

How stunting cutoffs can fail

Hidden Undernutrition: How universal cutoffs can fail to capture stunting in low and middle income countries

Joseph V. Hackman¹, Daniel J. Hruschka¹

Arizona State University, School of Human Evolution and Social Change

Abstract =273, Main Text (6261), Tables (3), Figures (6), References (59)

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Craig Hadley, Peter Rohloff, Ben Trumble, Gert Stulp, Rebecca Sear, and Alexandria Drake for constructive comments on the manuscript.

Funding: DJH acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation grant BCS-1150813, jointly funded by Programs in Cultural Anthropology, Social Psychology Program and Decision, Risk, and Management Sciences, and BCS-1658766, jointly funded by Programs in Cultural Anthropology and Methodology, Measurement and Statistics, and support from the Virginia G Piper Charitable Trust through an award to Mayo Clinic/ASU Obesity Solutions. The funder had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist. Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Author Contributions: All authors contributed equally.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to : Joseph Hackman, School of Human Evolution and Social Change: Arizona State University, 85287, United States of America, Email: jhackman@asu.edu

ABSTRACT

Stunting—or impaired child growth due to undernutrition—has multiple negative health effects, making it a top global health priority. The current benchmark for classifying stunting assumes a universal model of growth with height-for-age z-score (HAZ) cutoffs set by the WHO. However, this universal model may hide hotspots of stunting if populations differ in HAZ in ways that are independent of undernutrition. We assess the potential magnitude of this bias by decomposing variation in HAZ from 1,406,609 children from 63 low- and middle-income countries into two components: 1) a component shaped by environmental inputs—poverty, infectious disease, inadequate sanitation, and healthcare access, and 2) a country-specific basal starting point that is independent of such inputs. After removing the effects of numerous environmental inputs, we find that different countries have reliably and substantially different basal starting points in average HAZ scores (a range of 1.7 SD). These country-specific starting points, which we define as basal HAZ, are not associated with key indicators of undernutrition (e.g., infant mortality and average calorie deficit). By contrast, average increases in HAZ above a country's starting point, which we define as accrued HAZ, show strong correlations with these same variables, suggesting that low accrued HAZ captures standard definitions of stunting as impaired growth due to undernutrition. Using these two components, we show how universal cutoffs can underestimate stunting in specific world regions (e.g., sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean), where children in even very deprived situations start off taller. As stunting is a high priority global health problem, standards that are sensitive to such population variation in

How stunting cutoffs can fail

healthy growth should improve efforts to target those most vulnerable to childhood undernutrition.

KEYWORDS: Stunting, Malnutrition, Growth, Child Health, Universal Growth

How stunting cutoffs can fail

INTRODUCTION

Stunting, or impaired linear growth due to undernutrition, has numerous negative consequences for health, cognitive ability, and long-term academic and economic achievement¹⁻³. With an estimated 165 million children under the age of 5 currently suffering from stunting^{2,4,5}, monitoring, targeting, and preventing stunting has become a key global health priority⁶⁻⁸.

It is well-established that lack of adequate nutrition can lead to reduced height-for-age, and that nutrition interventions improve both child growth and longer term adult health and economic outcomes⁹⁻¹². However, other factors, including genetic variation, also contribute to variation in height-for-age¹³⁻¹⁶. Thus, in order to accurately identify stunting, it is important therefore to distinguish that component of low HAZ which is due to inadequate nutritional inputs from that which is due to other factors independent of poor health. Without careful attention to this issue, one might incorrectly infer that a child or population with relatively high HAZ is nutritionally better off than populations with lower HAZ.

One way to characterize the global variation in HAZ uses a two-component model of linear growth. According to this model, the first component of variation in HAZ results from improvements in environmental inputs, such as nutrition, infectious disease burden and access to healthcare (henceforth, accrued HAZ). The second component of variation in HAZ exists independent of such improvements, and reflects population-specific basal levels (henceforth, basal HAZ). According to this model, variation in basal HAZ would represent the variation observed between populations when nutrition and resource inputs are held constant. There are a number of hypothesized factors

How stunting cutoffs can fail

contributing to population differences in basal HAZ, including genetic factors and other forms of intergenerational transmission ¹⁷.

Current global standards for interpreting HAZ are based on a universal model of healthy child growth ^{18–21}, which assume that variation in the second component (i.e. basal HAZ) is sufficiently small relative to variation in the first component that a single standard will provide comparable estimates of undernutrition and healthy growth across all populations. In other words, the growth of healthy, exclusively breastfed children does not vary substantially across populations, and a single set of growth curves is sufficient to describe a universal norm of childhood growth. The World Health Organization's (WHO) Multicentre Growth Reference Study (MGRS) established such a set of curves, from sites in six countries around the world—Brazil, Ghana, India, Norway, Oman and the United States. The findings of this study now serve as the WHO's standard target for childhood growth across all countries, with thresholds for classifying stunting at -2SD for moderate stunting and -3SD for severe stunting ^{22–25}. According to the universal model underwriting these standards, any between-population differences in HAZ are a result of differences in contemporary environmental inputs, such as nutrition, infectious disease burden, and access to health care.

By contrast, an ecological or population-specific model proposes that the basal component is sufficiently large, such that populations can differ in HAZ for reasons unrelated to environmental differences in nutritional deficits and other kinds of deprivation. According to this view, a universal reference for stunting can seriously bias estimates of undernutrition across populations by conflating the variation due to deprivation (i.e. accrued HAZ) with the variation in basal HAZ (Hruschka & Hadley,

How stunting cutoffs can fail

2016). Figure 1 illustrates how bias can be introduced when comparing two populations that have similar observed HAZ scores (Figure 1).

Determining the relative contributions of these two components to height-for-age has implications for research in a range of fields that rely on height-for-age as a measure of healthy growth. This includes current global efforts to monitor undernutrition^{8,27} and to track progress towards international development goals^{6,7}, as well as studies of the impact of culture²⁸, kinship and family dynamics²⁹, ethnic disparities³⁰, anti-poverty and development programs³¹ on well-being. For example, the use of HAZ scores to compare undernutrition across major world regions has spurred a substantial literature on an “Asian Enigma”, whereby children in South Asian countries have unusually low HAZ scores despite the country’s relatively high incomes³². Due to the frequent use of HAZ as a proxy for stunting and undernutrition, the measure (HAZ) and concept (stunting due to undernutrition) are often used synonymously in these literatures. Thus, identifying how much each of the two components contribute to observed height-for-age in different populations should improve interpretation of HAZ as a measure of stunting across a range of fields.

Evidence from another measure of human growth—weight-for-height—in both children and adults indicates that the basal component can contribute substantially to population variation in human growth (Hruschka & Hadley, 2016; Hadley & Hruschka, 2017).

Moreover, these population differences in the basal component can emerge early in development³³ and are strongly correlated with the genetic affinity of human populations (Hruschka, Hadley, Brewis, & Stojanowski, 2015). Using the two-component model for weight-for-height, one study found that universal cutoffs that

How stunting cutoffs can fail

ignore basal differences potentially underestimate global rates of overweight by 400-500 million in adults (Hruschka, Hadley, & Brewis, 2014) and can shift rankings of those populations most at risk for wasting in children (Hruschka & Hadley, 2016; Hruschka et al., 2014). Empirical studies across a wider range of countries have also provided mixed support for the sufficiency of the universal standard for growth in height. The most common approach has been to examine growth curves of privileged children raised in optimal, yet diverse environments. This can involve selecting only those children in low- and middle-income countries who are reared in ideal conditions ^{19,36} or examining growth curves among children in high-income countries ^{37,38}. These studies have shown mixed results, with some supporting a single standard of healthy growth ¹⁹ and others indicating the need for population-specific standards of healthy growth ³⁹. A crucial limitation of these studies is that they are restricted to countries with sufficiently large samples of privileged children. For example, one recent study across the full range of international Demographic and Health Surveys considered less than 0.1% of children, drawing nearly two-thirds of its sample from one country (Dominican Republic) and an additional 16% from one world region—Latin American and Caribbean countries ³⁶.

Here we use a complementary approach to the typical focus on privileged populations. Instead, we focus on growth data from populations who live in situations of extreme resource scarcity and infectious disease burden to establish a lower limit to the effect of environmental inputs on childhood growth. We do this by first modeling the effects of a wide range of environmental variables that have been shown to influence child growth, including economic resources, disease burden, healthcare access, and hygiene and sanitation at multiple levels (e.g., household, community, and country). With this, we

How stunting cutoffs can fail

demonstrate that at extreme levels of deprivation, mean HAZ bottoms out and reaches a minimum (or basal) level below which further deprivation has little effect on growth. Moreover, this basal HAZ level differs substantially between countries, and these differences are uncorrelated with other country-level indicators of nutrition and mortality. These findings support an interpretation of basal HAZ as the component of variation in HAZ that is independent of environmental inputs and is unrelated to mortality. By contrast, the remaining component of HAZ (i.e. accrued HAZ) is strongly correlated with country-level calorie deficits and mortality, indicating that accrued HAZ is the component of HAZ that reflects the standard definition of stunting as compromised height due to environmental insults. Ideally stunting cutoffs would capture the accrued component of HAZ, and adjusting stunting cutoffs for basal HAZ is one way to accomplish this. We outline such an approach, and show that population-sensitive cutoffs can give a very different picture of the relative prevalence of stunting in different parts of the world.

In this paper, we first describe the method in more detail and apply it to Demographic and Health Survey data on 1,406,609 children from 63 low- and middle-income countries (1990-2017). Next, we estimate survey-level estimates of accrued HAZ (first component), and reliable and stable country-level estimates of basal HAZ (second component). We validate these estimates with survey-level variables that represent environmental inputs and health outcomes we would expect to be associated with accrued HAZ (but not basal HAZ) under a two-component model. These include infant mortality and extent of calorie deficits for a given country in a given year. We then use country-level basal HAZ estimates to calculate revised population-sensitive cutoffs for

How stunting cutoffs can fail

severe and moderate stunting and identify those countries and regions where estimates based on a universal standard might give much lower estimates of stunting than population-sensitive cutoffs.

This approach permits us to examine population variation in growth in low and middle-income countries that are usually missed by studies using strict inclusion criteria of children reared in economically advantaged conditions. It also permits us to estimate how universal growth standards might underestimate the burden of stunting in specific low- and middle-income countries and regions.

METHODS

Data: Demographic and Health Surveys are nationally representative household surveys that collect information on a range of health indicators. We used data from 198 surveys from 1990 to 2017 from 63 countries, which have necessary data on child growth and household resources (See SM for all exclusions). We initially present the effects of resources on HAZ across four age categories (0-5 months $n = 146,723$, 6-11 months $n = 157,044$, 12-35 months $n = 584,488$, and 36-60 months $n = 509,321$, All ages $n=1,425,500$). Prior research has shown that cross-sectional HAZ among 0-11 months may not be a particularly reliable measure of malnutrition, an observation that has prompted clinicians to prefer monitoring of growth velocity for children ages 0-11 month as a more sensitive measure of nutritional status⁴⁰. Thus, in order to decompose HAZ into resource-dependent and -independent components we limit subsequent analyses to 12-60 month children ($N=1,100,818$), where HAZ is a more reliable indicator of nutritional status.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

Height-for-Age Zscores (HAZ): We used the WHO SPSS anthro macros (<http://www.who.int/childgrowth/software/en/>) to estimate HAZ for all children in the full sample. The WHO guidelines suggest excluding children with implausible anthropometric values of +/- 6 SD. However, the lower limit of effects of undernourishment remains relatively undefined, with some reports of HAZ values of -6 to -7SD as plausible ⁴¹. Thus, we excluded children with +6/-7 SD.

Explanatory Variables

The explanatory variables broadly represent sources of influence on childhood growth, ranging from resource access to hygiene and infectious disease exposure ⁴². We indicate whether these variables are measured at the household, sampling cluster, or country-level.

Absolute Wealth Estimates (AWE)—Household-level: We estimated the absolute wealth of households using a newly developed asset-based approach that estimates comparable household wealth estimates in absolute units— 2011-constant international dollars with purchasing power parity ⁴³. This facilitates comparisons of the wealth of households both within a country across different survey years, as well as across survey populations. We used two measures of household wealth per capita: (1) a continuous log-transformed value for AWE and (2) a categorical variable binned into sixteen categories, each representing a 50% increase over the prior category [$< \$90$ through $> \text{approx. } \$36,000$], for the full sample.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

Healthcare access—Child-level. We include a binary coded variable which indicates if the child's mother had four or more antenatal visits and a binary variable indicating if the child was born in a medical facility.

Hygiene and Sanitation—Cluster-level. We control for the impact of sanitation on child height using a cluster level variable of the proportion of households in the cluster who engage in open defecation. Headey et al 2016 reported nonlinearities in the association between cluster-level measures of open defecation and HAZ measurements.

Specifically, they found steep negative association for proportions below 0.30, after which the association becomes relatively flat. To address these nonlinearities, we include two variables capturing cluster-level exposure to open defecation. The first is the raw continuous proportion, ranging from 0 to 1. The second is a spline of the raw proportion centered on 0.3 proportion and indicates how the effect of open-defecation changes as the proportion exceeds 0.3.

Exposure to infectious disease—Household- Cluster- and country-level. To account for infectious disease exposure, we include a binary variable indicating whether the child experienced diarrhea within the last two weeks. Second, infectious disease burden at the cluster level may provide a more reliable indicator of chronic disease exposure. To account for exposure at the cluster level, we calculated the proportion of households in a sample cluster that reported any child experiencing diarrhea.

We also include country-level data from the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) on 5-year estimates of the prevalence of childhood HIV and Tuberculosis ⁴⁴. HIV-infected children have been shown to experience poor growth ⁴⁵. We apply a simple interpolation procedure to generate survey-year specific estimates from the 5-year prevalence data.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

For example, if the DHS survey occurred in 2003, we use the difference between the 2000 and 2005 GBD estimates to calculate a yearly rate of change and generate a specific estimate for the year 2003. The estimates were scaled so that one unit increase in the variable is associated with an increase of 1 case per 100.

Mean Proportion of Calories from Fat – Country-level. As stunting is not just the result of a chronic lack of calories but also a result of lack of specific macronutrient intake, we include country-level measures of average proportion of daily calories that come from fat ⁴⁶. These data come from the FAO stat database (<http://www.fao.org/faostat>), which uses household food balance sheets to estimate average, per-capita household dietary energy intake as well as total grams of fat, protein, and carbohydrates. These three-year country-average estimates were available for all survey years before 2014. We used the latest country values (from 2013) for all surveys in 2014 (N=51,413), 2015 (N=292330), and 2016 (N=23,248). We estimated the proportion of calories that come from fat by converting the per-capita grams of fat into calories and dividing by total estimated per-capital calories. We used calories from fat because the average proportion of calories from protein varied less across countries (ranging from 0.07-0.15) and was uncorrelated with fat or carbohydrate caloric intake.

Study Year. We include a year variable indicating year since 1990, our earliest set of surveys, to capture any potential increases in HAZ over time that are not captured by our explanatory variables, and to ensure our estimates of basal HAZ are set to the lowest estimated value.

Household and Individual Demographic Variables. All models control for urban residence and number of siblings born of the same mother. We also include maternal

How stunting cutoffs can fail

education, as a four-level ordinal variable indicating none, primary, secondary or higher education. To account for any gender differences in the effects of the explanatory variables on HAZ we run separate models for boys and girls in the full analytic sample.

Validation Measures

To validate our estimates of the two components of HAZ (basal and accrued HAZ), we explore the associations between these estimates and country/year-level estimates of all cause infant mortality, estimated caloric deficits, as well as independent measures of country-level economic productivity.

Infant Mortality. Estimates of infant and under-five mortality rates for the survey year were taken from the World Bank Indicators website

(<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.IMRT.IN>). These estimates were developed by the UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation at childmortality.org.

