3.43±0.99; WLZ-2.65±0.68; MUAC(mm) 11.5±0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (SF)</td>
<td>Number of participants: 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants age: 13.2 ± 4.5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants gender: 45 F/56 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritional status: WAZ -3.92 ± 0.55; LAZ-3.64±0.99; WLZ-2.72±0.72; MUAC(mm) 11.5±0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (PS)</td>
<td>Number of participants: 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants age: 12.4 ± 3.6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants gender: 45 F/57 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritional status: WAZ -3.72 ± 0.68; LAZ-3.35±0.97; WLZ-2.66±0.78; MUAC(mm) 11.5±0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 (PS+SF)</td>
<td>Number of participants: 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants age: 12.2 ± 4.0 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants gender: 48 F/55 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutritional status: WAZ -3.81 ± 0.63; LAZ-3.33±1.04; WLZ-2.78±0.88; MUAC(mm) 11.6±0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Baseline characteristics of participants:**
### Interventions

| Group 1 (HC): | Description: Standard treatment at outpatient nutrition follow-up unit (growth monitoring, health and nutrition education) for 6 months  
Frequency: every 2 weeks for 3 months; thereafter monthly up to 6 months  
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: None  
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: daily micronutrient supplementation for 3 months |
| Group 2 (CC): | Description: Standard treatment at community nutrition follow-up unit (growth monitoring, health and nutrition education) for 6 months  
Frequency: every 2 weeks for 3 months; thereafter monthly up to 6 months  
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: None  
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: daily micronutrient supplementation for 3 months |
| Group 3 (SF): | Description: Standard treatment at community nutrition follow-up unit (growth monitoring, health and nutrition education) for 6 months plus supplementary food (SF) for the first 3 months  
Dose and frequency of SF: children 6-12 months received 1 food packet daily; those aged 12-24 months received 2 food packets daily  
Nutritional composition of SF: rice and lentil powder, molasses and soy bean oil  
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 150 kcal/day for those aged 6-12 months; 300 kcal/day for those aged 12-24 months  
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: daily micronutrient supplementation for 3 months |
| Group 4 (PS): | Description: Standard treatment at community nutrition follow-up unit (growth monitoring, health and nutrition education) plus psychosocial stimulation (PS) for 6 months  
Frequency of PS: Play session and parental education (1 hour) every 2 weeks for 3 months, thereafter monthly up to 6 months  
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: None  
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: daily micronutrient supplementation for 3 months |
| Group 5 (PS+SF): | Description: Standard treatment at community nutrition follow-up unit (growth monitoring, health and nutrition education) plus PS for 6 months plus SF for the first 3 months  
Dose and frequency of SF: children 6-12 months received 1 food packet daily; those aged 12-24 months received 2 food packets daily  
Nutritional composition of SF: rice and lentil powder, molasses and soy bean oil  
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 150 kcal/day for those aged 6-12 months; 300 kcal/day for those aged 12-24 months  
Frequency of PS: Play session and parental education (1 hour) every 2 weeks for 3 months, thereafter monthly up to 6 months  
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: daily micronutrient supplementation for 3 months |

### Outcomes

| Hossain 2011: | Changes in weight  
Secondary outcomes: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in length, WAZ, LAZ, WLZ, MUAC</th>
<th>Mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nahar 2012:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary outcomes:</strong></td>
<td>Mental and psychomotor development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary outcomes:</strong></td>
<td>Changes in weight and length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverse events related to supplementary food:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adherence to intervention:</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 90% and 92% in SF-group and SF+PS group, respectively (data not provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean number of follow-up visits: HC group: 4.4 ± 2.1; CC group: 6.3 ± 2.5; SF group: 7.5 ± 1.7 ; PS group: 9.1 ± 2.1 and PS + SF group: 9.5 ± 1.9 (P&lt; 0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links to other studies (specify study ID):</th>
<th>Nahar 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trial registration details:</strong></td>
<td>NCT01157741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics:</strong> Ethical review committee of ICDDR,B and University of California institutional review board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informed consent:</strong> written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict of interest statement:</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding:</strong> Sida-SAREC, Sweden; Program in International and Community Nutrition, UC Davis, Fogarty International Centre, the International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh (ICDDR, B) and its donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics:</strong> Ethical review committee of ICDDR,B and University of California institutional review board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informed consent:</strong> written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict of interest statement:</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference standard used for anthropometrical data:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHS reference standard used for assessing eligibility of participants; WHO reference standard used for data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of anthropometrical measurements:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements performed by a research assistant twice and average recorded. Weight was measured by means of a digital scale with 10g precision (Seca, model -345), recumbent length measured to the nearest mm using a locally constructed length board and MUAC with a non-stretchable insertion tape. If the measurements varied more than 100g for weight, 5mm for length and 2 mm for MUAC a third measurement was performed and the average of the nearest 2 measurements taken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk of bias table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors’ judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Computer-generated block randomisation scheme, with permuted block lengths of 5 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>Group assignment was kept in sequentially numbered, closed envelopes (See Nahar 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Not described in the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is not clear if the research assistant who recorded the outcome measurements was blinded to the treatment allocation of the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Hossain 2011: Attrition rates for each group after 3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supplementation
HC: 43/102 (42%)
CC: 40/99 (40%)
SF: 24/101 (24%)
PS: 43/102 (42%)
PS+SF: 35/103 (34%)
Differential attrition between CC and SF > 10%:
therefore high risk of bias
Nahar 2012:
Attrition rate for each group at 6 months
HC: 43/102 (42%)
CC: 40/99 (40%)
SF: 24/101 (24%)
PS: 43/102 (42%)
PS+SF: 35/103 (34%)
Differential attrition between CC and SF: 16% therefore
high risk of bias

Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Low risk
Published outcomes are in line with those stated in the registered protocol in www.clinicaltrials.gov

Other bias | Low risk
Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: None
Conflict of interest: Declared no conflict of interest.
Funding: non-conflicted funding sources

Rao 1977

Methods
Study design: Cluster Controlled trial
Country and location of study: Rural villages near Hyderabad, India
No. of trial sites: 9 villages
Date recruitment initiated: Not stated
Study dates and duration: 14 months (dates not reported)
Frequency of Follow-up: every 3 months
Type of assessment at each follow up: weight, height, clinical
evaluation of nutritional status
Duration of follow-up: 14 months

Participants
Inclusion criteria: Children aged 1 to 5 years living in selected villages
were matched for sex, height and weight and allocated to receive
supplementary food or no supplementary food
Total number included in trial: 415 (316 received supplementary food; 109 received no supplementary food)
Baseline characteristics of participants: Authors report no differences
in the mean heights and weights and prevalence of nutritional deficiency
signs among children between the two treatment groups (Data not
shown)

Interventions
Group 1 (Supplementary food)
Description: Community-based administration of supplementary food for
14 months
Amount and frequency: administered as sweet cakes daily for 6 days a
week
Nutritional composition of supplement: Wheat flour (23g), sugar (35g)
and edible oil (10g)
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: 310 kcal and 3 g protein
per day
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: None
Group 2 (Control)
Description: No intervention (control group)
Total daily supplementary nutrient intake: None
Additional co-interventions/treatment received: None

Outcomes

Primary outcomes:
Changes in height and weight

Adverse events related to supplementary food: Not reported

Adherence to intervention: 85% attendance among children receiving the supplementary food. Adherence was ensured among those children who attended feeding sessions.

Notes

Links to other studies (specify study ID): Gopalan 1973

Trial registration details: Not reported

Funding: Not reported

Ethics: Not reported

Informed consent: Not reported

Conflict of interest statement: Not reported

Reference standard used for anthropometrical data: NCHS growth reference standards

Risk of bias table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Authors' judgement</th>
<th>Support for judgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Although it is stated that nine villages were randomly selected to participate in the trial, it was not stated that the villages were randomly assigned to the intervention or control groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>It is not clear how the villages were allocated to the intervention or control groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>No information was provided regarding the blinding of the study participants and personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>No information was provided regarding the blinding of the person who measured the anthropometrical outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>We only have attrition rate for each group as a whole and not specifically for the subgroups: Supplemented group: 95/306 (31%) Non-supplemented group: 27/109 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Study protocol not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bias</td>
<td>Unclear risk</td>
<td>Differences in baseline characteristics between groups: None Conflict of interest: Conflict of interest was not declared Funding: Unclear as funding sources not described</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of excluded studies

Aboud 2008
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes

Aboud 2009
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Aboud 2011
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Ackatia-Armah 2013

Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished

Adu-Afarwuah 2007
Reason for exclusion | Incorrect intervention  
---|---  
Adu-Afarwuah 2008 | Incorrect intervention  
Ahmed 2014 | Incorrect intervention  
Aitchison 2000 | Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk  
Akhter 2011 | Incorrect intervention  
Alarcon 2003 | Incorrect intervention  
Aleman 2008 | Incorrect intervention  
Aripeen 2009 | Incorrect intervention  
Arora 1998 | Incorrect participants  
Ashworth 2009 | Incorrect intervention  
Avula 2011 | Review  
Bachmann 2009 | Incorrect intervention  
Bachmann 2010 | Review  
Bahwere 2014 | Incorrect intervention  
Baker 2014 | Review  
Beghin 1973 | Incorrect intervention  
Benefice 1996 | Incorrect study design  
Bhandari 2001 | Incorrect participants: nutritionally at risk infants; only present the proportion of participants who are severely or moderately undernourished at baseline  
Bhutta 1994 | Incorrect participants  
Bhutta 1997 | Incorrect participants  
Bhutta 2008 | Incorrect participants  
Bisimwa 2012 | Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk  
Borja 2013 | Overview of main findings  
Brazionis 2013 | Incorrect study design  
Briend 1999 | Incorrect intervention
Reason for exclusion  Briend 2001  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Brown 1992  Review
Reason for exclusion  Cattaneo 2010  Incorrect participants-n utritionally at risk
Reason for exclusion  Caulfield 1995  No relevant outcomes
Reason for exclusion  Chang 2002  No relevant outcomes
Reason for exclusion  Chang 2010  No relevant outcomes
Reason for exclusion  Chaparro 2010  Review
Reason for exclusion  Chaudhuri 2002  Review
Reason for exclusion  Ciliberto 2005  Incorrect intervention
Reason for exclusion  Ciliberto 2006  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Cohuet 2012  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Colecraft 2004  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Collins 2002  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Conlisk 2004  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Cooper 2009  Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Reason for exclusion  de Pee 2009  Review
Reason for exclusion  de Pee 2010  Review
Reason for exclusion  Defourney 2009  Review
Reason for exclusion  Desai 2014  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Dewey 2008  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Dewey 2008  Review
Reason for exclusion  Dibari 2013  Incorrect participants
Reason for exclusion  Diop 2003  Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Reason for exclusion  Dong 2013  Incorrect study design
Reason for exclusion  Dube 2009  Incorrect intervention period
Els 2013
Reason for exclusion: Review
Englberger 2003
Reason for exclusion: Review
Ferreira 2008
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Filteau 2011
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Fjeld 1989
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants
Flax 2009
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes
Flax 2010
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes
Friedlander 1972
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect comparison group
Gaboulaud 2007
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention
Gardner 1995
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes
Gaskin 2000
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Ghassemi 1992
Reason for exclusion: Review
Ghoneim 2004
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design
Golden 1981
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants
Goodman 1991
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes
Graham 1996
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention
Grantham-McGregor 1989
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Grantham-McGregor 1991
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Grantham-McGregor 1992
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Grantham-McGregor 1993
Reason for exclusion: Review
Grantham-McGregor 1994
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention
Grantham-McGregor 1997
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Grobler 2013
Reason for exclusion: Review
Gross 2003
Reason for exclusion: Description of study design
Gutierrez 1998
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habicht 1992</td>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habicht 1995</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-moderately malnourished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habicht 2010</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamadani 2006</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habicht 1992</td>
<td>Incorrect comparison group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidkamp 2012</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikens 1989</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikens 1993</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks 2003</td>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare 1996</td>
<td>Incorrect intervention period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoddinott 2008</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoppe 2008</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hossain 2005</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hossain 2009</td>
<td>Incorrect participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hossain 2010</td>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffman 2011</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husaini 1991</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huybregts 2012</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iannotti 2014</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAP 2013</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imdad 2011</td>
<td>Treatment guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inayati 2012</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanaka 2009</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanaka 2010</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanaka 2011</td>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isanaka 2011</td>
<td>Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanovic</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jukes</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabir</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimbira</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakchuk</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jukes</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabir</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimbira</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakchuk</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerac</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerac</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanum</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilaru</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kouanda</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krahenbuhl</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraut</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krebs</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krebs</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulwa</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuusipalo</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGroné</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakkam</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larney</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassi</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazzerini</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reason for exclusion  | No relevant outcomes
---|---
Lin 2008  | Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Long 2012  | Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Lopriore 2004  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Lutter 1989  | Incorrect intervention
Lutter 1990  | Incorrect intervention
Lutter 2008  | Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Maleta 2004  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Mangani 2013a  | Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk
Mangani 2013b  | No relevant outcomes
Marsh 2002  | Description of study design
Martorell 1995a  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Martorell 1995b  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Martorell 1995c  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Matilsky 2009  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
McDonald 2013  | Incorrect intervention
McKay 1978  | No relevant outcomes
Missiriya 2014  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Mora 1981  | Incorrect intervention
Nackers 2010  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Nahar 2012a  | No relevant outcomes
Nga 2013  | Incorrect intervention period
Nikiema 2014  | Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished
Oakley 2010  | Incorrect intervention
Ocloo 1993  | Commentary
Ojofeitimi 2001
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Ortiz-Andreuccchi 2009
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Palwala 2009
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Patel 2005
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Patel 2010
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk

Penny 2005
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Perez-Escamilla 1995
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately malnourished

Pham 2012
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Phuka 2008
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Phuka 2009
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Phuka 2009a
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished

Phuka 2011
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention period

Picot 2012
Reason for exclusion: Review

Pollitt 1994 b
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Pollitt 1994a
Reason for exclusion: Review

Pollitt 1995
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes

Pollitt 1997
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk

Powell 2004
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Prasanna 1968
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Pretorius 1966
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Prinsloo 1969
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Puett 2013
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Purwestri 2012
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk

Rao 1992
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Rao 2002
Reason for exclusion  | Razafindrakoto 1994  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants  
Reddy 1974  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants  
Richter-Strydom 1985  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—moderately undernourished  
Rivera 1991  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—moderately undernourished  
Rivera 1995  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—moderately undernourished  
Rivera 1996  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—moderately undernourished  
Rivera 2004  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—nutritionally at risk  
Roux 2010  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect intervention  
Roy 1994  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect study design  
Roy 2005  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—moderately undernourished  
Roy 2007  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—nutritionally at risk  
Rudolph 2013  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect study design  
Ruel 2008  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect intervention  
Russell 2010  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect study design  
Salehi 2004  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—nutritionally at risk  
Sandige 2004  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect intervention  
Santos 2005  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect study design  
Scherbaum 2000  
Reason for exclusion  | Review  
Schoonees 2013  
Reason for exclusion  | Review  
Schroeder 1995  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect participants—moderately undernourished  
Schroeder 1997  
Reason for exclusion  | Incorrect intervention period  
Schultink 2009  
Reason for exclusion  | Review  
Schurch 1995  
Reason for exclusion  | Review  
Sguassero 2012  
Reason for exclusion  | Review  

Shamim 2014
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect study design

Shewade 2013
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Siega-Riz 2014
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-nutritionally at risk

Simondon 1996
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Sinclair 2011
Reason for exclusion: Review

Singh 2010
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished

Stein 2003
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes

Stein 2004
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes

Stein 2006
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished

Sunguya 2013
Reason for exclusion: Review

Super 1990
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Thakwalakwa 2009
Reason for exclusion: Commentary

Thakwalakwa 2010
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished

Thakwalakwa 2012
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished

Thakwalakwa 2014
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes

Trehan 2013
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

van der Kam 2012
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention period

Vasquez-Garibay 2005
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Vazir 2013
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect intervention

Verna 2012
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished

Vitolo 2010
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants

Waber 1981
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes

Walka 1997
Reason for exclusion: No relevant outcomes

Walker 1990
Reason for exclusion: Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished

Walker 1991
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for exclusion</th>
<th>Walker 1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Walker 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Walker 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Walker 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Wang 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Webb 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Weisz 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect participants-moderately undernourished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>White 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relevant outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Winter 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Yang 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Yebyo 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Zhang 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect study design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for exclusion</td>
<td>Yang 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Characteristics of studies awaiting classification**

**Elizabeth 1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>RCT and prospective follow up in both hospital and community setting (2 trials)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>6-24 months, mild, moderate, severe PEM (IAP classification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>STIM vs NUT vs CONTROL. Followed up for 2 years. Not sure if intervention given for this long or if this is just the follow up time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Nutritional status, IQ testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grellety 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Prospective analytical cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>All children 6-23 months eligible for supplementary food; nutritionally at risk some severely/moderately undernourished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Plumpy Doz provided to all registered children versus children who failed to register and therefore did not receive supplementary food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Anthropometry measured 2 weeks after each monthly ration; proportion died, stunted, wasted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kabahenda 2014**

