

**Effects of prenatal nutritional supplements on gestational weight gain in low- and middle-income countries: a meta-analysis of individual participant data**

Enju Liu<sup>1,2</sup>, Dongqing Wang<sup>3,4</sup>, Anne Marie Darling<sup>3</sup>, Nandita Perumal<sup>3</sup>, Molin Wang<sup>5,6</sup>, Tahmeed Ahmed<sup>7</sup>, Parul Christian<sup>8</sup>, Kathryn G. Dewey<sup>9</sup>, Gilberto Kac<sup>10</sup>, Stephen Kennedy<sup>11</sup>, Vishak Subramoney<sup>12,13</sup>, Brittany Briggs<sup>14</sup>, Wafaie W. Fawzi<sup>3,5,15</sup>, and members of the GWG Pooling Project Consortium \*

<sup>1</sup> Institutional Centers for Clinical and Translational Research, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

<sup>2</sup> Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition, Boston Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

<sup>3</sup> Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

<sup>4</sup> Department of Global and Community Health, College of Health and Human Services, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, United States of America

<sup>5</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

<sup>6</sup> Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

<sup>7</sup> Nutrition & Clinical Services, International Centre for Diarrheal Disease Research, Bangladesh

<sup>8</sup> Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, United States of America

<sup>9</sup> Department of Nutrition, University of California, Davis, Davis, California, United States of America

<sup>10</sup> Nutritional Epidemiology Observatory, Josué de Castro Nutrition Institute, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

<sup>11</sup> Nuffield Department of Women's & Reproductive Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

<sup>12</sup> Certara Canada, 2000 Peel St, Montreal, Quebec H3A 2W5, Canada

<sup>13</sup> DVPL Tech.

<sup>14</sup> Certara USA, Inc. on behalf of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle, Washington, United States of America

<sup>15</sup> Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

**\* Members of the GWG Pooling Project Consortium**

1. Seth Adu-Afarwuah, Department of Nutrition and Food Science, University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana
2. Abu Ahmed Shamim, Center for Non-communicable Diseases and Nutrition, BRAC James P Grant School of Public Health, BRAC University, 6th Floor, Medona Tower, 28 Mohakhali Commercial Area, Bir Uttom AK Khandaker Road, Dhaka 1213, Bangladesh
3. Shams Arifeen, International Center for Diarrheal Disease Research, Dhaka, Bangladesh
4. Per Ashorn, Center for Child, Adolescent and Maternal Health Research, Faculty of Medicine and Health Technology, Tampere University and Tampere University Hospital, Tampere, Finland
5. Ulla Ashorn, Center for Child, Adolescent and Maternal Health Research, Faculty of Medicine and Health Technology, Tampere University and Tampere University Hospital, Tampere, Finland
6. Zulfiqar A Bhutta, Centre for Global Child Health, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario, Canada & Institute for Global Health & Development, the Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan
7. Yue Cheng, Department of Nutrition and Food Safety Research, School of Public Health, Xi'an Jiaotong University Health Science Center, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710061, P.R. China
8. Anthony M Costello, Global Health and Sustainable Development, UCL Institute for Global Health, 30 Guilford Street, London WC1N 1EH, UK
9. Henrik Friis, Department of Nutrition, Exercise and Sports, University of Copenhagen, Rolighedsvej 26, 1958 Frederiksberg C, Denmark
10. Exnevia Gomo, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Zimbabwe, Box A178 Avondale, Harare
11. Rebecca Grais, Epicentre, 14-34 Avenue Jean Jaurès 75019 Paris, France
12. Ousmane Guindo, Epicentre Niger, Niamey, Niger
13. Lieven Huybregts, Department of Food Technology, Safety and Health, Ghent University, Coupure links 653, 9000 Gent, Belgium; Poverty, Health and Nutrition Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC, USA