Estimated Caloric Deficit. Depth of caloric deficit uses national food balance sheets to estimate the number of calories, on average, that would be needed to lift a population's undernourished from their status. It is estimated as the difference between average dietary energy requirement and the average dietary energy consumption of those classified as food-deprived in a population. This reflects the population's average intensity of food deprivation (<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SN.ITK.DFCT>). It is calculated by estimating the difference between average dietary requirement and the average consumption of the undernourished population within a country. This is then normalized by the population total.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

GDP per Capita: We use GDP per capita as a country-level measure of economic capacity. To facilitate comparisons across countries and survey years, we use GDP per capita in purchasing power parity-based constant 2011 international dollars (<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.KD>).

ANALYSIS PLAN

Estimating Basal HAZ. The concept of basal HAZ is based on the assumption that in situations of extreme deprivation the relationship between environmental inputs and HAZ will reach a bottom. At this low point, or basal HAZ, declining resources no longer lead to declining HAZ. To illustrate bottoming out of the relationship between resources and HAZ across the full sample, we first plot the mean HAZ among all children in four age categories - 0-5 months, 6-11 months, 12-35 months and 36-60 months - across 16 categories of household wealth per capita (Figure 2).

We then compare two models that predict HAZ as the function of a much broader range of environmental inputs, including household socioeconomic status, disease burden, access to healthcare, and dietary composition. The first model assumes that HAZ is simply a linear function of these variables, and thus permits no bottoming out of the relationship with environmental inputs at extreme deprivation. The second model uses a sigmoid function that permits the effect of environmental inputs on HAZ to bottom out in situations of extreme deprivation. Specifically:

$$HAZ = \frac{a}{1 + e^{(c - \sum \beta_k X_k)}} + d_i + \gamma YEAR + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

How stunting cutoffs can fail

where $\sum \beta_k X_k$ is a linear combination of the individual, household, cluster, and country level environmental inputs representing increasing resources. This model includes all of the covariates described above.

In the model, parameter d_i is the low point at which HAZ bottoms out for population i . This is the expected HAZ for a population when all resources reach their lowest possible value and represents our best estimate of the population's basal HAZ. In this sense, d_i is a population-specific starting point from which a population can increase as it enjoys better nutrition, lower disease burden and other improved environmental inputs. Importantly, the model permits this d parameter to vary across surveys and countries, so that we can assign each country its own starting point and characterize the variation in that starting point.

To estimate country-specific basal HAZ values (i.e., the d parameter), we use the conditional modes of the random effects for each country (using restricted maximum likelihood REML), which are similar to the Empirical Best Unbiased Linear Predictions (EBLUPs) from linear mixed effects models (Bates, 2010, Bates et al., 2017; Faraway, 2016; Zuur, Ieno, Walker, Saveliev, & Smith, 2009). These are the variable intercepts for each country in the nonlinear model and represent our estimates of basal HAZ for that population. We use these values to estimate mean accrued HAZ for each survey by subtracting basal HAZ from a survey's mean HAZ (mean HAZ – basal HAZ).

Parameter a is the distance between this bottoming out point and the upper limit of the sigmoid curve relating resources and HAZ. This represents the total potential increase in HAZ above the baseline across the full spectrum of resources, and thus represents the maximum environmentally induced increase in HAZ we would expect for a

How stunting cutoffs can fail

population. In supplemental materials, we show that this potential increase (a) does not substantially change by country. The mixed effect model was estimated using the nlme function in R ⁵⁰.

Testing for bottoming out of the effects of resources. To determine if the sigmoid model that permits bottoming out of the relationship between environmental inputs and HAZ provides better fit to the data than a strictly linear model without any bottoming out, we assess whether this sigmoid model fit the data better than a linear model with the same variable specifications using Akaike Information Criteria of models estimated with maximum likelihood.

Sensitivity analyses. We also tested an interaction between wealth and urban residence, to account for the possibility raised by an early reader of the paper that wealth may have smaller effects among rural subsistence farmers than urban residents. However, it was not significant so it was not retained in the model.

Assessing reliability of basal HAZ and the validity of accrued and basal HAZ. If basal HAZ represents relatively stable country-level differences in HAZ that are independent of environmental input, then they should not vary between surveys from the same country or between sexes from the same survey. We assess the reliability of survey-year estimates of basal HAZ as indicators of country-level basal HAZ by estimating how much of between-survey variation is due to stable between-country differences. We

How stunting cutoffs can fail

assess the reliability of sex-specific estimates of basal HAZ by assessing the correlation between country-level basal HAZ estimated separately for girls and for boys. Based on the high reliability of country-specific estimates across surveys and between sexes, we use country-specific estimates for further analyses.

While basal HAZ is a country-level concept, accrued HAZ and observed HAZ can change within a country over time as environmental inputs change. To assess the validity of the decomposition of HAZ into country-level basal HAZ and survey-level mean accrued HAZ estimates we compare these estimates with contemporary all-cause infant mortality, estimated caloric deficits, as well as GDP per capita. If basal HAZ is independent of undernutrition, then we expect little correlation between basal HAZ and these measures of resources and mortality. By contrast, the mean accrued HAZ for a survey is expected to capture the portion of HAZ that is sensitive to nutrition and resource inputs, and thus should show stronger associations with these validation measures than the observed HAZ. Specifically, accrued HAZ (but not basal HAZ) should be negatively correlated with calorie deficits and all-cause infant mortality and positively correlated with GDP per capita. Furthermore, the correlations with accrued HAZ should be larger than the correlations with observed HAZ, since we are partialling out the variance in HAZ due to basal differences.

Calculating country-specific cutoffs for severe stunting. After establishing that basal HAZ is independent of environmental inputs and accrued HAZ captures the component of HAZ that is sensitive to environmental inputs, we estimate the extent to which universal cutoffs bias stunting estimates relative to population-sensitive cutoffs. To

How stunting cutoffs can fail

calculate a population-sensitive cutoff for a country, we assume there is a benchmark of accrued HAZ that a child must achieve to surpass a stunting threshold. We also assume that children from different countries may start with different basal HAZ (Figure 2). Thus, a country-specific cutoff is the specific benchmark of accrued HAZ added to the country's basal HAZ.

A key part of the procedure is identifying how much HAZ a child must accrue over a population's basal level to surpass the stunting threshold (henceforth, the benchmark for accrued HAZ). One way to estimate this benchmark is to assume that the WHO stunting cutoffs are relatively good at classifying stunting in a well-studied population for which we have a basal HAZ estimate (henceforth, the reference population). We then ask how much accrued HAZ a child in that population must amass over and above the population's basal HAZ to surpass the WHO stunting threshold. This benchmark for accrued HAZ is then added to any country's basal HAZ to determine that country's specific stunting cutoff.

Importantly, the accrued HAZ benchmark will depend on the basal HAZ of the reference population used. Thus it is crucial to select a reference population in which the WHO cutoffs already accurately classify undernourished children as stunted. We use India as this reference population for a number of reasons. First, India has high rates of childhood stunting²⁵. Second, there is a long history of assessing malnutrition using childhood anthropometrics among Indian children^{51,52}. Third, India's capital was one of the sites used in the creation of the WHO standards²⁴. Finally, India is the most populous of countries in the dataset and constitutes a large part of the total sample (N=333,246; 24% of total sample). Again, by choosing India as the reference

How stunting cutoffs can fail

population, we are assuming that the WHO cutoffs correctly identify stunting based on HAZ scores in India. Changing the reference population will uniformly up- or down-shift stunting thresholds for all countries depending on the reference population's basal HAZ level. However, it will not change the relative ranking of those cutoffs between countries.

Using India for the purposes of these analyses, we calculate the accrued HAZ benchmark, which is how much accrued HAZ a child in India needs in order to surpass the WHO stunting cutoff and no longer be classified as stunted (Figure 2). Formally, the accrued HAZ benchmark is calculated as $Cutoff_{WHO} - bHAZ_{India}$. Where $Cutoff_{WHO}$ is the current WHO cutoff for stunting and $bHAZ_{India}$ is the basal HAZ for India. This benchmark means that any child, anywhere, that fails to accrue this specified amount of HAZ above their county-specific basal HAZ would be considered stunted (Figure 2).

We use this accrued HAZ benchmark to estimate the necessary HAZ for a child in a different country to achieve in order to avoid being classified as stunted. If the new country is Haiti, we add this accrued HAZ benchmark to Haiti's basal HAZ ($bHAZ_{Haiti}$) to identify the necessary observed HAZ for a child in Haiti to achieve in order to avoid being classified as stunted ($Cutoff_{Haiti}$). Specifically, the population-sensitive cutoff for Haiti would be calculate as follows:

$$Cutoff_{Haiti} = bHAZ_{Haiti} + (Cutoff_{WHO} - bHAZ_{India}) \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

To identify cutoffs for severe stunting we use $Cutoff_{WHO} = -3$ and for moderate stunting we use $Cutoff_{WHO} = -2$.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

Estimating bias in prevalence of stunting. Employing these new country-specific cutoffs, we used survey-weighted sample proportions to estimate the prevalence of moderate and severe stunting. We then compare these to stunting prevalence estimates based on the original WHO cutoffs.

RESULTS

The distribution of HAZ by age and wealth are presented in Table 1. Similar to previous cross-national assessments of HAZ, we found HAZ declined with age until around 12m where it stabilized^{53,54}. Second, the within- and between-survey variance in HAZ declined with age. Overall, 93%-94% of the variance in HAZ occurs across individual within surveys, with 6%-7% between surveys (SM Table S1). The mean HAZ by age category for each survey is presented in SM Table S2.

HEIGHT-FOR-AGE AND HOUSEHOLD WEALTH

Table 1 also presents the correlations between household wealth and HAZ. Total estimates of absolute household wealth were positively associated with HAZ estimates across the full dataset ($r=0.19$, $p<0.001$). Importantly, the associations between wealth and HAZ increased with age, with the highest correlation in the 36-60m age category ($r=0.27$, $p<0.001$). Crucially, across all age categories there was no association between wealth and HAZ for children in households below \$300 USD, providing the first indication of the presence of a bottoming out of the effect of wealth on HAZ.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

Plotting the mean HAZ by wealth also illustrates this bottoming out of the effects of material wealth on linear growth (Figure 3). These preliminary bivariate analyses show that HAZ scores are sensitive to household wealth for children 12-60 m and that the effect is similar for children 12-35 m and 36-60 m. However, HAZ scores are much less sensitive to increasing wealth among children 0-11 m, which is consistent with prior research on age-specific sensitivity of cross-sectional HAZ to environmental inputs ⁴⁰.

MODEL ESTIMATING BASAL HAZ

Consistent with the substantial effect of resources on HAZ, both linear and sigmoid models showed a significant and substantial effects of a range of environmental inputs on child HAZ (Table 2, Figure 4). Importantly, the sigmoid model (which permits bottoming out of the effect of environmental inputs on HAZ) provides a much better fit to the data than linear models that do not permit such bottoming out (SM Table S3). The survey-specific estimates of where HAZ bottoms out (estimates of basal HAZ) also show substantial variation (Figure 4). Specifically, the survey-level basal HAZ estimates showed a full range of 1.8 SD across all surveys for boys and 1.8 SD for girls (SM Figure S2 & SM Table S4).

RELIABILITY OF BASAL HAZ ESTIMATES

Most of the variation in survey-level basal HAZ estimates were attributable to country-level differences (86-87%), indicating that there were reliable country-level differences in basal HAZ (SM Table S5 & SM Figure S2). Furthermore, the separate, country-level estimates of basal HAZ for boys and girls showed strong associations with each other ($R^2=0.94$). These results indicate that country-level estimates are reliable, and we focus

How stunting cutoffs can fail

remaining analyses on country-level estimates of basal HAZ rather than estimates for a specific survey year. The full range of country-level basal HAZ estimates was 1.7 SD for boys and 1.6 SD for girls between countries, which is similar to the ranges identified from survey-level estimates (SM Table S4 and SM Figure S2).

VALIDATING BASAL HAZ

According to the two component model, basal HAZ is stable within populations, while accrued HAZ and standard observed HAZ can vary within countries as environmental inputs change. Table 3 presents the correlations of country-level basal HAZ, survey-level observed HAZ, and survey-level accrued HAZ with key validation measures of environmental inputs and health outcomes. As expected mean observed HAZ has a strong negative correlation with measures of infant mortality (Girls $R^2=0.46$, Boys $R^2=0.39$), and estimated caloric deficits (Girls $R^2=0.17$, Boys $R^2=0.14$), as well as a positive association with measures of economic capacity, GDP per capita (Girls $R^2=0.37$, Boys $R^2=0.33$).

By contrast, basal HAZ estimates show no association with any of the validation measures, supporting the interpretation of basal HAZ as a measure unrelated to key environmental inputs or health outcomes (Figure 5, see SM Figure S3 for boys). While basal HAZ shows low to non-existent associations with these indicators of nutritional adequacy, economic capacity, and health outcomes, accrued HAZ shows strong associations with infant mortality (Girls $R^2=0.55$, Boys $R^2=0.45$), and estimated caloric deficits (Girls $R^2=0.28$, Boys $R^2=0.24$), as well as a positive association with measures of economic capacity, GDP per capita (Girls $R^2=0.48$, Boys $R^2=0.44$). In all cases, accrued HAZ showed much stronger association with validation measures than the

How stunting cutoffs can fail

standard HAZ measures. This suggests that accrued HAZ captures the component of observed HAZ that reflects standard definitions of stunting as compromised growth due to environmental insults.

BASAL HAZ AND ADJUSTED STUNTING CUTOFFS

The basal HAZ for India (our selected reference population) is -3.21 SD for boys and -3.11 for girls. If we use India as the reference population as described above, then the necessary accrued HAZ to surpass the WHO moderate stunting threshold is

$(Cutoff_{WHO} - bHAZ_{India}) = (-2.00 - (-3.21)) = 1.21$. Equation 1 would estimate the cutoff for moderate stunting for a new country, Haiti, as $(1.21 + bHAZ_{Haiti})$ (boys) and $1.11 + bHAZ_{Haiti}$ (girls), where $bHAZ_{Haiti}$ is the country-specific basal HAZ for Haiti.

Similarly, the cutoff for severe stunting is $0.21 + bHAZ_{Haiti}$ (boys) and $0.11 + bHAZ_{Haiti}$ (girls). In other words, any boy in Haiti with a HAZ less than $0.21 + bHAZ_{Haiti}$ would be classified as severely stunted. Using India as the reference and adjusting stunting cutoffs for all countries based on country-specific basal HAZ estimates, we assess the changes in prevalence estimates focusing specifically on severe stunting. Importantly, the extent to which estimates of severe stunting change between universal and country-specific standards is not uniform across the world (SM Figure S5 and SM Table S7).

Figure 6 shows the differences in the prevalence of severe stunting across populations, when estimated with the WHO cutoffs and the new, country-specific cutoffs (SM Table S8). Nearly all countries have a higher estimated prevalence of severe stunting using the country-specific cutoffs. The few exceptions are Bangladesh, Pakistan, Yemen, and Guatemala which have even lower basal HAZ estimates than India, and thus have lower country-specific stunting cutoffs.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

As expected, populations with relatively higher basal HAZ estimates saw the greatest increase in estimated rates of severe stunting when using country-specific cutoffs. Notably, the countries with the greatest increase in estimated stunting are largely in sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Latin America and the Caribbean with large populations of African ancestry, such as Haiti. Compared to estimates from universal cutoffs, Zimbabwe had on average 19% more estimated severe stunting in all survey years (1994, 2005, 2010). Swaziland saw 20% more estimated severe stunting for the survey year 2006. Morocco had 22% more in the 1992 survey and 15% more in the 2003 survey. In the western hemisphere Haiti had on average 18% more severe stunting for all four survey years (1994, 2000, 2006, and 2012).

DISCUSSION

While the World Health Organization's Multicentre Growth Reference Study built a standard using data from children reared in optimal environments, we describe here a complementary method for identifying the range of healthy and unhealthy growth by taking a bottom-up view. We establish a lower limit for the effect of resources on childhood growth, by showing a bottoming out effect of resources on height. We further identify country-specific lower limits—basal HAZ—and show that country differences between basal HAZ estimates are substantial, reliable, and independent of other country-level measures of nutrition (i.e. calorie deficit), economic resources (i.e. GDP per capita), and health outcomes (infant mortality). Adjusting stunting cutoffs for each country's basal HAZ give a very different picture of risk for stunting in different parts of the world. Most notably, it suggests that current universal cutoffs set by the WHO

How stunting cutoffs can fail

underestimate stunting in specific world regions where children on average grow taller even in extremely deprived circumstances.