<p>| Methods | Clinical trial (non-randomised) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>100 Child-caregiver dyads where children were aged 6-48 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Nutrition education programme for caregivers for 5 weeks versus sewing classes for caregivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Changes in HAZ, WAZ, WHZ, MUAC at 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kielmann 1978**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>RCT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>All children in study villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Nutrition care (anthropometric surveillance, food supplements, nutrition education) or nutrition care plus medical care, Calorie-enriched milk and porridge/gruel daily ad libitum at &quot;feeding stations&quot; in villages versus medical care or control group (minimal medical care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Growth outcomes reported in Taylor reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status. Cannot get hold of full text of Taylor reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kinra 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Non-randomised community trial; Follow-up survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>Children in study villages born between 1 January 1987-31 December 1990; 1165 former Hyderabad trial participants from study villages, aged 13-18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Administration of a daily community based cereal-based meal within an integrated child development services programme versus no intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Trial outcomes not stated; Height, BMI, skinfold thickness, BP, blood lipids and glucose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manary 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Clinical trial (not truly randomised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>Children aged 12-60 months discharged from NRU, Blantyre, Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>RTUF, RTUF supplement or blended maize/soy flour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Rate of linear growth, Rate of weight gain, reaching graduation weight (WHZ=0); Rate of MUAC gain, Adverse events. HIV-negative participants reported by Manary 2004; HIV-positive participants reported by Ndeka 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Comparative study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Simpore 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>RCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>Children aged 6-60 months who were undernourished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Home-based Misola plus spirulina (5g) four times daily or home-based traditional meals plus spirulina (5g) four times daily versus home-based Misola four times daily or home-based traditional meals four times daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Weight gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Comparative study. Outcome data not presented by baseline nutritional status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Characteristics of ongoing studies

| NCT 01705769 | Children aged 6-59 months with uncomplicated severe acute malnutrition (SAM) defined as Weight for height less than -3 SD of WHO standard or oedema of both feet or both. Exclusion criteria: Complicated SAM defined as child with SAM having signs of severe illness requiring hospitalization, known allergy to animal milk or peanuts | Randomized to 3 feeding regimes: High energy and micronutrient rich foods; Ready to Use Therapeutic Food-Centrally produced or Ready to Use Therapeutic Food-locally produced for up to 16 weeks | Primary outcome: Recovery by 16 weeks after enrollment (defined as achieving weight for height greater than or equal to -2 SD and absence of oedema of both feet). Secondary outcomes: Rate of weight gain (grams/kg body wt/day), Proportion of children with weight for height greater than or equal to -2 SD and absence of oedema of feet, Time required to reach recovery; Cost of three feeding regimens; Factors which affect recovery Feedback from families, health care providers and ICDS functionaries about the feeding regimens regarding perceptions and feasibility of use Incidence and prevalence of diarrhea, ARI and fever during treatment phase Mortality and hospitalizations | Incorrect comparison group (comparative study) |
| NCT 01634009 | Children aged 6-60 months with SAM (defined as <3SD weight-for-height) who completed acute (stabilization) management and are clinically well, regaining appetite, have no oedema or signs of concurrent infections. Exclusion criteria: children with tuberculosis or any congenital/acquired disorder affecting growth i.e. trisomy-21 or cerebral palsy; children on an exclusion diet for the treatment of persistent diarrhea or having history of soy, peanut or milk protein allergy. | Soy-based RUTF (amount not specified) Standard RUTF (amount not specified) | Primary outcome: rate of weight gain up to 3 years | Study awaiting assessment |
| NCT 00941434 | To contact authors for any results | | | |
| NCT 01144806 | To contact authors for any results | | | |
### Summary of findings tables

#### Table 1.

**Supplementary food compared to no supplementary food for severely underweight children: 6 to 24 months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)</th>
<th>Relative No of Participants of the evidence (studies)</th>
<th>Quality (GRADE)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-for-age z-score</strong> - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>Assumed risk: The mean weight-for-age z-score - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.07 higher (0.14 lower to 0.28 higher)</td>
<td>162 (1 study3)</td>
<td>low2,3,4</td>
<td>very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight-for-height z-score</strong> - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>Assumed risk: The mean weight-for-height z-score - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.19 higher (0.06 lower to 0.44 higher)</td>
<td>162 (1 study3)</td>
<td>low2,3,4</td>
<td>very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height-for-age z-score</strong> - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>Assumed risk: The mean height-for-age z-score - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.07 lower (0.36 lower to 0.22 higher)</td>
<td>162 (1 study3)</td>
<td>low2,3,4</td>
<td>very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-upper arm circumference (cm)</strong> - Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>Assumed risk: The mean mid-upper arm circumference (cm) - supplementation for 3 months in the intervention groups was 0.19 higher (0.06 lower to 0.44 higher)</td>
<td>162 (1 study3)</td>
<td>low2,3,4</td>
<td>very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The basis for the assumed risk (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

**Ck:** Confidence interval.

**GRADE Working Group grades of evidence**

**High quality:** Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

**Moderate quality:** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low quality:** We are very uncertain about the estimate.