14. Sheila Isanaka, Epicentre 14-34 Avenue Jean Jaurès 75019 Paris, France & Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Departments of Nutrition and Global Health and Population, Boston, MA, USA
15. Keith P. West, Jr. Center for Human Nutrition, Dept of International Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA
16. Patrick Kolsteren, Department of Food Technology, Safety and Health, Ghent University, Coupure links 653, 9000 Gent, Belgium
17. Nancy F. Krebs, University of Colorado School of Medicine; Aurora, Colorado, USA
18. Carl Lachat, Department of Food Technology, Safety and Health, Ghent University, Coupure links 653, 9000 Gent, Belgium
19. Anna Lartey, Department of Nutrition and Food Science, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana
20. Steven C. LeClerq, Center for Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA
21. Kenneth Maleta, School of Public Health and Family Medicine, University of Malawi, College of Medicine, Blantyre, Malawi, 1 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Private Bag 360, Blantyre 3, Malawi
22. Dharma S Manandhar, Mother and Infant Research Activities (MIRA), GPO Box 921, Kathmandu, Nepal
23. Reynaldo Martorell, Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
24. Susana L Matias, Department of Nutritional Sciences and Toxicology, University of California, Berkeley
25. Elizabeth M. McClure, RTI International, Durham, NC, USA
26. K. Michael Hambidge, University of Colorado School of Medicine; Aurora, Colorado, USA
27. Sophie E. Moore, Department of Women and Children's Health, King's College London, St Thomas' Hospital, Westminster Bridge Road, London, SE1 7EH & MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Atlantic Boulevard, Fajara, PO Box 273, Banjul, The Gambia.

28. Malay Kanti Mridha, Center for Non-communicable Diseases and Nutrition, BRAC James P Grant School of Public Health, BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh
29. David Osrin, UCL Institute for Global Health, 30 Guilford Street, London WC1N 1EH, UK
30. Andrea B. Pembe, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
31. Andrew M. Prentice, MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Atlantic Boulevard, Fajara, PO Box 273, Banjul, The Gambia.
32. Usha Ramakrishnan, Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
33. Juan Rivera, National Institute of Public Health, Cuernavaca, Morelos, Mexico
34. Sajid Soofi, Centre of Excellence in Women and Child Health, the Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan
35. Kerry Schulze, Center for Human Nutrition, Dept of International Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA
36. Willy Urassa, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
37. Lee Wu, Center for Human Nutrition, Department of International Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA
38. Lingxia Zeng, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Xi'an Jiaotong University Health Science Center, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710061, P.R. China
39. Zhonghai Zhu, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Xi'an Jiaotong University Health Science Center, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710061, P.R. China

**Disclaimers:** None of the authors reported a conflict of interest related to the study.

**Data availability:** Data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code will be made available upon request pending application and approval.

**Corresponding Authors**

Enju Liu, PhD

Institutional Centers for Clinical and Translational Research,

Boston Children's Hospital,

300 Longwood Avenue – Mailstop 3200

Boston, MA 02115

Email: [enju.liu@childrens.harvard.edu](mailto:enju.liu@childrens.harvard.edu)

Wafaie Fawzi, MBBS, DrPH

Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health

665 Huntington Ave,

Boston MA 02115

Email: [mina@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:mina@hsph.harvard.edu)

**Sources of Support:** This study was supported by funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

(OPP1204850)

**Short running head:** nutrient supplements and gestational weight gain

### **Abbreviations**

BMI	Body mass index
GWG	Gestational weight gain
IOM	Institute of Medicine
LMICs	Low- and middle-income countries
LNS	Lipid-based nutrient supplements
MMS	Multiple micronutrient supplements
WMD	Weighted mean difference

**Keywords:** Multiple micronutrient supplements; Small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements; Gestational weight gain; Randomized controlled trials; Meta-analysis; Low- and middle-income countries

2 **ABSTRACT**

3 **Background:** Gestational weight gain (GWG) below or above the Institute of Medicine (IOM)  
4 recommendations has been associated with adverse perinatal outcomes. Few studies have examined the  
5 effect of prenatal nutrient supplementations on GWG in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

6 **Objective:** To investigate the effects of multiple micronutrient supplements (MMS) and small-quantity  
7 lipid-based nutrient supplements (LNS) on GWG in LMICs.

8 **Methods** A two-stage meta-analysis of individual participant data was conducted to examine the effects  
9 of MMS (45,507 women from 14 trials) and small-quantity LNS (6,237 women from 4 trials) on GWG  
10 compared to iron and folic acid supplements only. Percent adequacy of GWG and total weight gain at  
11 delivery were calculated according to the IOM 2009 guidelines. Binary outcomes included severely  
12 inadequate (percent adequacy < 70%), inadequate (< 90%), and excessive (>125%) GWG. Results from  
13 individual trials were pooled using fixed-effects inverse-variance models. Heterogeneity was examined  
14 using  $I^2$ , stratified analysis, and meta-regression.