The WHO holds the position that since ~90-95% of the variance in HAZ falls within populations, any between-group differences can be effectively ignored^{18,55,56}. The between- and within-population variance reported here falls within the ranges reported by the MGRS³⁸. However, we also demonstrate that even a small amount of between-population variation in basal HAZ can lead to substantial underreporting of stunting in specific world regions depending on the reference population one uses.

The WHO standard creates a powerful policy message that when needs are met, children grow very similarly regardless of where they live or their ethnic background. While it is true that increasing economic resources and nutrition is associated with increase linear growth across these samples, populations also appear to differ (often substantially) in their basal levels. By assuming that all children have the same starting point at extremes of deprivation, universal cutoffs may neglect children in countries and regions where healthy HAZ tends to be higher. Moreover, using a reference population that is well-studied in the nutrition literature—India—we find that current standards may underestimate the proportion of stunted and severely stunted children in the entire global sample.

Limitations & Future Directions

There are a number of limitations worth noting. First, we chose country of residence as the basis from grouping individuals into populations for a number of reasons, including the availability of country-level indicators and the use of countries as a common unit for

How stunting cutoffs can fail

global health monitoring. However, finer-grained estimated of variation in basal HAZ may be achieved by examining finer-grained subgroupings within countries based on subdistrict of residence and ethnolinguistic affiliation ²⁶. Second, to further calibrate accrued HAZ as an indicator of undernutrition and to assess its improvement over universal cutoffs for tracking development, we need more direct markers of economic, nutritional, and health care resources. A number of explanatory variables used in our model are not measured at the level of the household, but at the cluster or population levels. Finer-grained measurements of infectious disease exposure, dietary quality and diversity, and health care access at the household level would help refine these estimates of basal HAZ across populations. Finally, comparing HAZ with other resource-sensitive development indicators across populations may also improve our understanding of the meaning of HAZ as a measure of undernutrition. Standardized measures of cognitive development would be ideal ^{57,58} as an alternative indicator of adequate development. Like height, cognitive development is sensitive to resource inputs, indeed showing strong correlations with HAZ ⁵⁹. Such an additional measure would help determine when variation in height reflects undernutrition and when it does not.

Conclusion

This work adds to a growing body of literature showing the importance of incorporating population variation in body size when using anthropometrics to assess health globally ²⁶. The approach taken here opens up the possibility of assessing population differences in growth without the restricted sampling of only those children raised in environments deemed ideal. Such an approach would add to our understanding of the

How stunting cutoffs can fail

full range of human childhood growth (Christensen et al., 2016; Natale & Rajagopalan, 2014), it also has the potential to identify variation in the meaning of HAZ as a measure of undernutrition in different worldwide populations, and to identify those populations that might be missed by universal standards for normal growth.

REFERENCES

1. Victora CG, Adair L, Fall C, et al. Maternal and Child Undernutrition 2 Maternal and child undernutrition : consequences for adult health and human capital. 2008;371:340-357. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61692-4
2. de Onis M, Blössner M, Borghi E. Prevalence and trends of stunting among pre-school children, 1990–2020. *Public Health Nutr.* 2012;15(01):142-148. doi:10.1017/S1368980011001315
3. Prendergast AJ, Humphrey JH. The stunting syndrome in developing countries. *Paediatr Int Child Health.* 2014;34(4):250-265. doi:10.1179/2046905514Y.0000000158
4. Angood C, Khara T, Dolan C, et al. Research priorities on the relationship between wasting and stunting. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(5):1-13. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153221
5. Kim J. Remarks by World Bank Group President Jim Yong Kim at the Early Childhood Development Event. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/speech/2016/04/14/remarks-world-bank-group-president-jim-yong-kim-early-childhood-development>. Published 2016. Accessed July 7, 2017.
6. De Onis M, Dewey KG, Borghi E, et al. The world health organization’s global target for reducing childhood stunting by 2025: Rationale and proposed actions. *Matern Child Nutr.* 2013;9(S2):6-26. doi:10.1111/mcn.12075
7. Stevens GA, Finucane MM, Paciorek CJ, et al. Trends in mild, moderate, and severe stunting and underweight, and progress towards MDG 1 in 141 developing countries: A systematic analysis of population representative data. *Lancet.* 2012;380(9844):824-834. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60647-3
8. Osgood-Zimmerman A, Milllear AI, Stubbs RW, et al. Mapping child growth failure in Africa between 2000 and 2015. *Nature.* 2018;555(7694):41-47. doi:10.1038/nature25760
9. Hoddinott J, Maluccio J, Behrman J, Flores R. Effect of a nutrition intervention during early childhood on economic productivity in Guatemalan adults. *Lancet.* 2008. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673608602056>. Accessed July 7, 2017.
10. Schroeder D, Martorell R, Rivera J. Age Differences in the Impact of Nutritional Supplementation. *J.* 1995. <http://search.proquest.com/openview/a5b1ebd8c6534e19a808965fe13ea1f9/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=34400>. Accessed July 7, 2017.
11. Waterlow J. Introduction. Causes and mechanisms of linear growth retardation (stunting). *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 1994. <http://archive.unu.edu/unupress/food2/UID06E/UID06E03.HTM>. Accessed July 7, 2017.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

12. Dewey KG, Begum K. Long-term consequences of stunting in early life. *Matern Child Nutr.* 2011;7(s3):5-18. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8709.2011.00349.x
13. Weedon M, Lettre G, Freathy R, Lindgren C. A common variant of HMGA2 is associated with adult and childhood height in the general population. *Nature.* 2007. <https://www.nature.com/ng/journal/v39/n10/abs/ng2121.html>. Accessed July 7, 2017.
14. Davies D. The importance of genetic influences on growth in early childhood with particular reference to children of Asiatic origin. *Linear growth Retard less.* 1988.
15. Goldstein H, Tanner JM. Ecological Considerations in the Creation and Use of Child Growth Standards. *Lancet.* 1980;315(8168):582-585. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(80)91067-3
16. Med-cir RJR. GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS IN GROWTH IN CHILDHOOD R J Rona GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS IN THE CONTROL OF GROWTH IN CHILDHOOD. *Br Med Bull.* 1981;37(3):265-272. <https://academic.oup.com/bmb/article-abstract/37/3/265/259533>. Accessed July 7, 2017.
17. Coffey D, Deaton A, Dreze J, Dean S, Tarozzi A. Stunting Amongst Children - Facts and Implications. *Econ Polit Wkly.* 2013;xlvi(34):68-70. http://www.princeton.edu/~deaton/downloads/Coffey_Deaton_Dreze_Tarozzi_Stunting_among_Children_EPW_2013.pdf. Accessed March 1, 2018.
18. WHO Multicentre growth reference study group. WHO Child Growth Standards based on length / height , weight and age. *Acta Paediatr.* 2006;Suppl 450:76-85. doi:10.1080/08035320500495548
19. Graitcer PL, Gentry EM. Measuring children: one reference for all. *Lancet.* 1981;318(8241):297-299.
20. de Onis M, Onyango AW, Borghi E, Garza C, Yang H. Comparison of the World Health Organization (WHO) Child Growth Standards and the National Center for Health Statistics/WHO international growth reference: implications for child health programmes. *Public Health Nutr.* 2006;9(07):942-947. doi:10.1017/PHN20062005
21. Borghi E, de Onis M, Garza C, et al. Construction of the World Health Organization child growth standards: Selection of methods for attained growth curves. *Stat Med.* 2006;25(2):247-265. doi:10.1002/sim.2227
22. Natale V, Rajagopalan A. Worldwide variation in human growth and the World Health Organization growth standards: a systematic review. *BMJ Open.* 2014;4(1):e003735. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003735
23. de Onis M, Yip R. The WHO Growth Chart: Historical Considerations and Current Scientific Issues. In: Nutrition in Pregnancy and Growth, ed. *Nutrition in Pregnancy and Growth.* ; 1996:74-89.
24. Onis M De, Garza C, Victora CG, Onyango AW, Edward A. The WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study : Planning , study design , and methodology.

How stunting cutoffs can fail

- 2004;25(1):15-26.
25. Martorell R, Young MF. Patterns of Stunting and Wasting: Potential Explanatory Factors. *Adv Nutr An Int Rev J*. 2012;3(2):227-233. doi:10.3945/an.111.001107
 26. Hruschka D, Hadley C. How much do universal anthropometric standards bias the global monitoring of obesity and undernutrition? *Obes Rev*. 2016;17(11):1030-1039. doi:10.1111/obr.12449
 27. Annan K. Data can help to end malnutrition across Africa. *Nature*. 2018;555(7694):7-7. doi:10.1038/d41586-018-02386-3
 28. McDade TW, Reyes-Garcia V, Blackinton P, Tanner S, Huanca T, Leonard WR. Ethnobotanical knowledge is associated with indices of child health in the Bolivian Amazon. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2007;104(15):6134-6139. doi:10.1073/pnas.0609123104
 29. Gibson MA, Mace R. Helpful grandmothers in rural Ethiopia: A study of the effect of kin on child survival and growth. *Evol Hum Behav*. 2005;26(6):469-482. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2005.03.004
 30. Lawson DW, Mulder MB, Ghiselli ME, et al. Ethnicity and child health in northern tanzania: Maasai pastoralists are disadvantaged compared to neighbouring ethnic groups. Wiley AS, ed. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(10):e110447. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0110447
 31. Behrman JR, Hoddinott J. Programme evaluation with unobserved heterogeneity and selective implementation: The mexican PROGRESA impact on child nutrition. *Oxf Bull Econ Stat*. 2005;67(4):547-569. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0084.2005.00131.x
 32. Deaton A, Drèze J. Food and Nutrition in India: Facts and Interpretations. *Econ Polit Wkly*. 2009;47(7):42-65. doi:10.2307/40278509
 33. Hadley C, Hruschka D. Population level differences in adult body mass emerge in infancy and early childhood: Evidence from a global sample of low and lower-income countries. *Am J Phys Anthropol*. 2014;154(2):232-238. doi:10.1002/ajpa.22496
 34. Hruschka D, Hadley C, Brewis AA, Stojanowski CM. Genetic population structure accounts for contemporary ecogeographic patterns in tropic and subtropic-dwelling humans. Jordan FM, ed. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(3):e0122301. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0122301
 35. Hruschka D, Hadley C, Brewis A. Disentangling basal and accumulated body mass for cross-population comparisons. *Am J Phys Anthropol*. 2014;153(4):542-550. doi:10.1002/ajpa.22452
 36. Karra M, Subramanian S, Fink G. Height in healthy children in low- and middle-income countries : *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2017;105(1):121-126. doi:10.3945/ajcn.116.136705.2
 37. Hui L, Schooling C, Cowling B. Are universal standards for optimal infant growth

How stunting cutoffs can fail

- appropriate? Evidence from a Hong Kong Chinese birth cohort. *Arch Dis*. 2008. <http://adc.bmj.com/content/93/7/561.short>. Accessed July 10, 2017.
38. Buuren S van, Wouwe J van. WHO child growth standards in action. *Arch Dis Child*. 2008. <http://adc.bmj.com/content/93/7/549.short>. Accessed July 1, 2017.
 39. Christesen HT, Pedersen BT, Pournara E, Petit IO, Júlíusson PB. Short stature: Comparison of WHO and national growth standards/references for height. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(6):1-11. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0157277
 40. Wright C. Identification and management of failure to thrive: a community perspective. *Arch Dis Child*. 2000;82:5-9. doi:10.1136/adc.82.1.5
 41. Bhattacharyya AK. Composite index of anthropometric failure (CIAF) classification: Is it more useful? *Bull World Health Organ*. 2006;84(4):335. doi:/S0042-96862006000400023
 42. Headey D, Hoddinott J, Park S. Drivers of nutritional change in four South Asian countries: a dynamic observational analysis. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2016;12(S1):210-218. doi:10.1111/mcn.12274
 43. Hruschka D, Gerkey D, Hadley C. Estimating the absolute wealth of households. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2015;93(7):483-490. doi:10.2471/BLT.14.147082
 44. IHME. GBD Results Tool. <http://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-results-tool>. Accessed August 20, 2001.
 45. Arpadi SM. Growth Failure in Children With HIV Infection. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2000;25:S37-S42. doi:10.1097/00126334-200010001-00006
 46. Branca F, Ferrari M. Impact of micronutrient deficiencies on growth: The stunting syndrome. *Ann Nutr Metab*. 2002;46(SUPPL. 1):8-17. doi:10.1159/000066397
 47. Bates DM. lme4: Mixed-effects modeling with R. 2010. <http://lme4.r-forge.r-project.org/IMMwR/lrgprt.pdf>. Accessed July 11, 2017.
 48. Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker N, Saveliev AA, Smith GM. *Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology with R*. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2009. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-87458-6
 49. Faraway JJ. Extending the linear model with R: generalized linear, mixed effects and nonparametric regression models. *Chapman Hall/CRC Texts Stat Sci Ser*. 2006:1-28. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0420.2006.00596_12.x
 50. Bates DM, Pinheiro JC, Bates DM, DebRoy S, Sarker D, R Core Team. *Linear and Nonlinear Mixed-Effects Models*. 2017. <http://newprairiepress.org/agstatconference>. Accessed July 9, 2017.
 51. Nandy S, Irving M, Gordon D, Subramanian S V, Smith GD. Policy and Practice Poverty , child undernutrition and morbidity : new evidence from India. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2005;011650(04):210-216. doi:/S0042-96862005000300014
 52. Radhakrishna R, Ravi C. Malnutrition in India: Trends and Determinants. *Econ*

How stunting cutoffs can fail

- Polit Wkly.* 2004;39(7):671-676. doi:10.2307/4414642
53. Shrimpton R, Victora CG, de Onis M, Lima RC, Blössner M, Clugston G. Worldwide timing of growth faltering: implications for nutritional interventions. *Pediatrics.* 2001;107(5):E75. doi:10.1542/PEDS.107.5.E75
 54. Leroy JL, Ruel M, Habicht J-P, Frongillo EA. Linear Growth Deficit Continues to Accumulate beyond the First 1000 Days in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Global Evidence from 51 National Surveys. *J Nutr.* 2014;144(9):1460-1466. doi:10.3945/jn.114.191981
 55. Habicht J, Yarbrough C, Martorell R, Malina R. Height and weight standards for preschool children: How relevant are ethnic differences in growth potential? *Lancet.* 1974.
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0140673674926634>. Accessed July 1, 2017.
 56. Onis M, Mercedes. Assessment of differences in linear growth among populations in the WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study. *Acta Paediatr.* 2007;95:56-65. doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2006.tb02376.x
 57. Kar BR, Rao SL, Chandramouli BA. Cognitive development in children with chronic protein energy malnutrition. *Behav Brain Funct.* 2008;4(1):31. doi:10.1186/1744-9081-4-31
 58. Tarleton JL, Haque R, Mondal D, Shu J, Farr BM, Petri WA. Cognitive effects of diarrhea, malnutrition, and *Entamoeba histolytica* infection on school age children in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2006;74(3):475-481. doi:74/3/475 [pii]
 59. Spears D. Height and cognitive achievement among Indian children. *Econ Hum Biol.* 2012;10(2):210-219. doi:10.1016/j.ehb.2011.08.005

How stunting cutoffs can fail


KEY MESSEGES:

1. Stunting standards based on universal models of growth can bias global estimates of stunting if population differences in HAZ are not due solely to poor health.
2. The resource-independent component of HAZ which differs substantially and reliably across populations and shows no association with indicators of resource access.
3. Current standards of estimating stunting can miss a substantial amount of stunting in populations with taller resource-independent components of HAZ.

How stunting cutoffs can fail


Figure 1. Hypothetical relationship between basal, accrued, and observed height in two populations.

In this situation, Indian and Haitian children have similar observed heights, and both are above the universal stunting cutoff. However, because they had different basal starting points, the Haitian children have experienced much smaller gains from environmental inputs (accrued height) than Indian children.