1 Weight-for-age z-score three months post-supplementation reported by Hossain 2011 [N=136; MD 0.10 lower (0.37 lower to 0.17 higher)].
2 High risk of attrition bias within and between groups (attrition rate >10%) for Hossain 2011.
3 Blinding of caregivers, investigators and outcome assessors unclear for Hossain 2011.
4 Number of participants less than 400.
5 Weight-for-height z-score three months post-supplementation reported by Hossain 2011 [N=136; MD 0.0 higher (0.31 lower to 0.31 higher)].
6 Height-for-age z-score three months post-supplementation reported by Hossain 2011 [N=136; MD 0.0 higher (0.35 lower to 0.35 higher)].
Data and analyses

5. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Severely underweight children aged 6 to 24 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Weight-for-age z-score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.07 [-0.14, 0.28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2 Three months post-supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>-0.10 [-0.37, 0.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Weight-for-height z-score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.19 [-0.06, 0.44]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2 Three months post-supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.31, 0.31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Height-for-age z-score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>-0.07 [-0.36, 0.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2 Three months post-supplementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.35, 0.35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Mid-upper arm circumference (cm)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Subtotals only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.18, 0.18]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Health outcomes in adolescents who were severely underweight children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Body mass index (kg/m²)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Fasting blood glucose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 LDL cholesterol level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 HDL cholesterol level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Total cholesterol level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Proportion of participants with hypertension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Proportion of participants that are pre-diabetic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8 Proportion of participants with diabetes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9 Proportion of participants with cardiovascular events (myocardial infarction, stroke)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Health outcomes in adults who were severely underweight children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome or Subgroup</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
<th>Effect Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Body mass index (kg/m²)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Fasting blood glucose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 LDL cholesterol level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 HDL cholesterol level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Total cholesterol level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Proportion of participants with hypertension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Proportion of participants that are pre-diabetic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Proportion of participants with diabetes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 Proportion of participants with cardiovascular events (myocardial infarction, stroke)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIGURES

Figure 1: Study flow diagram.
**Figure 2:** Risk of bias graph: review authors’ judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies.

**Figure 3:** Risk of bias summary: review authors’ judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.
Figure 4 (Analysis 5.1)
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Severely underweight children aged 6 to 24 months, outcome: 5.1 Weight-for-age z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussain 2011</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.28]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.28]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.84 (P = 0.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 Three months post-supplementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussain 2011</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>[-0.27, 0.17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>[-0.27, 0.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.72 (P = 0.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.93, df = 1 (P = 0.33), I² = 0%

Figure 5 (Analysis 5.2)
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Severely underweight children aged 6 to 24 months, outcome: 5.2 Weight-for-height z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussain 2011</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.44]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.44]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.51 (P = 0.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 Three months post-supplementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussain 2011</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.31, 0.31]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.31, 0.31]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.88, df = 1 (P = 0.35), I² = 0%

Figure 6 (Analysis 5.3)
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Severely underweight children aged 6 to 24 months, outcome: 5.3 Height-for-age z-score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1 Supplementation for 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussain 2011</td>
<td>-3.76</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-3.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.36, 0.22]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>[-0.36, 0.22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.47 (P = 0.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Three months post supplementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussain 2011</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.35, 0.35]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[-0.35, 0.35]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.09, df = 1 (P = 0.76), I² = 0%
Figure 7 (Analysis 5.4)
Forest plot of comparison: 5 Supplementary food versus no supplementary food: Severely underweight children aged 6 to 24 months, outcome: 5.4 Mid-upper arm circumference (cm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No supplement Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hossein 2011</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.18, 0.18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.18, 0.18]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: Not applicable
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.00)

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable
Appendices

Appendix 1. Search strategies

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Ovid MEDLINE(R) <1946 to Present>
Search Strategy:

1. Malnutrition/ (7338)
2. Wasting Syndrome/ (884)
3. Kwashiorkor/ (2519)
4. (malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*).ti. or (malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*).ab. (31691)
5. (wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or malnutrition or Kwashiorkor).ti. or (wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or malnutrition or Kwashiorkor).ab. (20010)
6. Infant Nutrition Disorders/ or Child Nutrition Disorders/ (6315)
7. Protein-Energy Malnutrition/ (6731)
8. (undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*).ti. or (undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*).ab. (7334)
9. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 (63229)
10. (baby or babies or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschool* or pre-school* or schoolchild*).ti. or (baby or babies or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschool* or pre-school* or schoolchild*).ab. (1271299)
11. Exp Infant/ (947395)
12. Exp Child/ (1565252)
13. 10 or 11 or 12 (2354551)
14. 9 and 13 (24556)
15. Foods, Specialized/. (110)
16. Food, Fortified/. (7755)
17. Food, Formulated/. (5394)
18. Nutrition Therapy/ (902)
19. ((food* or diet*) adj3 (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)).ti. or ((food* or diet*) adj3 (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)).ab. (43934)
20. ((nutrient* or nutrition*) adj3 (complement* or therap* or supplement*)).ti. or ((nutrient* or nutrition*) adj3 (complement* or therap* or supplement*)).ab. (12139)
21. (l lipid based or (l lipid adj3 supplement* or LNS).ti. or (l lipid based or (l lipid adj3 supplement* or LNS).ab. (4706)
22. ((home adj3 supplement*) or (home adj3 fortif*) or (home adj3 process*)).ti. or ((home adj3 supplement*) or (home adj3 fortif*) or (home adj3 process*)).ab. (662)
23. (RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RUSF).ti. or (RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RUSF).ab. (177)
24. corn soy blend.ti. or corn soy blend.ab. (28)
25. 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 (69814)
26. Health Education/ (52659)
27. Health Promotion/ or Health Communication/ (54432)
28. (randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial).pt. (470295)
29. random?ed.ti. or random?ed.ab. (391626)
30. (randomly or placebo*).ab. (359998)
31. (trial or groups).ab. (1632018)
32. cohort*.ti. or cohort*.ab. (292598)
33. Cohort Studies/ (172385)
34. Prospective Studies/ (376948)
35. 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 (2531092)
36. ((nutrition* or diet* or food*) adj3 (educat* or counsel* or advice)).ti. or ((nutrition* or diet* or food*) adj3 (educat* or counsel* or advice)).ab. (12239)
37. 26 or 27 or 36 (111696)
38. 14 and 25 and 37 (179)
39. 25 or 37 (179353)
40. 14 and 39 (2562)
41. 35 and 40 (845)

Database: Embase 1947-Present, updated daily
Search Strategy:

1. Malnutrition/ (42655)
2. Wasting Syndrome/ (3168)
3. Kwashiorkor/ (4307)
4. (malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*).ti. or (malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*).ab. (43215)
5. (wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or malnutrition or Kwashiorkor).ti. or (wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or malnutrition or Kwashiorkor).ab. (26646)
6. Infant Nutrition Disorders/ or Child Nutrition Disorders/ (14630)
7. Protein-Energy Malnutrition/ (5115)
8 (undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*)ti.or [undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*].ab. (9693)
9 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 (100244)
10 (baby* or babies* or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschool* or pre-school* or schoolchild*).ti.or (baby* or babies* or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschool* or pre-school* or schoolchild*).ab. (1685661)
11 exp Infant/ (928390)
12 exp Child/ (2279378)
13 10 or 11 or 12 (2743937)
14 9 and 13 (34186)
15 Foods, Specialized/ (73712)
16 Food, Fortified/ (54779)
17 Food, Formulated/ (2801)
18 Nutrition Therapy/ (44706)
19 [(food* or diet*) adj3 (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)].ti.or [(food* or diet*) adj3 (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)].ab. (54814)
20 [(nutrient* or nutrition*) adj3 (complement* or therap* or supplement*)].ti.or [(nutrient* or nutrition*) adj3 (complement* or therap* or supplement*)].ab. (15865)
21 (lipid based or (lipid adj3 supplement*) or LNS).ti.or (lipid based or (lipid adj3 supplement*) or LNS).ab. (6323)
22 [(home adj3 supplement*) or (home adj3 fortif*) or (home adj3 process*)].ti.or [(home adj3 supplement*) or (home adj3 fortif*) or (home adj3 process*)].ab. (832)
23 (RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RUSF).ti.or (RUTF or RTUF or RUF or RUSF).ab. (268)
24 corn soy blend.ti.or corn soy blend.ab. (37)
25 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 (219609)
26 Health Education/ (80896)
27 Health Promotion/ or Health Communication/ (106498)
28 (randomized controlled trial or controlled clinical trial).pt. (0)
29 randomi?ed.ti. or randomi?ed.ab. (503713)
30 (randomly or placebo*).ab. (451694)
31 (trial or groups).ab. (2153119)
32 cohort*.ti. or cohort*.ab. (413661)
33 Cohort Studies/ (175439)
34 Prospective Studies/ (260157)
35 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 (3014742)
36 [(nutrition* or diet* or food*) adj3 (educat* or counsel* or advice*)].ti. or [(nutrition* or diet* or food*) adj3 (educat* or counsel* or advice*)].ab. (16225)
37 26 or 27 or 36 (190356)
38 14 and 25 and 37 (362)
39 25 or 37 (402566)
40 14 and 39 (4903)
41 35 and 40 (1250)
42 randomized controlled trial/ (350399)
43 controlled clinical trial/ (386681)
44 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 42 or 43 (3146810)
45 40 and 44 (1304)
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Description:
ID Search Hits
#1 MeSH descriptor: [Malnutrition] explode all trees 1982
#2 MeSH descriptor: [Wasting Syndrome] explode all trees 99
#3 MeSH descriptor: [Kwashiorkor] explode all trees 34
#4 malnutrition* or malnourish* or mal-nutrition* or mal-nourish*:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 1690
#5 wasting or wasted or stunting or stunted or growth-falter* or marasmus or Kwashiorkor:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 980
#6 MeSH descriptor: [Child Nutrition Disorders] explode all trees 127
#7 MeSH descriptor: [Infant Nutrition Disorders] explode all trees 84
#8 MeSH descriptor: [Protein-Energy Malnutrition] explode all trees 226
#9 undernutrition* or undernourish* or under-nutrition or under-nourish*:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 300
#10 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 4162
#11 baby or babies or infant* or child* or toddler* or preschool* or pre-school* or schoolchild*:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 93565
#12 MeSH descriptor: [Infant] explode all trees 13196
#13 MeSH descriptor: [Child] explode all trees 106
#14 #11 or #12 or #13 93565
#15 #10 and #14 1529
#16 MeSH descriptor: [Foods, Specialized] explode all trees 2964
#17 MeSH descriptor: [Food, Fortified] explode all trees 1203
#18 MeSH descriptor: [Food, Formulated] explode all trees 1067
#19 MeSH descriptor: [Nutrition Therapy] explode all trees 7033
#20 (food* or diet*) and (complement* or formulat* or therap* or supplement* or fortif*)].ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) 22268
Concealment should not usually be a problem (Higgins 2008). However, when there is only a small cluster domain imbalance:

• Inadequate: when additional recruiting was done after randomisation.
• Adequate: when no recruiting was done after randomisation.

Recruitment bias can occur when individuals are recruited to the trial after the clusters have been randomised (Higgins 2008). The types of participants recruited can be influenced by the knowledge of whether the specific cluster is an intervention or a control cluster.

- Adequate: when no recruiting was done after randomisation.
- Inadequate: when additional recruiting was done after randomisation.
- Unclear: when no reporting was done regarding the timing of recruiting all participants.

## Appendix 2. Additional domains for cluster RCTs

### Domain 1: recruitment bias

Recruitment bias can occur when individuals are recruited to the trial after the clusters have been randomised (Higgins 2008). The types of participants recruited can be influenced by the knowledge of whether the specific cluster is an intervention or a control cluster.

- Adequate: when no recruiting was done after randomisation.
- Inadequate: when additional recruiting was done after randomisation.
- Unclear: when no reporting was done regarding the timing of recruiting all participants.

### Domain 2: baseline imbalance

Cluster-randomised trials often randomise all clusters at once, therefore, a lack of allocation concealment should not usually be a problem (Higgins 2008). However, when there is only a small
number of clusters, there is a possibility of chance baseline imbalances between the randomised groups. This may affect either the clusters or the individuals.

- Adequate: when the baseline comparability of clusters is sufficient, or when statistical adjustment for baseline characteristics occurred (Higgins 2008).
- Inadequate: when there are significant differences between clusters and no statistical adjustments for baseline characteristics were made accordingly.
- Unclear: when no reporting was done regarding baseline characteristics, or when it is not clear whether the differences between the clusters were significant.

**Domain 3: loss of clusters**

It is possible that complete clusters may be lost from a trial, and have to be omitted from the analysis (Higgins 2008). In the same way as for missing outcome data in individually randomised trials, this may lead to bias in cluster-randomised trials. In addition, missing outcomes for individuals within clusters may also lead to a risk of bias in cluster-randomised trials.

- Adequate: there were no missing data, or the missing data were addressed in the correct manner.
- Inadequate: there were missing data and it was dealt with in a way that could have introduced bias.
- Unclear: when no reporting was done regarding missing data (either complete clusters or individuals within clusters), or when it is unclear whether the authors of the primary study have dealt with the missing data adequately (e.g. acceptable statistical adjustments).