15 **Results** MMS resulted in a greater percent adequacy of GWG (weighted mean difference (WMD):  
16 0.86%; 95% CI: 0.28%, 1.44%;  $P < 0.01$ ) and higher GWG at delivery (WMD: 209 g; 95% CI: 139, 280;  
17  $P < 0.01$ ) than among those in the control arm. Women who received MMS had a 2.9% reduced risk of  
18 severely inadequate GWG (RR: 0.971; 95% CI: 0.956, 0.987;  $P < 0.01$ ). No association was found  
19 between small-quantity LNS and GWG percent adequacy (WMD: 1.51%; 95% CI: -0.38%, 3.40%;  $P =$   
20 0.21). Neither MMS nor small-quantity LNS was associated with excessive GWG.

21 **Conclusions** Maternal MMS was associated with a greater GWG percent adequacy and total GWG at  
22 delivery compared to iron and folic acid only. This finding is consistent with previous results on birth  
23 outcomes and will inform policy development and local recommendation of switching routine prenatal  
24 iron and folic acid supplements to MMS.

## 25 INTRODUCTION

26           Pregnancy is characterized by multiple metabolic changes with additional requirements for  
27 nutrients and energy intake. As pregnancy progresses, the maternal basal metabolic rate continues to  
28 increase, reaching 10-20% more than non-pregnancy levels (1). Maternal weight gain is small and  
29 primarily due to fat deposition and placental development during the first trimester. The fastest weight  
30 gain occurs in the second trimester, with a slightly decreasing rate during the third trimester. Weight gain  
31 in the later trimesters is more related to fetal growth as well as maternal fat stores and total body water  
32 accretion (2). Overall approximately 50% of total gestational weight gain (GWG) during pregnancy is  
33 attributed to the fetoplacental unit (fetus, placental, amniotic fluid, and gravid uterus), another 25% is  
34 attributed to increases in blood volume, extravascular fluid, and breast tissue, and the remaining 25% to  
35 maternal fat stores (1, 2).

36           Undernutrition is common among women in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) (3).  
37 Pregnant women in these settings are often at higher risk of multiple micronutrient deficiencies due to  
38 food insecurity, low dietary diversity, and the increased demands of the developing fetus (4, 5). Currently,  
39 the widely available prenatal multiple micronutrient supplements (MMS) product is the United Nations  
40 International Multiple Micronutrient Antenatal Preparation (UNIMMAP) tablet, which contains 15  
41 micronutrients including 30 mg of iron and 0.4 mg of folic acid. Data from previous meta-analyses have  
42 shown that, compared to iron and folic acid supplements, prenatal MMS decreases the risk of low  
43 birthweight and small-for-gestational-age birth (6, 7), and particularly benefit infants born to underweight  
44 or anemic women (6).

45           Prenatal small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements (LNS), providing approximately 120  
46 kcal/day, offer another strategy for delivering not only vitamins and minerals, but also essential fatty  
47 acids and macronutrients not incorporated in MMS tablets. Two meta-analyses reported that prenatal  
48 LNS, including those providing much more than 120 kcal/day, significantly increased birthweight and  
49 length and reduced the risk of small for gestational age birth (8, 9). However, meta-analysis focused on  
50 the effect of small-quantity LNS is lacking.

51 Gestational weight gain (GWG) is widely used as an indicator of the adequacy of nutrition during  
52 pregnancy. Inadequate GWG has been consistently associated with adverse birth outcomes such as  
53 prematurity (10-12), small for gestational age birth (12-14), low birthweight (10, 12-15), and infant  
54 mortality (16). On the other hand, excessive GWG has been associated with increased risks of large for  
55 gestational age, macrosomia, cesarean delivery, gestational diabetes, and subsequent maternal obesity (17,  
56 18). Demographic surveillance data from sub-Saharan Africa and India suggest that average weight gain  
57 among pregnant women is only around 60% of the recommended amount for normal-weight women (19).  
58 A more recent modeling analysis using Demographic and Health Surveys data revealed inadequate GWG  
59 in most LMICs and regions (20).

60 Since weight gain during pregnancy is often monitored in prenatal clinical care, it is a modifiable  
61 risk factor for adverse birth and maternal outcomes. However, few existing randomized controlled trials  
62 have been designed to examine the effect of prenatal nutritional supplements on GWG (21-23), and direct  
63 evidence of the effect on GWG is limited. We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis using  
64 individual participant data from randomized controlled trials to examine the effects of MMS and small-  
65 quantity LNS on GWG among pregnant women in LMICs. We further aimed to identify potential  
66 modifiers of the effect of these nutritional supplements on GWG.