How stunting cutoffs can fail

Figure 2. Deriving country-specific cutoffs for stunting from basal HAZ and World Health Organization standards. Dashed lines represent the WHO cutoffs for moderate and severe stunting. Dotted lines represent basal HAZ estimates of the reference country, India, and two additional countries, Haiti and Guatemala. Panel (A) displays the current WHO cutoffs for both moderate and severe stunting. Panel (B) uses the basal HAZ of India as a reference population to calculate the difference between the basal HAZ_{India} and the current WHO stunting cutoffs, to calculate the accrued HAZ benchmark (solid arrows). Panel (C) applies the accrued HAZ benchmark Haiti, to create new stunting cutoffs. Since basal HAZ_{Haiti} is greater than basal HAZ_{India}, the new cutoffs for Haiti are higher than the current WHO cutoffs. Finally, panel (D) applies the difference to Guatemala, a population with a lower basal HAZ than the reference population, resulting in lower cutoffs than the WHO standards.



How stunting cutoffs can fail




Figure 3. Mean height-for-age z-scores by estimated household wealth per capita for the full sample split by age categories. Shaded regions represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean HAZ for a given wealth category. The x-axis reflects the mean wealth of the binned wealth category.

How stunting cutoffs can fail




Figure 4. Decomposing HAZ variation into country-specific starting points and resource-driven increases. Country-specific HAZ is plotted over increasing resources referenced by household wealth (See SM Figure S4 & Table S6). The dashed line

How stunting cutoffs can fail

represents the WHO cutoff for moderate stunting. Each country is represented by one curve, with highlights for India (orange) and Haiti (blue). Labelled countries highlight the range countries at the top 10% and the bottom 15% of the distribution of basal HAZ estimates. PK – Pakistan; GU – Guatemala; YE – Yemen; IA – India; BD – Bangladesh; MM – Myanmar; NP – Nepal; KE – Kenya; CG – Congo; GN – Guinea; GM – Gambia; LS – Lesotho; LB – Liberia; SN – Senegal; NM – Namibia; TG – Togo; DR - Dominican Republic; MA – Morocco; PY – Paraguay; ZW – Zimbabwe; MB – Moldova; HT – Haiti; SZ – Swaziland.

How stunting cutoffs can fail




Figure 5. Associations between the two components of height-for-age (country-level basal HAZ and survey-level accrued HAZ) and survey-year estimates of Calorie Deficits and Infant Mortality estimates (for girls). Plots for boys are presented in supplemental materials (SM Figure S3).

How stunting cutoffs can fail




Figure 6. Comparing severe stunting prevalence estimates based on universal MGRS cutoffs and country-specific cutoffs derived from basal HAZ estimates. Labeled data points above the equivalence line are surveys where severe stunting prevalence estimates increased by greater than 0.20 when using country-specific cutoffs. All data points below the line are surveys whose basal HAZ estimates are less than the reference (India), resulting in slightly lower estimated prevalence of severe stunting. LS – Lesotho; HT – Haiti; ZW – Zimbabwe; MA – Morocco; SZ – Swaziland; NM – Namibia; GU – Guatemala; YE – Yemen; PK – Pakistan; TG – Tog

How stunting cutoffs can fail

Table 1. Distribution of HAZ by Age and Associations with Absolute Household Wealth

	0-5 m	6-11 m	12-35 m	36-60 m	Total
N	149,237	159,964	595,544	519,225	1,423,970
HAZ (mean)	-0.59	-0.90	-1.73	-1.69	-1.50
HAZ (SD)	1.99	1.87	1.80	1.58	1.80
Between-survey SD	0.35	0.33	0.30	0.25	0.29
HAZ-Wealth					
Correlation	0.07	0.15	0.23	0.27	0.21
≥\$300 per capita	0.07	0.15	0.24	0.27	0.21
< \$300 per capita	-0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01

How stunting cutoffs can fail

Table 2. Nonlinear Mixed Effects Model for Height for Age Zscores (HAZ)

	Boys		Girls	
	Coef.	Std Err	Coef.	Std Err
<i>Sigmoid curve parameters</i>				
Increase from Lower Asymptote (a)	2.18***	0.04	2.17***	0.05
Inflection point (c)	5.14***	0.15	4.77***	0.15
Lower Asymptote (d)	-2.71***	0.05	-2.55***	0.05
<i>Cluster-level</i>				
Households experienced diarrhea	-0.26***	0.05	-0.2***	0.02
Open defecation	-0.39***	0.06	-0.37***	0.06
Open defecation > 0.30	0.30***	0.08	0.18*	0.09
<i>Household-level</i>				
Absolute Household Wealth	0.48***	0.02	0.46***	0.01
Urban	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01
<i>Individual-level</i>				
Number of children	-0.02***	0.00	-0.04***	0.00
Four or more antenatal visits	0.31***	0.02	0.25***	0.02
Missing Data on Antenatal Visits	0.16***	0.02	-0.04*	0.02
Born in a medical facility	0.34***	0.02	0.34***	0.02
Mom Primary	0.24***	0.02	0.27***	0.02
Mom Secondary	0.59***	0.02	0.59***	0.02
Mom Higher	1.07***	0.04	1.04***	0.04
Child Experienced Diarrhea	-0.3***	0.02	-0.34***	0.05
<i>Country-level</i>				
Prevalence of HIV and Tuberculosis	-0.26***	0.02	-0.25***	0.02
Proportion of Calories from Fat	2.76***	0.41	2.25***	0.41
Survey Year	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00
<hr/>				
N _{countries}	63		63	
N _{survey}	201		201	
Observations	567,806		546,963	

Table 3. R² between three height-for-age zscores and population wealth and health metrics

Country-level estimates	Girls			Boys		
	Infant Mortality	Caloric Deficits	GDP per Capita	Infant Mortality	Caloric Deficits	GDP per Capita
HAZ	0.46	0.17	0.37	0.39	0.14	0.33
basal HAZ	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.03
accrued HAZ	0.55	0.28	0.48	0.45	0.24	0.44

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS FOR:

Hidden Undernutrition: How universal cutoffs can fail to capture stunting

CONTENTS

DATA EXCLUSIONS.....	46
SM TABLE 1: SURVEY AND COUNTRY VARIANCE RATIOS.....	47
SM TABLE 2: DESCRIPTIVES OF HAZ ACROSS AGE CATEGORIES BY SURVEY	48
SM TABLE 3: LINEAR AND NONLINEAR MODEL COMPARISON.....	55
SM FIGURE 2: DISTRIBUTION OF BHAZ ESTIMATES ACROSS COUNTRIES	56
SM TABLE 4: SAMPLE SIZE AND DISTRIBUTION OF HAZ, BHAZ, AND AHAZ FOR 12-60M.....	57
SM FIGURE 2 & SM TABLE 5: RELIABILITY OF COUNTRY-LEVEL ESTIMATES	62
SM FIGURE 3: BHAZ AND AHAZ VALIDATION PLOTS FOR BOYS	63
SM FIGURE 4 & SM TABLE 6: CONVERTING RESOURCES MEASURE TO AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD WEALTH	64
SM FIGURE 5: PROPORTIONAL INCREASE IN PREVALENCE ESTIMATES	66
SM TABLE 7 & 8: CHANGES IN PREVELANCE OF SEVERE STUNTING BY WORLD REGION AND SURVEY.....	67

DATA EXCLUSIONS

We excluded children with implausible HAZ values and those missing data for any variables used in the final model. Our full sample of children, age 0-60m with plausible HAZ estimates totaled N=1,503,852. From this, we excluded cases with missing wealth measures (N=50,872), cluster level estimates of open-defecation (N=7,053) and reports of recent diarrhea (N=7,795). We also excluded two surveys with missing data on number of antenatal visits—Jordan 2009 with no data and Bangladesh 2014 with values limited to children under 3 y. Finally, we excluded all surveys (n=5) from three countries that did not have recent country-level data on fat intake: Comoros 1996 and 2012 (N=3604), Democratic Republic of Congo 2007 and 2013 (N=11,800), and Burundi 2010 (N=3,487). After all exclusions, our final analytic sample for all ages N=1,406,609 children across 198 surveys in 63 countries.

SM TABLE 1: SURVEY AND COUNTRY VARIANCE RATIOS

SM Table 1. Variance of Individual and Survey HAZ			
		Girls	Boys
	Individual	2.81	3
	Survey	0.26	0.23
<i>Amount of Variance Explained</i>			
	Individual	0.92	0.93
	Survey	0.08	0.07

SM Table 1. The variance of HAZ at the individual and averaged at the survey level. This shows the bulk of the variation in HAZ is observed at the between individual level, and very little variation in raw HAZ is found between surveys. This type of finding has been used as a justification for the use of a single reference curve, as this captures the direct, between individual differences in the economic, nutritional, and healthcare determinants of growth (Borghetti et al., 2006; Habicht et al., 1974) .

SM TABLE 2: DESCRIPTIVES OF HAZ ACROSS AGE CATEGORIES BY SURVEY

SM Table 2. Descriptives of HAZ across age categories by surveys. Children from Pakistan 1991 (Mean HAZ=-2.4, SD=2.0), Guatemala 1995 (Mean HAZ=-2.4, SD=1.6), and Bangladesh 1996 (Mean HAZ=-2.3, SD=1.7) had the lowest overall means across all ages, while children from Armenia 2016 (Mean HAZ=-0.06, SD=1.8), Moldova 2005 (Mean HAZ=-0.22, SD=1.8), and Dominican Republic 2013 (Mean HAZ=-0.39, SD=1.3) had the highest overall means across all ages. All survey-level distributions of HAZ are presented in by age category in SM Table 2.

DHS Country Code	Study Year	0-5 Months			6-11 Months			12-35 Months			36-60 Months			Total		
		Mean	Stdv	N	Mean	Stdv	N	Mean	Stdv	N	Mean	Stdv	N	Mean	Stdv	N
AL	2008	-0.63	-0.63	112	-1.13	2.92	111	-0.92	2.55	556	-0.70	2.16	698	-0.81	2.42	1477
AM	2000	-0.24	-0.24	142	-0.08	1.45	143	-0.82	1.43	560	-1.11	1.21	689	-0.83	1.40	1534
AM	2005	-0.44	-0.44	139	-0.37	1.57	128	-0.66	1.71	530	-0.53	1.70	481	-0.56	1.69	1278
AM	2010	-0.59	-0.59	148	-0.54	2.09	152	-0.97	1.91	589	-1.12	1.87	508	-0.94	1.90	1397
AM	2016	-0.46	-0.46	160	-0.23	2.17	159	-0.18	1.83	638	-0.27	1.48	632	-0.25	1.73	1589
AO	2015	-0.84	-0.84	798	-1.18	1.73	700	-1.83	1.61	2602	-1.69	1.48	2373	-1.58	1.63	6473
AZ	2006	-0.74	-0.74	229	-0.35	2.04	205	-1.34	1.85	825	-1.63	1.81	802	-1.29	1.89	2061
BD	1996	-1.21	-1.21	532	-1.48	1.56	510	-2.61	1.67	1966	-2.67	1.57	1982	-2.37	1.71	4990
BD	1999	-1.25	-1.25	670	-1.43	1.47	486	-2.21	1.47	2206	-2.22	1.37	2110	-2.03	1.50	5472
BD	2004	-1.10	-1.10	626	-1.29	1.38	570	-2.11	1.39	2423	-2.19	1.33	2402	-1.96	1.41	6021
BD	2007	-0.91	-0.91	491	-1.02	1.47	574	-1.84	1.38	2203	-2.01	1.29	2104	-1.73	1.42	5372
BD	2011	-0.79	-0.79	705	-1.15	1.57	827	-1.89	1.52	2944	-1.83	1.34	3320	-1.69	1.51	7796
BF	1993	0.22	0.22	575	-0.42	1.76	481	-1.84	1.59	1757	-1.86	1.44	1714	-1.44	1.75	4527
BF	1999	-0.04	-0.04	575	-0.77	1.74	497	-2.19	1.81	1868	-2.19	1.61	1775	-1.78	1.90	4715
BF	2003	0.18	0.18	1013	-0.57	2.10	958	-2.12	1.92	3373	-2.16	1.68	3353	-1.70	2.06	8697
BF	2010	-0.28	-0.28	736	-0.57	1.78	711	-1.71	1.59	2711	-1.65	1.50	2547	-1.41	1.70	6705
BJ	1996	-0.51	-0.51	502	-0.64	1.71	494	-1.82	1.60	1628	NA	NA	NA	-1.35	1.76	2624
BJ	2001	-0.29	-0.29	515	-0.53	1.70	525	-1.84	1.65	1817	-1.92	1.39	1629	-1.54	1.69	4486
BJ	2006	-0.94	-0.94	1415	-1.36	2.15	1599	-2.06	2.11	5299	-2.17	1.80	4839	-1.90	2.06	13152
BJ	2012	-1.09	-1.09	841	-1.69	3.08	1111	-2.13	2.81	4426	-2.42	2.28	4588	-2.13	2.71	10966
BO	1994	-0.51	-0.51	462	-0.79	1.60	574	-1.76	1.58	1957	NA	NA	NA	-1.38	1.69	2993
BO	1998	-0.64	-0.64	593	-0.90	1.71	724	-1.71	1.60	2467	-1.66	1.36	2555	-1.50	1.59	6339

BO	2003	-0.28	-0.28	823	-0.74	1.61	883	-1.70	1.46	3652	-1.58	1.27	3923	-1.43	1.48	9281
CF	1994	-0.33	-0.33	446	-1.01	1.72	438	-2.13	1.59	1536	NA	NA	NA	-1.60	1.79	2420
CG	2005	-0.37	-0.37	494	-0.37	1.96	454	-1.33	1.94	1680	-1.27	1.64	1389	-1.08	1.92	4017
CG	2011	-0.40	-0.40	501	-0.57	1.62	537	-1.37	1.60	1865	-1.35	1.34	1618	-1.16	1.55	4521
CI	1994	-0.43	-0.43	656	-0.64	1.54	606	-1.73	1.49	2228	NA	NA	NA	-1.29	1.64	3490
CI	1998	-0.61	-0.61	161	-0.52	1.84	210	-1.41	1.64	680	-1.60	1.49	534	-1.27	1.67	1585
CI	2012	-0.42	-0.42	378	-0.46	1.77	395	-1.53	1.53	1368	-1.60	1.49	1123	-1.30	1.64	3264
CM	1991	-0.22	-0.22	290	-0.71	1.52	330	-1.72	1.66	1099	-1.71	1.50	963	-1.43	1.66	2682
CM	1998	-0.31	-0.31	351	-0.67	1.84	333	-1.83	1.69	1175	NA	NA	NA	-1.33	1.85	1859
CM	2004	-0.35	-0.35	372	-0.78	1.75	389	-1.69	1.79	1364	-1.67	1.64	1171	-1.43	1.81	3296
CM	2011	-0.17	-0.17	544	-0.43	1.67	652	-1.55	1.69	2157	-1.60	1.58	1804	-1.28	1.77	5157
CO	1995	-0.50	-0.50	418	-0.72	1.14	485	-1.10	1.24	1903	-1.21	1.13	1750	-1.05	1.22	4556
CO	2000	-0.49	-0.49	423	-0.64	1.12	489	-1.17	1.21	1693	-1.12	1.09	1618	-1.02	1.19	4223
CO	2005	-0.18	-0.18	1291	-0.47	1.23	1331	-1.03	1.18	4938	-1.03	1.07	4911	-0.88	1.19	12471
CO	2010	-0.36	-0.36	1471	-0.60	1.18	1719	-0.96	1.15	6418	-0.91	1.06	6427	-0.85	1.15	16035
DR	1991	-0.73	-0.73	311	-0.94	1.46	412	-1.28	1.49	1379	-1.17	1.31	1161	-1.15	1.43	3263
DR	1996	-0.22	-0.22	347	-0.32	1.43	378	-0.94	1.45	1590	-0.91	1.20	1478	-0.80	1.37	3793
DR	2002	-0.19	-0.19	853	-0.32	1.50	1060	-0.69	1.42	3937	-0.60	1.27	3557	-0.57	1.40	9407
DR	2007	-0.41	-0.41	961	-0.22	1.59	1110	-0.67	1.44	4016	-0.60	1.22	4142	-0.57	1.40	10229
DR	2013	-0.44	-0.44	384	-0.17	1.38	445	-0.51	1.37	1637	-0.33	1.10	1549	-0.39	1.27	4015
EG	1992	0.03	0.03	708	-0.84	1.84	711	-1.54	1.88	3046	-1.20	1.61	3201	-1.18	1.85	7666
EG	1995	-0.15	-0.15	1090	-1.20	1.97	1093	-1.80	1.90	4249	-1.50	1.55	4333	-1.45	1.85	10765
EG	2000	-0.85	-0.85	1167	-0.94	2.04	1110	-1.24	1.66	4290	-1.09	1.36	4070	-1.11	1.67	10637
EG	2003	-1.22	-1.22	652	-1.08	1.90	661	-1.29	1.58	2473	-1.06	1.11	2429	-1.17	1.48	6215
EG	2005	-0.83	-0.83	1228	-1.10	2.26	1310	-1.28	2.23	5274	-1.06	1.65	5166	-1.13	2.01	12978
EG	2008	-0.44	-0.44	1050	-0.66	2.37	1228	-1.42	2.29	4134	-1.27	1.83	3814	-1.17	2.18	10226
EG	2014	-0.45	-0.45	1371	-0.08	2.52	1647	-0.63	2.28	6187	-0.43	2.04	5545	-0.48	2.26	14750
ET	2000	-0.64	-0.64	887	-1.19	1.74	914	-2.43	1.71	3569	-2.43	1.52	3626	-2.13	1.78	8996
ET	2005	-0.41	-0.41	375	-1.08	1.91	407	-2.17	2.13	1596	-2.18	1.83	1710	-1.90	2.11	4088
ET	2011	-0.08	-0.08	1060	-0.67	1.83	984	-1.97	1.78	3732	-2.02	1.56	4040	-1.66	1.86	9816
ET	2016	-0.18	-0.18	956	-0.42	1.70	961	-1.68	1.75	3563	-1.74	1.61	3533	-1.41	1.81	9013
GA	2000	-0.39	-0.39	441	-0.72	1.81	406	-1.47	1.61	1485	-1.35	1.41	1225	-1.21	1.64	3557
GA	2012	-0.56	-0.56	384	-0.55	1.80	435	-1.25	1.67	1461	-1.15	1.42	1167	-1.05	1.68	3447
GH	1993	-0.36	-0.36	361	-0.56	1.51	345	-1.85	1.58	1242	NA	NA	NA	-1.35	1.71	1948
GH	1998	0.03	0.03	278	-0.48	1.61	313	-1.54	1.51	1145	-1.83	1.57	1072	-1.38	1.67	2808