67 **METHODS**

68 **Identification of eligible trials and individual participants**

69 We conducted a systematic search using PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science to identify  
70 randomized controlled trials among pregnant women published after January 2000 up to December 2021  
71 **(Supplemental material: Search strategy)**. Study-level inclusion criteria included: 1) randomized  
72 controlled trials of prenatal nutrient supplements from LMICs, including trials of MMS or small-quantity  
73 LNS; and 2) studies that had measured maternal weight during pregnancy. Trials conducted exclusively  
74 among pregnant women with a health condition, such as anemia, human immunodeficiency virus, or  
75 diabetes, were excluded. We also reviewed the references of the included trials and previous systematic  
76 reviews to identify additional relevant studies. Study protocol was developed with pre-defined outcome  
77 metrics and analysis plan while we were conducting literature search and screening.

78 We contacted the principal investigators of all identified trials to seek collaboration and data  
79 sharing. For those who agreed to participate in this individual participant data meta-analyses, the  
80 Knowledge Integration (Ki) team at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and study principal  
81 investigators executed data contributor agreements with the corresponding institutions. Once data were  
82 obtained from each trial, we checked data completeness and mapped all the variables we had requested.  
83 All data queries were resolved with individual principal investigators, and there was no critical issue  
84 regarding data integrity. In order to facilitate pooling of data across trials, data items were recoded into a  
85 common format, classifications of participant characteristics and their disease/condition status were  
86 standardized, and variables were named consistently across studies. We further applied individual-level  
87 criteria to identify eligible individual participants, including: 1) singleton pregnancies, 2) at least one  
88 weight measurement in the second or third trimesters, 3) known gestational ages at the time of weight  
89 measurements, and 4) availability of maternal height measure. Data from pregnancies that resulted in  
90 stillbirths or neonatal deaths were included. The balance across intervention and controls arms with  
91 respect to baseline subject characteristic were checked for each trial separately.

92

## 93 **Estimation of pre-pregnancy weight and BMI**

94 An accurate assessment of GWG during pregnancy requires a pre-pregnancy weight measure,  
95 which is often unavailable in epidemiologic studies. In this analysis, we used first-trimester weight as a  
96 proxy for maternal pre-pregnancy weight. Overall, 60% of pregnant women included in the analysis had  
97 pre-pregnancy weight or weight measured in the first trimester. We developed an imputation model for  
98 women who did not have observed pre-pregnancy or first-trimester weight measure to impute their first-  
99 trimester weight using weights measured later during pregnancy. The details of the model development,  
100 selection, and validation have been published elsewhere (24). Briefly, mixed-effects models and restricted  
101 cubic splines were used to impute weight at 9 weeks of gestation. We chose to impute weight at 9 weeks  
102 because it is consistent with the first available weight measure during pregnancy used in the  
103 INTERGROWTH-21st Study, an international research project that developed GWG standards among  
104 pre-pregnancy normal-weight women (25). The availability of an observed pre-pregnancy or first-  
105 trimester weight measure and the average of total number of weight measures during pregnancy by trials  
106 are presented **Supplemental Table 1**. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated by dividing pre-pregnancy  
107 (observed) or first-trimester weight (observed or imputed) in kilograms by the square of height in meters.  
108 For women aged  $\geq 20$  years old, we used the World Health Organization (WHO) BMI cutoffs to define  
109 underweight ( $\text{BMI} < 18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ), normal weight ( $18.5 \leq \text{BMI} < 25.0 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ), overweight ( $25.0 \leq \text{BMI} <$   
110  $30.0 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ), and obesity ( $\text{BMI} \geq 30.0 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ) (26). For adolescent women ( $< 20$  years old), we used the  
111 WHO adolescent growth reference to define underweight (BMI-for-age Z-score:  $< -2$ ), normal weight  
112 (BMI-for-age Z-score:  $-2$  to  $< 1$ ), overweight (BMI-for-age Z-score:  $1$  to  $< 2$ ), and obesity (BMI-for-age  
113 Z-score:  $\geq 2$ ) (27).