GH	2003	-0.21	-0.21	290	-0.57	1.68	380	-1.74	1.52	1310	-1.76	1.40	1192	-1.47	1.63	3172
GH	2008	-0.01	-0.01	237	-0.19	1.96	294	-1.34	1.68	991	-1.47	1.52	939	-1.13	1.79	2461
GH	2014	-0.12	-0.12	319	-0.35	1.30	289	-1.18	1.31	1138	-1.20	1.12	991	-0.98	1.32	2737
GM	2013	-0.58	-0.58	410	-0.51	1.93	409	-1.39	1.63	1300	-1.23	1.51	1125	-1.12	1.78	3244
GN	1999	-0.15	-0.15	605	-0.45	1.81	408	-1.56	1.85	1773	-1.62	1.83	1754	-1.29	1.94	4540
GN	2005	0.00	0.00	345	-0.49	1.99	309	-1.85	1.73	1081	-1.90	1.66	991	-1.48	1.93	2726
GN	2012	-0.01	-0.01	380	-0.02	1.99	350	-1.26	1.85	1255	-1.55	1.70	1202	-1.08	1.91	3187
GU	1995	-1.18	-1.18	929	-1.69	1.54	989	-2.72	1.48	3575	-2.65	1.37	3279	-2.41	1.56	8772
GU	1999	-1.42	-1.42	388	-1.71	1.48	420	-2.49	1.52	1600	-2.47	1.37	1595	-2.30	1.51	4003
GU	2015	-1.45	-1.45	1172	-1.58	1.15	1213	-2.05	1.21	4763	-1.93	1.17	4638	-1.90	1.21	11786
GY	2009	-1.64	-1.64	118	-0.83	2.01	169	-1.21	1.63	753	-0.97	1.44	623	-1.11	1.69	1663
HN	2006	-0.46	-0.46	449	-0.89	1.35	1079	-1.61	1.37	3896	-1.72	1.25	3884	-1.52	1.37	9308
HN	2012	-0.65	-0.65	1074	-0.76	1.22	1081	-1.30	1.25	4117	-1.45	1.16	3740	-1.23	1.25	10012
HT	1994	-0.33	-0.33	306	-0.80	1.57	330	-1.81	1.73	1124	-1.95	1.72	1102	-1.59	1.79	2862
HT	2000	-0.52	-0.52	558	-0.59	1.49	652	-1.42	1.49	2323	-1.47	1.39	2083	-1.25	1.52	5616
HT	2006	-0.68	-0.68	302	-0.81	1.49	285	-1.50	1.46	1057	-1.45	1.39	947	-1.31	1.50	2591
HT	2012	-0.45	-0.45	465	-0.32	1.44	504	-1.20	1.39	1656	-1.26	1.32	1408	-1.02	1.46	4033
IA	1993	-1.11	-1.11	3682	-1.56	2.05	3626	-2.44	1.92	14434	-2.67	1.87	6855	-2.21	2.03	28597
IA	1999	-0.99	-0.99	4681	-1.40	1.91	4458	-2.49	1.88	17589	NA	NA	NA	-2.04	2.03	26728
IA	2006	-0.68	-0.68	3757	-1.02	1.94	4404	-1.94	1.80	17401	-1.95	1.61	17514	-1.74	1.84	43076
IA	2015	-0.60	-0.60	20949	-0.81	2.03	24019	-1.60	1.86	94162	-1.71	1.52	95555	-1.47	1.83	234685
JO	1990	-0.26	-0.26	623	-0.59	1.72	732	-1.04	1.53	2875	-1.11	1.27	2594	-0.95	1.50	6824
JO	1997	-0.36	-0.36	451	-0.24	1.45	599	-0.80	1.25	2309	-0.83	1.11	2296	-0.72	1.25	5655
JO	2002	-0.26	-0.26	433	-0.28	1.37	587	-0.84	1.31	1998	-0.81	1.07	1909	-0.71	1.28	4927
JO	2007	0.16	0.16	440	0.09	2.17	469	-0.75	2.05	1871	-0.92	1.56	1869	-0.65	1.97	4649
JO	2012	-0.22	-0.22	531	-0.03	1.33	575	-0.54	1.29	2585	-0.58	1.09	2629	-0.48	1.25	6320
KE	1993	-0.50	-0.50	453	-0.89	1.68	566	-1.91	1.63	2037	-1.83	1.43	1981	-1.64	1.64	5037
KE	1998	-0.55	-0.55	482	-0.86	1.93	552	-1.82	1.79	2008	NA	NA	NA	-1.44	1.92	3042
KE	2009	-0.30	-0.30	530	-0.93	1.95	613	-1.68	1.79	2116	-1.49	1.52	2001	-1.38	1.81	5260
KE	2014	-0.48	-0.48	1760	-0.58	1.47	2018	-1.39	1.49	7709	-1.31	1.33	7388	-1.19	1.48	18875
KH	2000	-0.96	-0.96	425	-1.18	1.91	387	-2.08	2.04	1359	-2.31	1.59	1578	-1.96	1.96	3749
KH	2005	-0.85	-0.85	331	-1.17	1.54	392	-1.98	1.34	1465	-2.24	1.33	1464	-1.89	1.47	3652
KH	2010	-0.62	-0.62	319	-0.90	1.42	407	-1.79	1.54	1572	-1.99	1.31	1478	-1.67	1.53	3776
KH	2014	-0.59	-0.59	447	-0.73	1.52	473	-1.52	1.46	1815	-1.72	1.16	1658	-1.42	1.49	4393
KK	1995	0.00	0.00	110	-0.28	1.55	123	-1.11	1.48	510	NA	NA	NA	-0.81	1.55	743

KK	1999	0.10	0.10	43	-0.36	1.21	57	-0.74	1.54	240	-1.05	1.24	238	-0.77	1.47	578
KY	1997	-0.47	-0.47	159	-0.88	1.75	165	-1.59	1.47	662	NA	NA	NA	-1.29	1.59	986
KY	2012	0.07	0.07	417	-0.23	1.59	512	-1.00	1.48	1660	-1.12	1.12	1472	-0.83	1.49	4061
LB	2007	-0.16	-0.16	468	-0.66	1.83	581	-1.76	1.84	1813	-2.01	1.71	1634	-1.54	1.91	4496
LB	2013	-0.24	-0.24	335	-0.52	1.76	452	-1.49	1.63	1271	-1.75	1.48	1180	-1.32	1.71	3238
LS	2004	-0.87	-0.87	191	-1.17	1.86	182	-2.16	1.59	566	-2.11	1.36	490	-1.84	1.72	1429
LS	2009	-0.61	-0.61	192	-0.94	2.10	191	-1.70	1.54	674	-1.95	1.24	596	-1.58	1.64	1653
LS	2014	-0.90	-0.90	171	-1.19	1.54	158	-1.65	1.36	568	-1.73	1.17	441	-1.53	1.40	1338
MA	1992	-0.35	-0.35	429	-0.42	1.59	476	-1.52	1.65	1841	-1.55	1.38	1885	-1.31	1.61	4631
MA	2003	-0.44	-0.44	538	-0.47	2.18	563	-0.93	2.09	2197	-1.07	1.47	2312	-0.90	1.88	5610
MB	2005	0.09	0.09	123	0.27	1.76	145	-0.17	1.80	594	-0.40	1.64	487	-0.18	1.75	1349
MD	1992	-1.20	-1.20	526	-1.73	1.34	486	-2.57	1.41	1740	-2.60	1.34	1468	-2.31	1.48	4220
MD	1997	-1.08	-1.08	580	-1.64	1.54	560	-2.51	1.49	1945	NA	NA	NA	-2.09	1.62	3085
MD	2004	-0.95	-0.95	480	-1.54	1.99	534	-2.20	1.99	1833	-2.12	1.58	1837	-1.97	1.90	4684
MD	2009	-0.81	-0.81	543	-1.38	2.35	580	-1.98	2.24	2148	-2.14	1.84	2129	-1.86	2.17	5400
ML	1996	-0.14	-0.14	1022	-0.60	1.71	937	-2.11	1.74	3004	NA	NA	NA	-1.42	1.92	4963
ML	2001	-0.25	-0.25	1283	-0.92	1.83	1148	-2.07	1.96	3853	-2.05	1.79	3577	-1.69	1.99	9861
ML	2006	-0.10	-0.10	1334	-0.63	2.00	1295	-1.83	2.04	4648	-1.76	1.87	4225	-1.47	2.09	11502
ML	2012	0.10	0.10	335	-0.57	1.88	467	-1.67	2.03	1811	-1.77	1.83	1906	-1.47	2.04	4519
MV	2009	-0.70	-0.70	240	-0.98	1.67	296	-1.03	1.62	986	-0.89	1.33	901	-0.94	1.54	2423
MW	1992	-0.89	-0.89	448	-1.26	1.61	409	-2.36	1.53	1340	-2.50	1.42	1145	-2.07	1.64	3342
MW	2000	-0.88	-0.88	1140	-1.18	1.96	1148	-2.34	1.80	4042	-2.41	1.50	3257	-2.05	1.87	9587
MW	2004	-0.82	-0.82	897	-1.58	1.96	1061	-2.34	1.88	3540	-2.29	1.59	3012	-2.07	1.91	8510
MW	2010	-1.15	-1.15	407	-1.19	2.06	516	-2.04	1.73	2034	-1.98	1.43	1821	-1.85	1.75	4778
MW	2015	-0.89	-0.89	499	-1.05	1.58	553	-1.62	1.47	2095	-1.74	1.23	2044	-1.54	1.44	5191
MZ	1997	-0.85	-0.85	687	-1.20	1.97	710	-2.24	1.76	2153	NA	NA	NA	-1.76	1.95	3550
MZ	2003	-0.92	-0.92	981	-1.39	1.62	949	-2.17	1.55	3254	-2.06	1.44	3050	-1.89	1.59	8234
MZ	2011	-1.18	-1.18	1026	-1.14	1.97	1143	-1.84	1.78	4020	-1.77	1.42	3446	-1.66	1.74	9635
NC	1998	-0.48	-0.48	658	-0.85	1.56	727	-1.59	1.66	2749	-1.67	1.47	2940	-1.44	1.62	7074
NC	2001	-0.15	-0.15	560	-0.68	1.60	577	-1.34	1.54	2542	-1.46	1.41	2376	-1.21	1.55	6055
NG	1990	-0.62	-0.62	713	-0.95	1.90	745	-2.19	1.91	2340	-2.37	1.69	2231	-1.92	1.94	6029
NG	2003	-0.63	-0.63	562	-0.99	2.09	594	-2.08	2.07	1844	-1.99	1.85	1682	-1.74	2.12	4682
NG	2008	-0.76	-0.76	2414	-1.15	2.54	2462	-2.02	2.50	8405	-1.94	2.18	8411	-1.75	2.46	21692
NG	2013	-0.15	-0.15	2718	-0.65	2.27	3025	-1.70	2.25	10368	-1.74	1.94	10034	-1.43	2.22	26145
NI	1992	-0.31	-0.31	651	-0.89	1.82	592	-2.19	1.75	1919	-2.11	1.63	1689	-1.75	1.86	4851

NI	1998	-0.48	-0.48	814	-1.26	1.63	733	-2.41	1.54	2473	NA	NA	NA	-1.81	1.77	4020
NI	2006	-0.30	-0.30	449	-1.01	1.89	420	-2.43	1.81	1548	-2.40	1.65	1416	-2.01	1.93	3833
NI	2012	-0.60	-0.60	563	-1.05	1.85	530	-2.08	1.95	1967	-1.88	1.66	1971	-1.73	1.90	5031
NM	1992	-1.02	-1.02	394	-1.14	1.86	361	-1.71	1.61	1171	-1.54	1.41	823	-1.49	1.65	2749
NM	2000	-0.55	-0.55	393	-0.63	1.64	383	-1.34	1.58	1232	-1.39	1.38	1004	-1.17	1.59	3012
NM	2007	-0.56	-0.56	484	-0.76	1.60	510	-1.56	1.58	1564	-1.45	1.39	1239	-1.29	1.58	3797
NM	2013	-0.38	-0.38	247	-0.08	1.72	236	-1.23	1.53	768	-1.23	1.30	596	-0.97	1.58	1847
NP	1996	-1.38	-1.38	628	-1.54	1.39	674	-2.62	1.37	2412	NA	NA	NA	-2.21	1.48	3714
NP	2001	-1.09	-1.09	623	-1.41	1.39	615	-2.40	1.31	2462	-2.48	1.23	2499	-2.20	1.37	6199
NP	2006	-0.75	-0.75	465	-1.22	1.29	515	-2.12	1.29	2130	-2.28	1.20	2108	-1.97	1.36	5218
NP	2011	-0.74	-0.74	219	-0.95	1.43	242	-1.84	1.40	938	-2.03	1.23	955	-1.72	1.42	2354
NP	2016	-0.53	-0.53	228	-0.86	1.48	236	-1.72	1.27	968	-1.78	1.21	928	-1.54	1.36	2360
PE	1991	-0.57	-0.57	818	-1.01	1.46	827	-1.75	1.49	3014	-1.90	1.34	3177	-1.61	1.48	7836
PE	1996	-0.63	-0.63	1418	-0.88	1.63	1546	-1.62	1.57	6051	-1.67	1.40	6156	-1.47	1.55	15171
PE	2000	-0.59	-0.59	1034	-0.88	1.53	1143	-1.64	1.46	4694	-1.67	1.30	4894	-1.49	1.46	11765
PE	2006	-0.62	-0.62	248	-0.84	1.24	249	-1.61	1.26	940	-1.66	1.14	880	-1.44	1.27	2317
PE	2008	-0.81	-0.81	691	-0.92	1.34	814	-1.48	1.21	3297	-1.42	1.15	3366	-1.34	1.22	8168
PE	2009	-0.90	-0.90	846	-0.97	1.16	1035	-1.39	1.24	3641	-1.40	1.11	3882	-1.30	1.19	9404
PE	2010	-0.91	-0.91	753	-1.07	1.12	896	-1.38	1.17	3607	-1.32	1.07	3547	-1.28	1.14	8803
PE	2011	-0.86	-0.86	778	-1.02	1.15	842	-1.32	1.11	3628	-1.26	1.05	3500	-1.23	1.10	8748
PE	2012	-0.84	-0.84	833	-0.98	1.08	925	-1.25	1.08	3748	-1.18	1.04	3720	-1.16	1.07	9226
PK	1991	-1.03	-1.03	508	-1.47	2.25	489	-2.61	1.93	1872	-2.80	1.76	1721	-2.39	2.03	4590
PK	2012	-0.97	-0.97	319	-1.12	2.23	328	-2.24	2.20	1330	-2.36	2.09	1455	-2.07	2.24	3432
PY	1990	-0.68	-0.68	387	-0.83	1.48	387	-1.21	1.38	1503	-0.95	1.22	1388	-1.02	1.34	3665
RW	1992	-0.93	-0.93	500	-1.40	1.73	462	-2.31	1.46	1808	-2.44	1.28	1623	-2.11	1.56	4393
RW	2000	-0.38	-0.38	711	-0.99	1.89	863	-2.02	1.83	2336	-2.14	1.55	2394	-1.74	1.86	6304
RW	2005	-0.90	-0.90	433	-1.16	1.56	399	-2.25	1.67	1633	-2.23	1.41	1284	-1.97	1.69	3749
RW	2010	-0.62	-0.62	362	-0.99	1.55	415	-1.98	1.41	1675	-1.97	1.15	1662	-1.76	1.43	4114
RW	2015	-0.61	-0.61	346	-0.92	1.56	421	-1.85	1.39	1488	-1.74	1.26	1327	-1.58	1.45	3582
SL	2008	-0.61	-0.61	244	-0.93	2.49	275	-1.48	2.34	918	-1.65	2.03	802	-1.38	2.33	2239
SL	2013	-1.08	-1.08	428	-0.90	2.44	524	-1.54	2.36	1767	-1.64	2.01	1725	-1.46	2.27	4444
SN	1993	-0.42	-0.42	564	-0.59	1.78	509	-1.69	1.61	1800	-1.71	1.55	1759	-1.42	1.69	4632
SN	2005	-0.13	-0.13	364	-0.33	1.53	323	-1.11	1.51	1180	-1.21	1.38	1047	-0.94	1.54	2914
SN	2010	-0.39	-0.39	432	-0.76	1.75	391	-1.56	1.72	1599	-1.50	1.66	1434	-1.32	1.77	3856
SN	2012	-0.29	-0.29	652	-0.38	1.33	667	-1.26	1.41	2455	-1.12	1.40	2244	-1.00	1.44	6018

SN	2014	-0.52	-0.52	610	-0.62	1.31	630	-1.26	1.30	2573	-1.11	1.25	2264	-1.07	1.32	6077
SN	2015	-0.62	-0.62	628	-0.71	1.27	727	-1.29	1.29	2555	-1.19	1.24	2283	-1.12	1.30	6193
SN	2016	-0.50	-0.50	605	-0.69	1.29	678	-1.22	1.26	2434	-1.03	1.23	2328	-1.02	1.28	6045
ST	2008	-1.37	-1.37	157	-1.20	2.59	176	-1.22	2.19	703	-1.20	1.55	607	-1.22	2.13	1643
SZ	2006	-0.54	-0.54	209	-0.40	1.74	272	-1.57	1.41	865	-1.31	1.18	738	-1.22	1.52	2084
TD	1997	-0.01	-0.01	776	-0.56	1.82	665	-2.18	1.85	2201	-2.09	1.72	2183	-1.67	1.98	5825
TD	2004	0.39	0.39	555	-0.56	1.79	487	-2.16	2.11	1768	-2.00	1.88	1817	-1.62	2.17	4627
TD	2015	0.12	0.12	1111	-0.68	1.93	1087	-2.08	2.01	3876	-2.03	1.83	4278	-1.68	2.07	10352
TG	1998	-0.25	-0.25	687	-0.53	1.59	718	-1.78	1.57	2337	NA	NA	NA	-1.26	1.72	3742
TG	2014	-0.38	-0.38	288	-0.73	1.37	377	-1.34	1.39	1337	-1.59	1.31	1218	-1.28	1.43	3220
TJ	2012	-0.08	-0.08	412	-0.61	2.09	534	-1.35	1.79	2067	-1.34	1.48	1698	-1.15	1.80	4711
TL	2009	-0.73	-0.73	632	-1.49	2.32	770	-2.26	2.21	3288	-2.40	1.50	3315	-2.12	2.08	8005
TL	2016	-0.79	-0.79	513	-1.06	2.76	603	-1.81	2.37	2475	-1.85	1.79	2486	-1.67	2.28	6077
TR	1993	-0.01	-0.01	338	-0.26	1.50	349	-1.01	1.49	1218	-1.39	1.38	1272	-0.97	1.53	3177
TR	1998	0.22	0.22	314	-0.01	1.44	312	-1.01	1.42	1082	-1.28	1.40	1128	-0.87	1.52	2836
TZ	1991	-1.12	-1.12	767	-1.52	1.60	762	-2.20	1.67	2823	-2.25	1.44	2237	-2.01	1.63	6589
TZ	1996	-1.00	-1.00	633	-1.39	1.69	663	-2.29	1.59	2292	-2.22	1.38	1914	-2.01	1.63	5502
TZ	1999	-0.91	-0.91	319	-1.41	1.46	288	-2.11	1.43	1052	-2.14	1.25	914	-1.90	1.44	2573
TZ	2004	-0.76	-0.76	815	-1.27	1.44	871	-2.00	1.43	3053	-2.00	1.27	2533	-1.77	1.44	7272
TZ	2010	-0.67	-0.67	778	-1.04	1.60	763	-1.96	1.48	2781	-1.81	1.29	2590	-1.66	1.55	6912
TZ	2015	-0.56	-0.56	1018	-0.93	1.50	1010	-1.69	1.37	3836	-1.61	1.19	3172	-1.45	1.43	9036
UG	1995	-0.77	-0.77	613	-1.31	1.61	735	-2.00	1.64	2400	-2.04	1.56	962	-1.74	1.68	4710
UG	2000	-0.73	-0.73	536	-1.27	1.50	646	-2.03	1.56	2206	-1.97	1.38	1847	-1.78	1.57	5235
UG	2006	-0.58	-0.58	254	-0.98	1.73	280	-1.76	1.63	1014	-1.82	1.36	859	-1.56	1.63	2407
UG	2011	-0.31	-0.31	243	-0.81	1.57	236	-1.67	1.58	862	-1.61	1.38	761	-1.39	1.61	2102
UG	2016	-0.28	-0.28	485	-0.69	1.50	493	-1.54	1.41	1831	-1.32	1.29	1634	-1.23	1.48	4443
UZ	1996	-0.39	-0.39	129	-1.04	2.26	191	-1.77	2.40	742	NA	NA	NA	-1.47	2.36	1062
YE	1991	-0.86	-0.86	323	-1.56	1.87	413	-2.07	1.56	1221	-1.94	1.39	999	-1.82	1.67	2956
YE	2013	-0.72	-0.72	1520	-1.12	1.80	1439	-2.00	1.75	5677	-2.26	1.52	5489	-1.87	1.77	14125
ZM	1992	-0.99	-0.99	645	-1.23	1.57	635	-2.20	1.48	2144	-2.16	1.34	1623	-1.91	1.54	5047
ZM	1996	-0.86	-0.86	651	-1.29	1.66	634	-2.28	1.56	2457	-2.24	1.41	1902	-1.99	1.62	5644
ZM	2002	-0.79	-0.79	623	-1.56	1.75	632	-2.41	1.69	2386	-2.35	1.46	1950	-2.11	1.73	5591
ZM	2007	-0.77	-0.77	529	-1.08	2.22	600	-1.97	1.88	2253	-1.93	1.49	1915	-1.74	1.87	5297
ZM	2013	-0.61	-0.61	1109	-1.27	1.93	1231	-1.85	1.80	4796	-1.68	1.45	4590	-1.60	1.75	11726
ZW	1994	-0.36	-0.36	389	-0.52	1.61	402	-1.66	1.39	1340	NA	NA	NA	-1.21	1.57	2131

ZW	1999	-0.31	-0.31	309	-0.66	1.97	276	-1.56	2.04	1191	-1.36	1.63	1009	-1.26	1.94	2785
ZW	2005	-0.55	-0.55	441	-0.96	1.96	458	-1.71	1.81	1659	-1.63	1.45	1555	-1.47	1.81	4113
ZW	2010	-0.47	-0.47	555	-0.82	1.54	633	-1.76	1.51	1777	-1.53	1.23	1425	-1.39	1.55	4390
ZW	2015	-0.73	-0.73	559	-0.69	1.50	526	-1.52	1.42	2023	-1.19	1.16	1876	-1.22	1.43	4984


SM TABLE 3: LINEAR AND NONLINEAR MODEL COMPARISON

SM Table 3. Model Comparison of Linear and Non-Linear Models

Model	DF	AIC	BIC	logLik	Change in AIC	L.Ratio	p-value
Non-Linear Model Boys	21	1664287	1664518	-832122.6	0	798.5771	<.0001
Linear Model Boys	19	1665082	1665291	-832521.9	-795		
Non-Linear Model Girls	21	1591204	1591434	-795581.0	0	796.4063	<.0001
Linear Model Girls	19	1591996	1592205	-795979.2	-792		

SM Table 3. Model comparison results. Results from the model comparison analysis show that the nonlinear specification provides a significantly better fit than the nonlinear specification. Models are fitted with Maximum Likelihood in order to compare AICs.

SM FIGURE 2: DISTRIBUTION OF BHAZ ESTIMATES ACROSS COUNTRIES



SM Figure 2. Distribution of bHAZ estimates. Countries with low bHAZ estimates were Pakistan (boys= -3.6 SD, girls= -3.5 SD), Guatemala (boys= -3.4 SD, girls= -3.3 SD), and India (boys= -3.2 SD, girls= -3.1 SD). Countries with high bHAZ estimates were Haiti (boys= -2.3 SD, girls= -2.1 SD), Paraguay (boys= -2.1 SD, girls=-2.0 SD), and Zimbabwe (boys= -2.3 SD, girls= -2.1 SD).

SM TABLE 4: SAMPLE SIZE AND DISTRIBUTION OF HAZ, BHAZ, AND AHAZ FOR 12-60M

SM Table 4. List of countries, survey years, sample size, and distribution of HAZ for 12-60m olds in the full sample.

DHS Country Code	Study Year	HAZ (Mean)	HAZ (SD)	Sample Size	bHAZ Girls Country	bHAZ Boys Country	Mean rHAZ Girls	Mean rHAZ Boys	bHAZ Girls Survey	bHAZ Boys Survey
AL	2008	-0.80	2.34	1254	-2.42	-2.51	1.61	1.72	-2.42	-2.51
AM	2000	-0.98	1.32	1249	-2.31	-2.42	1.30	1.49	-2.16	-2.29
AM	2005	-0.60	1.70	1011	-2.31	-2.42	1.75	1.79	-2.15	-2.12
AM	2010	-1.04	1.89	1097	-2.31	-2.42	1.22	1.44	-2.78	-2.96
AM	2016	-0.22	1.67	1270	-2.31	-2.42	2.05	2.25	-2.16	-2.32
AO	2015	-1.76	1.55	4975	-2.91	-3.11	1.08	1.42	-2.91	-3.11
AZ	2006	-1.48	1.84	1627	-2.74	-2.96	1.18	1.57	-2.74	-2.96
BD	1996	-2.64	1.62	3948	-2.99	-2.97	0.33	0.36	-3.17	-3.21
BD	1999	-2.22	1.42	4316	-2.99	-2.97	0.79	0.74	-2.91	-2.89
BD	2004	-2.15	1.36	4825	-2.99	-2.97	0.83	0.83	-2.98	-2.96
BD	2007	-1.92	1.34	4307	-2.99	-2.97	1.08	1.03	-2.90	-2.87
BD	2011	-1.86	1.43	6264	-2.99	-2.97	1.17	1.08	-2.99	-2.93
BF	1993	-1.85	1.52	3471	-2.50	-2.69	0.57	0.92	-2.29	-2.45
BF	1999	-2.19	1.71	3643	-2.50	-2.69	0.22	0.59	-2.64	-2.84
BF	2003	-2.14	1.81	6726	-2.50	-2.69	0.26	0.66	-2.65	-2.89
BF	2010	-1.68	1.55	5258	-2.50	-2.69	0.76	1.06	-2.41	-2.57
BJ	1996	-1.82	1.60	1628	-2.62	-2.91	0.64	1.27	-2.19	-2.55
BJ	2001	-1.88	1.53	3446	-2.62	-2.91	0.66	1.12	-2.51	-2.72
BJ	2006	-2.11	1.97	10138	-2.62	-2.91	0.40	0.92	-2.75	-3.04
BJ	2012	-2.28	2.56	9014	-2.62	-2.91	0.21	0.77	-3.04	-3.34
BO	1994	-1.76	1.58	1957	-2.60	-2.73	0.74	1.08	-2.51	-2.72
BO	1998	-1.68	1.48	5022	-2.60	-2.73	0.88	1.09	-2.62	-2.72
BO	2003	-1.64	1.36	7575	-2.60	-2.73	0.94	1.11	-2.67	-2.76
CF	1994	-2.13	1.59	1536	-2.60	-2.91	0.34	0.91	-2.60	-2.91
CG	2005	-1.30	1.81	3069	-2.27	-2.47	0.87	1.27	-2.28	-2.51
CG	2011	-1.36	1.49	3483	-2.27	-2.47	0.84	1.18	-2.26	-2.43
CI	1994	-1.73	1.49	2228	-2.36	-2.51	0.53	0.89	-2.31	-2.54
CI	1998	-1.49	1.58	1214	-2.36	-2.51	0.87	1.01	-2.38	-2.41
CI	2012	-1.56	1.51	2491	-2.36	-2.51	0.73	1.01	-2.39	-2.57


CM	1991	-1.72	1.59	2062	-2.53	-2.74	0.76	1.09	-2.55	-2.71
CM	1998	-1.83	1.69	1175	-2.53	-2.74	0.53	1.09	-2.52	-2.91
CM	2004	-1.68	1.72	2535	-2.53	-2.74	0.83	1.08	-2.55	-2.63
CM	2011	-1.57	1.64	3961	-2.53	-2.74	0.87	1.26	-2.52	-2.73
CO	1995	-1.15	1.19	3653	-2.43	-2.55	1.22	1.46	-2.34	-2.53
CO	2000	-1.15	1.16	3311	-2.43	-2.55	1.27	1.43	-2.48	-2.60
CO	2005	-1.03	1.13	9849	-2.43	-2.55	1.37	1.55	-2.42	-2.53
CO	2010	-0.93	1.10	12845	-2.43	-2.55	1.48	1.63	-2.48	-2.56
DR	1991	-1.23	1.41	2540	-2.17	-2.33	0.89	1.15	-2.29	-2.44
DR	1996	-0.93	1.33	3068	-2.17	-2.33	1.17	1.48	-2.12	-2.31
DR	2002	-0.65	1.35	7494	-2.17	-2.33	1.47	1.74	-2.03	-2.20
DR	2007	-0.63	1.33	8158	-2.17	-2.33	1.51	1.73	-2.20	-2.34
DR	2013	-0.42	1.25	3186	-2.17	-2.33	1.71	1.94	-2.21	-2.35
EG	1992	-1.36	1.76	6247	-2.34	-2.48	0.95	1.14	-2.15	-2.23
EG	1995	-1.65	1.74	8582	-2.34	-2.48	0.61	0.92	-2.46	-2.61
EG	2000	-1.16	1.52	8360	-2.34	-2.48	1.12	1.38	-2.27	-2.39
EG	2003	-1.18	1.37	4902	-2.34	-2.48	1.11	1.36	-2.30	-2.42
EG	2005	-1.17	1.97	10440	-2.34	-2.48	1.11	1.38	-2.36	-2.50
EG	2008	-1.35	2.08	7948	-2.34	-2.48	0.93	1.20	-2.70	-2.86
EG	2014	-0.53	2.17	11732	-2.34	-2.48	1.73	2.03	-2.15	-2.34
ET	2000	-2.43	1.62	7195	-2.64	-2.76	0.17	0.37	-2.80	-2.87
ET	2005	-2.17	1.98	3306	-2.64	-2.76	0.38	0.68	-2.59	-2.77
ET	2011	-2.00	1.67	7772	-2.64	-2.76	0.60	0.81	-2.64	-2.73
ET	2016	-1.71	1.68	7096	-2.64	-2.76	0.88	1.11	-2.54	-2.67
GA	2000	-1.42	1.52	2710	-2.59	-2.77	1.09	1.42	-2.63	-2.84
GA	2012	-1.20	1.56	2628	-2.59	-2.77	1.34	1.60	-2.54	-2.70
GH	1993	-1.85	1.58	1242	-2.33	-2.52	0.36	0.80	-2.38	-2.63
GH	1998	-1.68	1.55	2217	-2.33	-2.52	0.56	0.92	-2.30	-2.51
GH	2003	-1.75	1.46	2502	-2.33	-2.52	0.48	0.88	-2.42	-2.66
GH	2008	-1.40	1.61	1930	-2.33	-2.52	0.86	1.18	-2.27	-2.43
GH	2014	-1.19	1.23	2129	-2.33	-2.52	1.09	1.38	-2.26	-2.39
GM	2013	-1.32	1.58	2425	-2.22	-2.29	0.88	1.00	-2.22	-2.29
GN	1999	-1.59	1.84	3527	-2.26	-2.45	0.61	0.93	-2.16	-2.30
GN	2005	-1.88	1.70	2072	-2.26	-2.45	0.28	0.68	-2.46	-2.70
GN	2012	-1.40	1.78	2457	-2.26	-2.45	0.77	1.15	-2.15	-2.37
GU	1995	-2.68	1.43	6854	-3.35	-3.49	0.61	0.86	-3.39	-3.54
GU	1999	-2.48	1.45	3195	-3.35	-3.49	0.79	1.08	-3.28	-3.45
GU	2015	-1.99	1.19	9401	-3.35	-3.49	1.35	1.50	-3.38	-3.47
GY	2009	-1.10	1.55	1376	-2.37	-2.45	1.27	1.35	-2.37	-2.45
HN	2006	-1.67	1.31	7780	-2.68	-2.80	0.97	1.17	-2.72	-2.85
HN	2012	-1.37	1.21	7857	-2.68	-2.80	1.28	1.46	-2.64	-2.74
HT	1994	-1.88	1.73	2226	-2.13	-2.30	0.22	0.46	-2.35	-2.46
HT	2000	-1.45	1.44	4406	-2.13	-2.30	0.56	0.98	-1.94	-2.19

HT	2006	-1.48	1.43	2004	-2.13	-2.30	0.56	0.91	-2.13	-2.32
HT	2012	-1.22	1.36	3064	-2.13	-2.30	0.84	1.14	-2.08	-2.25
IA	1993	-2.51	1.91	21289	-3.11	-3.21	0.56	0.75	-3.12	-3.23
IA	1999	-2.49	1.88	17589	-3.11	-3.21	0.60	0.75	-3.29	-3.38
IA	2006	-1.95	1.71	34915	-3.11	-3.21	1.16	1.27	-3.05	-3.12
IA	2015	-1.65	1.70	189717	-3.11	-3.21	1.43	1.59	-2.99	-3.10
JO	1990	-1.07	1.41	5469	-2.30	-2.43	1.22	1.37	-2.18	-2.29
JO	1997	-0.82	1.19	4605	-2.30	-2.43	1.47	1.64	-2.26	-2.37
JO	2002	-0.82	1.20	3907	-2.30	-2.43	1.50	1.58	-2.38	-2.45
JO	2007	-0.83	1.82	3740	-2.30	-2.43	1.43	1.63	-2.43	-2.60
JO	2012	-0.56	1.19	5214	-2.30	-2.43	1.72	1.89	-2.28	-2.43
KE	1993	-1.87	1.53	4018	-2.33	-2.60	0.36	0.83	-2.41	-2.64
KE	1998	-1.82	1.79	2008	-2.33	-2.60	0.33	0.96	-2.30	-2.65
KE	2009	-1.59	1.67	4117	-2.33	-2.60	0.66	1.10	-2.40	-2.61
KE	2014	-1.35	1.41	15097	-2.33	-2.60	0.88	1.35	-2.23	-2.48
KH	2000	-2.20	1.82	2937	-2.80	-2.88	0.59	0.68	-2.71	-2.76
KH	2005	-2.11	1.34	2929	-2.80	-2.88	0.64	0.82	-2.78	-2.90
KH	2010	-1.89	1.43	3050	-2.80	-2.88	0.90	1.00	-2.88	-2.92
KH	2014	-1.62	1.33	3473	-2.80	-2.88	1.15	1.29	-2.84	-2.93
KK	1995	-1.11	1.48	510	-2.43	-2.57	1.16	1.61	-2.42	-2.73
KK	1999	-0.89	1.41	478	-2.43	-2.57	1.62	1.59	-2.45	-2.40
KY	1997	-1.59	1.47	662	-2.52	-2.67	0.86	1.15	-2.56	-2.72
KY	2012	-1.05	1.32	3132	-2.52	-2.67	1.43	1.66	-2.48	-2.63
LB	2007	-1.88	1.79	3447	-2.33	-2.60	0.33	0.84	-2.40	-2.68
LB	2013	-1.62	1.57	2451	-2.33	-2.60	0.61	1.09	-2.26	-2.52
LS	2004	-2.13	1.49	1056	-2.39	-2.55	0.22	0.45	-2.54	-2.62
LS	2009	-1.82	1.41	1270	-2.39	-2.55	0.48	0.82	-2.29	-2.45
LS	2014	-1.69	1.28	1009	-2.39	-2.55	0.58	0.98	-2.34	-2.57
MA	1992	-1.53	1.51	3726	-2.06	-2.17	0.54	0.63	-2.21	-2.23
MA	2003	-1.00	1.80	4509	-2.06	-2.17	0.98	1.25	-1.92	-2.11
MB	2005	-0.27	1.73	1081	-1.83	-1.87	1.57	1.58	-1.83	-1.87
MD	1992	-2.58	1.38	3208	-2.92	-3.17	0.22	0.70	-3.09	-3.32
MD	1997	-2.51	1.49	1945	-2.92	-3.17	0.21	0.85	-2.91	-3.31
MD	2004	-2.16	1.80	3670	-2.92	-3.17	0.66	1.10	-2.90	-3.12
MD	2009	-2.06	2.05	4277	-2.92	-3.17	0.79	1.18	-2.78	-2.92
ML	1996	-2.11	1.74	3004	-2.59	-2.79	0.38	0.78	-2.60	-2.83
ML	2001	-2.06	1.88	7430	-2.59	-2.79	0.46	0.80	-2.66	-2.85
ML	2006	-1.80	1.96	8873	-2.59	-2.79	0.72	1.06	-2.52	-2.69
ML	2012	-1.72	1.93	3717	-2.59	-2.79	0.79	1.14	-2.59	-2.77
MV	2009	-0.96	1.49	1887	-2.58	-2.61	1.63	1.63	-2.58	-2.61
MW	1992	-2.42	1.48	2485	-2.64	-2.84	0.10	0.53	-2.74	-2.97
MW	2000	-2.37	1.67	7299	-2.64	-2.84	0.18	0.56	-2.71	-2.89
MW	2004	-2.32	1.75	6552	-2.64	-2.84	0.21	0.64	-2.69	-2.91

MW	2010	-2.01	1.59	3855	-2.64	-2.84	0.50	0.95	-2.55	-2.79
MW	2015	-1.68	1.36	4139	-2.64	-2.84	0.88	1.23	-2.49	-2.65
MZ	1997	-2.24	1.76	2153	-2.55	-2.76	0.16	0.67	-2.60	-2.90
MZ	2003	-2.12	1.50	6304	-2.55	-2.76	0.35	0.72	-2.58	-2.76
MZ	2011	-1.81	1.62	7466	-2.55	-2.76	0.67	1.02	-2.46	-2.62
NC	1998	-1.63	1.57	5689	-2.41	-2.51	0.72	0.94	-2.46	-2.60
NC	2001	-1.40	1.48	4918	-2.41	-2.51	1.00	1.12	-2.36	-2.42
NG	1990	-2.28	1.81	4571	-2.82	-3.07	0.46	0.88	-2.89	-3.11
NG	2003	-2.04	1.97	3526	-2.82	-3.07	0.67	1.14	-2.79	-3.09
NG	2008	-1.98	2.35	16816	-2.82	-3.07	0.73	1.20	-2.82	-3.09
NG	2013	-1.72	2.10	20402	-2.82	-3.07	1.03	1.42	-2.77	-2.99
NI	1992	-2.15	1.70	3608	-2.74	-2.94	0.51	0.88	-2.57	-2.72
NI	1998	-2.41	1.54	2473	-2.74	-2.94	0.22	0.65	-2.77	-3.01
NI	2006	-2.41	1.74	2964	-2.74	-2.94	0.22	0.64	-2.95	-3.20
NI	2012	-1.98	1.81	3938	-2.74	-2.94	0.69	1.03	-2.66	-2.85
NM	1992	-1.64	1.54	1994	-2.36	-2.57	0.62	1.02	-2.37	-2.60
NM	2000	-1.37	1.50	2236	-2.36	-2.57	0.90	1.30	-2.17	-2.43
NM	2007	-1.51	1.50	2803	-2.36	-2.57	0.81	1.10	-2.47	-2.64
NM	2013	-1.23	1.44	1364	-2.36	-2.57	1.07	1.39	-2.43	-2.60
NP	1996	-2.62	1.37	2412	-2.97	-3.00	0.31	0.42	-3.03	-3.10
NP	2001	-2.44	1.27	4961	-2.97	-3.00	0.52	0.56	-3.04	-3.07
NP	2006	-2.20	1.25	4238	-2.97	-3.00	0.78	0.79	-2.95	-2.95
NP	2011	-1.94	1.32	1893	-2.97	-3.00	1.02	1.07	-2.87	-2.91
NP	2016	-1.75	1.24	1896	-2.97	-3.00	1.24	1.23	-2.94	-2.97
PE	1991	-1.83	1.42	6191	-2.76	-2.86	0.88	1.08	-2.67	-2.80
PE	1996	-1.65	1.49	12207	-2.76	-2.86	1.06	1.27	-2.60	-2.73
PE	2000	-1.66	1.38	9588	-2.76	-2.86	1.10	1.20	-2.72	-2.77
PE	2006	-1.63	1.20	1820	-2.76	-2.86	1.07	1.29	-2.82	-2.97
PE	2008	-1.45	1.18	6663	-2.76	-2.86	1.29	1.43	-2.83	-2.92
PE	2009	-1.39	1.17	7523	-2.76	-2.86	1.35	1.48	-2.82	-2.89
PE	2010	-1.35	1.12	7154	-2.76	-2.86	1.40	1.52	-2.81	-2.89
PE	2011	-1.29	1.08	7128	-2.76	-2.86	1.45	1.58	-2.79	-2.87
PE	2012	-1.21	1.06	7468	-2.76	-2.86	1.53	1.66	-2.79	-2.86
PK	1991	-2.70	1.85	3593	-3.47	-3.62	0.72	0.97	-3.44	-3.57
PK	2012	-2.30	2.14	2785	-3.47	-3.62	1.13	1.36	-3.50	-3.67
PY	1990	-1.09	1.31	2891	-2.05	-2.19	0.92	1.15	-2.05	-2.19
RW	1992	-2.37	1.38	3431	-2.66	-2.87	0.20	0.59	-2.67	-2.84
RW	2000	-2.08	1.70	4730	-2.66	-2.87	0.44	0.94	-2.46	-2.75
RW	2005	-2.24	1.56	2917	-2.66	-2.87	0.35	0.70	-2.79	-2.95
RW	2010	-1.97	1.29	3337	-2.66	-2.87	0.60	0.99	-2.70	-2.90
RW	2015	-1.80	1.33	2815	-2.66	-2.87	0.77	1.18	-2.71	-2.91
SL	2008	-1.56	2.20	1720	-2.40	-2.60	0.69	1.19	-2.22	-2.54
SL	2013	-1.59	2.20	3492	-2.40	-2.60	0.78	1.04	-2.57	-2.66

SN	1993	-1.70	1.58	3559	-2.16	-2.32	0.42	0.65	-2.34	-2.44
SN	2005	-1.16	1.45	2227	-2.16	-2.32	0.95	1.22	-1.93	-2.11
SN	2010	-1.53	1.70	3033	-2.16	-2.32	0.56	0.87	-2.38	-2.56
SN	2012	-1.19	1.41	4699	-2.16	-2.32	0.90	1.20	-2.08	-2.26
SN	2014	-1.19	1.28	4837	-2.16	-2.32	0.92	1.17	-2.10	-2.25
SN	2015	-1.25	1.27	4838	-2.16	-2.32	0.88	1.10	-2.20	-2.31
SN	2016	-1.13	1.25	4762	-2.16	-2.32	0.96	1.26	-2.08	-2.28
ST	2008	-1.21	1.92	1310	-2.27	-2.49	0.98	1.36	-2.27	-2.49
SZ	2006	-1.45	1.32	1603	-2.08	-2.28	0.53	0.92	-2.08	-2.28
TD	1997	-2.13	1.78	4384	-2.76	-2.97	0.56	0.90	-2.71	-2.89
TD	2004	-2.08	2.00	3585	-2.76	-2.97	0.60	0.97	-2.75	-2.97
TD	2015	-2.05	1.91	8154	-2.76	-2.97	0.62	1.00	-2.82	-3.05
TG	1998	-1.78	1.57	2337	-2.22	-2.42	0.30	0.76	-2.17	-2.46
TG	2014	-1.46	1.36	2555	-2.22	-2.42	0.72	1.00	-2.27	-2.38
TJ	2012	-1.35	1.66	3765	-2.75	-2.80	1.40	1.46	-2.75	-2.80
TL	2009	-2.33	1.89	6603	-2.93	-3.20	0.52	0.96	-2.92	-3.12
TL	2016	-1.83	2.10	4961	-2.93	-3.20	0.97	1.51	-2.95	-3.28
TR	1993	-1.21	1.45	2490	-2.43	-2.44	1.23	1.23	-2.42	-2.41
TR	1998	-1.15	1.42	2210	-2.43	-2.44	1.26	1.32	-2.44	-2.48
TZ	1991	-2.22	1.57	5060	-2.69	-2.87	0.37	0.74	-2.64	-2.85
TZ	1996	-2.26	1.50	4206	-2.69	-2.87	0.33	0.71	-2.76	-2.94
TZ	1999	-2.13	1.35	1966	-2.69	-2.87	0.54	0.76	-2.78	-2.85
TZ	2004	-2.00	1.36	5586	-2.69	-2.87	0.60	0.96	-2.62	-2.83
TZ	2010	-1.89	1.39	5371	-2.69	-2.87	0.70	1.08	-2.66	-2.90
TZ	2015	-1.65	1.29	7008	-2.69	-2.87	0.97	1.28	-2.66	-2.83
UG	1995	-2.01	1.62	3362	-2.42	-2.66	0.30	0.75	-2.44	-2.67
UG	2000	-2.00	1.48	4053	-2.42	-2.66	0.32	0.75	-2.50	-2.71
UG	2006	-1.78	1.51	1873	-2.42	-2.66	0.54	0.97	-2.39	-2.60
UG	2011	-1.64	1.49	1623	-2.42	-2.66	0.63	1.16	-2.38	-2.71
UG	2016	-1.44	1.36	3465	-2.42	-2.66	0.88	1.32	-2.38	-2.61
UZ	1996	-1.77	2.40	742	-2.82	-3.14	0.89	1.52	-2.82	-3.14
YE	1991	-2.01	1.49	2220	-3.02	-2.88	1.29	0.64	-2.89	-2.48
YE	2013	-2.13	1.65	11166	-3.02	-2.88	0.85	0.79	-3.15	-3.27
ZM	1992	-2.18	1.42	3767	-2.68	-2.90	0.38	0.82	-2.64	-2.88
ZM	1996	-2.26	1.50	4359	-2.68	-2.90	0.35	0.70	-2.71	-2.87
ZM	2002	-2.38	1.59	4336	-2.68	-2.90	0.20	0.60	-2.85	-3.06
ZM	2007	-1.95	1.71	4168	-2.68	-2.90	0.61	1.05	-2.55	-2.81
ZM	2013	-1.76	1.64	9386	-2.68	-2.90	0.83	1.22	-2.65	-2.87
ZW	1994	-1.66	1.39	1340	-2.17	-2.41	0.39	0.87	-2.12	-2.38
ZW	1999	-1.47	1.86	2200	-2.17	-2.41	0.56	1.08	-1.88	-2.19
ZW	2005	-1.67	1.65	3214	-2.17	-2.41	0.41	0.81	-2.20	-2.38
ZW	2010	-1.66	1.40	3202	-2.17	-2.41	0.41	0.86	-2.29	-2.52
ZW	2015	-1.36	1.31	3899	-2.17	-2.41	0.71	1.13	-2.36	-2.56

SM FIGURE 2 & SM TABLE 5: RELIABILITY OF COUNTRY-LEVEL ESTIMATES




SM Figure 2. Reliability of country-level estimates. Survey-level basal HAZ estimated for specific survey years plotted against country-level basal HAZ estimated across all survey years for which we have data for a country.

SM Table 5. Variance of Survey and Country Estimates of bHAZ

	Girls	Boys
Country	0.09	0.08
Survey	0.10	0.10
Ratio of Variance (ICC)	0.87	0.85

SM Table 5. Presents the variance of bHAZ estimates at the survey and country levels. The ratio of the variances suggests our basal estimates are reliable across survey years and are reliable across countries.

SM FIGURE 3: BHAZ AND AHAZ VALIDATION PLOTS FOR BOYS



SM Figure 3. Validation measures for boys. The assessment of bHAZ estimates for boys is qualitatively similar to those presented for girls in the main text.


SM FIGURE 4 & SM TABLE 6: CONVERTING RESOURCES MEASURE TO AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD WEALTH

The non-linear model estimates a sigmoid increase in HAZ based on increasing resources and decreasing burden of disease and poverty.

$$HAZ = \frac{a}{1 + e^{(c - \sum \beta_k X_k)}} + d_i + \gamma YEAR + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

The linear component of the model ($\sum \beta_k X_k - c$) captures the effects of these different environmental inputs in a single metric that can be interpreted as increasing resources.

To provide a meaningful metric resources when plotting expected HAZ over this resource component in Figure 3, we assign each value of this linear resource component a value for household wealth per capita in 2011 constant international dollars (PPP). We do this by regressing the AWE estimate of household wealth per capita against each household's value for the linear resource component. This showed a strong association with absolute household wealth estimates, which allowed us to convert the full linear resource component into absolute wealth estimates using a linear regression ($R^2=0.82$). We then use the regression equation to estimate the best fitting AWE value for any given linear resource component. We use this transformation to label the x-axis for Figure 3.




SM Figure S4. Relationship between the linear resource component and AWE estimates of household wealth per capita.

SM Table S6. Regression of resources on household wealth estimates

	Estimate	Std. Error
Intercept	3.08***	0
Resource	1.11***	0
Adjusted R ²	0.82	

Using resource estimates to predict Absolute Household Wealth Estimates

SM FIGURE 5: PROPORTIONAL INCREASE IN PREVALENCE ESTIMATES



SM Figure 5. Proportional increase in prevalence estimates using country-specific cutoffs that are adjusted for bHAZ estimates.

SM TABLE 7 & 8: CHANGES IN PREVELANCE OF SEVERE STUNTING BY WORLD REGION AND SURVEY

SM Table 7. Average Changes in the Prevalence estimates of Severe Stunting across world regions. Previous estimates based on the -3 SD cutoffs established by the MGRS. New estimates based on country-specific estimates that adjust the -3 SD MGRS cutoffs to account for population-level differences in basal HAZ estimates. Estimates are averages across all countries within the world region.

SM Table 7. Changes in Prevalence of Severe Stunting by World Region			
	Previous Estimates	New Estimates	Difference
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.21	0.33	0.11
Middle East & North Africa	0.12	0.22	0.10
Latin America & Caribbean	0.12	0.20	0.08
Europe & Central Asia	0.10	0.18	0.08
East Asia & Pacific	0.24	0.29	0.05
South Asia	0.27	0.29	0.02

SM Table 8. Proportional changes in estimates of severe stunting by survey and world region.

DHS Country Code	Study Year	World Region	MGRS Severe Stunting Prevalence	Country Adjusted Severe Stunting Prevalence	Difference
AL	2008	Europe and Central Asia	0.17	0.22	0.05
AM	2000	Europe and Central Asia	0.05	0.15	0.09
AM	2005	Europe and Central Asia	0.05	0.12	0.07
AM	2010	Europe and Central Asia	0.13	0.22	0.09
AM	2016	Europe and Central Asia	0.04	0.09	0.05
AO	2015	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.18	0.21	0.02
AZ	2006	Europe and Central Asia	0.17	0.21	0.03
BD	1996	South Asia	0.40	0.45	0.05
BD	1999	South Asia	0.27	0.31	0.04
BD	2004	South Asia	0.25	0.29	0.05
BD	2007	South Asia	0.19	0.23	0.04
BD	2011	South Asia	0.18	0.22	0.04
BF	1993	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.21	0.33	0.13
BF	1999	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.29	0.43	0.13

BF	2003	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.29	0.41	0.12
BF	2010	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.17	0.29	0.12
BJ	1996	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.29	0.08
BJ	2001	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.21	0.30	0.09
BJ	2006	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.28	0.36	0.07
BJ	2012	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.40	0.45	0.06
BO	1994	Latin America & Caribbean	0.18	0.30	0.11
BO	1998	Latin America & Caribbean	0.17	0.27	0.10
BO	2003	Latin America & Caribbean	0.13	0.24	0.10
CF	1994	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.27	0.36	0.09
CG	2005	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.16	0.29	0.13
CG	2011	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.12	0.27	0.15
CI	1994	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.18	0.33	0.15
CI	1998	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.14	0.27	0.13
CI	2012	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.15	0.28	0.13
CM	1991	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.18	0.28	0.09
CM	1998	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.21	0.33	0.12
CM	2004	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.30	0.10
CM	2011	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.17	0.27	0.10
CO	1995	Latin America & Caribbean	0.06	0.14	0.08
CO	2000	Latin America & Caribbean	0.05	0.13	0.08
CO	2005	Latin America & Caribbean	0.04	0.11	0.07
CO	2010	Latin America & Caribbean	0.03	0.10	0.06
DR	1991	Latin America & Caribbean	0.09	0.23	0.14
DR	1996	Latin America & Caribbean	0.06	0.16	0.10
DR	2002	Latin America & Caribbean	0.04	0.12	0.08
DR	2007	Latin America & Caribbean	0.03	0.11	0.08
DR	2013	Latin America & Caribbean	0.02	0.07	0.05
EG	1992	Middle East & North Africa	0.14	0.26	0.12
EG	1995	Middle East & North Africa	0.19	0.33	0.14
EG	2000	Middle East & North Africa	0.10	0.19	0.10
EG	2003	Middle East & North Africa	0.08	0.16	0.08
EG	2005	Middle East & North Africa	0.14	0.23	0.10
EG	2008	Middle East & North Africa	0.18	0.30	0.11
EG	2014	Middle East & North Africa	0.10	0.18	0.08
ET	2000	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.34	0.46	0.12
ET	2005	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.32	0.42	0.10
ET	2011	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.26	0.36	0.10
ET	2016	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.29	0.09
GA	2000	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.13	0.20	0.08
GA	2012	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.10	0.17	0.06
GH	1993	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.21	0.37	0.17
GH	1998	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.18	0.33	0.15

GH	2003	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.17	0.34	0.17
GH	2008	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.12	0.26	0.15
GH	2014	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.07	0.16	0.10
GM	2013	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.10	0.27	0.17
GN	1999	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.19	0.35	0.16
GN	2005	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.23	0.42	0.19
GN	2012	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.16	0.31	0.15
GU	1995	Latin America & Caribbean	0.40	0.33	-0.07
GU	1999	Latin America & Caribbean	0.36	0.28	-0.07
GU	2015	Latin America & Caribbean	0.19	0.14	-0.05
GY	2009	Latin America & Caribbean	0.08	0.19	0.11
HN	2006	Latin America & Caribbean	0.14	0.23	0.09
HN	2012	Latin America & Caribbean	0.08	0.15	0.06
HT	1994	Latin America & Caribbean	0.24	0.42	0.19
HT	2000	Latin America & Caribbean	0.13	0.32	0.19
HT	2006	Latin America & Caribbean	0.12	0.32	0.20
HT	2012	Latin America & Caribbean	0.09	0.25	0.16
IA	1993	South Asia	0.39	0.39	0.00
IA	1999	South Asia	0.37	0.37	0.00
IA	2006	South Asia	0.24	0.24	0.00
IA	2015	South Asia	0.18	0.18	0.00
JO	1990	Middle East & North Africa	0.07	0.19	0.11
JO	1997	Middle East & North Africa	0.03	0.09	0.07
JO	2002	Middle East & North Africa	0.03	0.11	0.08
JO	2007	Middle East & North Africa	0.09	0.16	0.07
JO	2012	Middle East & North Africa	0.02	0.07	0.04
KE	1993	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.37	0.17
KE	1998	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.23	0.39	0.16
KE	2009	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.17	0.31	0.15
KE	2014	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.10	0.22	0.12
KH	2000	East Asia & Pacific	0.31	0.40	0.08
KH	2005	East Asia & Pacific	0.22	0.29	0.07
KH	2010	East Asia & Pacific	0.17	0.23	0.06
KH	2014	East Asia & Pacific	0.11	0.18	0.06
KK	1995	Europe and Central Asia	0.08	0.19	0.11
KK	1999	Europe and Central Asia	0.05	0.11	0.06
KY	1997	Europe and Central Asia	0.12	0.26	0.14
KY	2012	Europe and Central Asia	0.06	0.12	0.06
LB	2007	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.24	0.39	0.14
LB	2013	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.16	0.29	0.13
LS	2004	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.24	0.42	0.18
LS	2009	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.18	0.35	0.17
LS	2014	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.14	0.30	0.16

MA	1992	Middle East & North Africa	0.14	0.36	0.22
MA	2003	Middle East & North Africa	0.11	0.26	0.15
MB	2005	Europe and Central Asia	0.04	0.16	0.13
MD	1992	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.38	0.41	0.03
MD	1997	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.37	0.40	0.03
MD	2004	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.30	0.32	0.03
MD	2009	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.31	0.33	0.02
ML	1996	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.28	0.39	0.10
ML	2001	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.30	0.39	0.10
ML	2006	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.25	0.34	0.09
ML	2012	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.24	0.32	0.08
MV	2009	South Asia	0.06	0.12	0.06
MW	1992	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.32	0.44	0.12
MW	2000	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.33	0.45	0.11
MW	2004	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.32	0.43	0.11
MW	2010	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.22	0.34	0.12
MW	2015	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.12	0.21	0.09
MZ	1997	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.32	0.44	0.12
MZ	2003	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.26	0.38	0.12
MZ	2011	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.31	0.11
NC	1998	Latin America & Caribbean	0.16	0.30	0.14
NC	2001	Latin America & Caribbean	0.11	0.24	0.12
NG	1990	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.32	0.37	0.04
NG	2003	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.29	0.32	0.04
NG	2008	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.31	0.35	0.03
NG	2013	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.25	0.29	0.03
NI	1992	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.29	0.36	0.07
NI	1998	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.34	0.41	0.08
NI	2006	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.36	0.43	0.07
NI	2012	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.26	0.32	0.06
NM	1992	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.15	0.30	0.15
NM	2000	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.12	0.24	0.12
NM	2007	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.14	0.27	0.14
NM	2013	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.09	0.20	0.11
NP	1996	South Asia	0.37	0.43	0.05
NP	2001	South Asia	0.32	0.37	0.05
NP	2006	South Asia	0.25	0.30	0.05
NP	2011	South Asia	0.19	0.23	0.04
NP	2016	South Asia	0.14	0.18	0.04
PE	1991	Latin America & Caribbean	0.18	0.26	0.08
PE	1996	Latin America & Caribbean	0.16	0.23	0.07
PE	2000	Latin America & Caribbean	0.14	0.21	0.07
PE	2006	Latin America & Caribbean	0.11	0.18	0.07

PE	2008	Latin America & Caribbean	0.09	0.15	0.06
PE	2009	Latin America & Caribbean	0.08	0.13	0.05
PE	2010	Latin America & Caribbean	0.07	0.12	0.05
PE	2011	Latin America & Caribbean	0.05	0.10	0.05
PE	2012	Latin America & Caribbean	0.04	0.08	0.04
PK	1991	South Asia	0.43	0.35	-0.08
PK	2012	South Asia	0.34	0.28	-0.06
PY	1990	Latin America & Caribbean	0.06	0.23	0.17
RW	1992	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.32	0.43	0.11
RW	2000	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.27	0.37	0.10
RW	2005	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.29	0.39	0.10
RW	2010	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.29	0.09
RW	2015	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.16	0.25	0.09
SL	2008	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.25	0.35	0.11
SL	2013	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.22	0.35	0.12
SN	1993	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.19	0.37	0.18
SN	2005	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.09	0.23	0.14
SN	2010	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.15	0.33	0.18
SN	2012	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.09	0.22	0.14
SN	2014	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.07	0.22	0.15
SN	2015	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.07	0.23	0.16
SN	2016	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.06	0.20	0.14
ST	2008	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.13	0.24	0.12
SZ	2006	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.10	0.31	0.20
TD	1997	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.31	0.36	0.06
TD	2004	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.32	0.38	0.06
TD	2015	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.30	0.36	0.06
TG	1998	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.39	0.19
TG	2014	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.11	0.28	0.17
TJ	2012	Europe and Central Asia	0.12	0.16	0.05
TL	2009	East Asia & Pacific	0.36	0.38	0.02
TL	2016	East Asia & Pacific	0.27	0.28	0.02
TR	1993	Europe and Central Asia	0.10	0.21	0.11
TR	1998	Europe and Central Asia	0.10	0.19	0.09
TZ	1991	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.29	0.40	0.11
TZ	1996	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.29	0.39	0.10
TZ	1999	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.25	0.35	0.10
TZ	2004	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.30	0.10
TZ	2010	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.19	0.27	0.08
TZ	2015	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.13	0.20	0.07
UG	1995	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.23	0.39	0.16
UG	2000	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.22	0.39	0.17
UG	2006	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.18	0.32	0.14

UG	2011	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.16	0.27	0.11
UG	2016	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.10	0.22	0.11
UZ	1996	Europe and Central Asia	0.27	0.30	0.02
YE	1991	Middle East & North Africa	0.27	0.33	0.05
YE	2013	Middle East & North Africa	0.27	0.32	0.05
ZM	1992	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.26	0.36	0.10
ZM	1996	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.29	0.39	0.10
ZM	2002	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.34	0.43	0.10
ZM	2007	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.24	0.33	0.09
ZM	2013	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.20	0.27	0.07
ZW	1994	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.14	0.36	0.23
ZW	1999	Sub-Saharan Africa	0.16	0.34	0.18