114

## 115 **Outcome metrics**

### 116 *Percent adequacy of GWG*

117 First, GWG at the time of last weight measure during pregnancy was calculated for each woman  
118 by subtracting pre-pregnancy or first-trimester weight from the last available weight measurement during

119 pregnancy. Second, following the Institute of Medicine (IOM) 2009 recommendation (2), we estimated  
120 the expected weight gain for each woman at the time of their last observed weight measure using the  
121 following formula:

122

123 *Recommended GWG = expected first-trimester weight gain/13.86\*(13.86-gestation age at first observed*  
124 *or imputed weight measurement) + [(gestational age at the last weight measurement – 13.86 weeks) ×*  
125 *recommended rate of GWG for the second and third trimester by BMI category based on IOM*  
126 *guidelines].*

127

128 We assumed that the expected first-trimester weight gain was 2 kg for underweight and normal-  
129 weight women, 1 kg for overweight women, and 0.5 kg for women with obesity (22). The recommended  
130 rates of GWG for the second and third trimesters were 0.51, 0.42, 0.28, and 0.22 kg per week for women  
131 with underweight, normal weight, overweight, and obesity, respectively (2).

132 Finally, the percent adequacy of GWG was calculated by dividing the observed GWG at the time  
133 of the last weight measurement by the expected GWG for that week of gestation based on the IOM  
134 recommendations, multiplied by 100. This continuous outcome is independent of gestational age at the  
135 time of weight measure and has been employed previously (22).

136

### 137 ***Severely inadequate, inadequate, and excessive GWG***

138 The percent adequacy of GWG defined as above was considered adequate between 90% and  
139 125%. The cut points 90% and 125% correspond to the lower and upper limits of the recommended total  
140 weight gain during pregnancy by IOM guideline (2). Severely inadequate GWG was defined as percent  
141 adequacy of GWG < 70%, inadequate GWG as percent adequacy of GWG < 90%, and excessive GWG as  
142 percent adequacy of GWG >125% (22).

143

### 144 ***Estimated total GWG at delivery***

145           The median time interval between last weight measurement and delivery was 6.0 (interquartile  
146 range: 3.2, 8.4) weeks. The total GWG at delivery was estimated by multiplying the percent adequacy of  
147 GWG (estimated above) by the IOM-recommended GWG at delivery, which was calculated based on the  
148 gestational age at delivery and BMI category for each individual woman.

149

## 150 **Statistical analysis**

151           Within each trial, we used multiple linear regression models to examine the association between  
152 MMS or small-quantity-LNS and continuous outcomes, including percent adequacy of GWG and  
153 estimated total GWG at delivery. Mean differences in percent adequacy and estimated total GWG and  
154 their 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were reported for continuous outcomes. We used modified Poisson  
155 regression with robust variance estimation to estimate the association between MMS or small-quantity-  
156 LNS versus iron and folic acid only and binary outcomes, including severely inadequate, inadequate, and  
157 excessive GWG. Risk ratios (RRs) and 95% CIs were reported for binary outcomes. For cluster  
158 randomized controlled trials, compound symmetry correlation structure was used to account for the fact  
159 that clusters were randomized instead of individual participants. For factorial design trials with MMS and  
160 another intervention, the interaction test between the two interventions was examined within each trial  
161 first, and if no interaction was found, all intervention arms were collapsed based on whether MMS was  
162 received.

163           To identify potential subgroups of women who might experience a greater effect from MMS or  
164 small-quantity LNS, we conducted stratified analyses by categories of the following factors for each trial:  
165 1) pre-pregnancy BMI (underweight, normal-weight, overweight or obese); 2) adherence to the assigned  
166 regimen (< 90% or  $\geq$  90%); 3) maternal age (< 20 yrs, 20-29 yrs, and  $\geq$  30 yrs); 4) gestational age at  
167 randomization (< 20 wks or  $\geq$  20 wks); 5) parity (0 or  $\geq$  1); 6) maternal education level (< 8 yrs or  $\geq$  8  
168 yrs); 7) maternal anemia status (< 11.0 g/dL or  $\geq$  11.0 g/dL); 8) maternal height (< 150 cm or  $\geq$  150cm);  
169 and 9) infant sex (male or female). These factors and their cut points were selected based on their  
170 inclusion in existing literature, data availability, and distribution in the current analysis. Individual data on

171 pill count or intervention uptake of the assigned regimen from each trial were collected, and adherence  
172 was assessed by dividing the amount of regimen consumed by the amount distributed to each woman  
173 during the overall study period. Mean differences for continuous outcomes and their corresponding 95%  
174 CIs were estimated by subgroups within each trial.

175         After analyses were completed for each trial, fixed-effect inverse-variance meta-analyses were  
176 conducted to pool study-specific overall and subgroup effects. Heterogeneity across trials was assessed  
177 using the  $I^2$  statistic, with thresholds of < 30%, 30-60%, and > 60% considered low, moderate, and high  
178 heterogeneity, respectively. Meta-regression analysis was used to examine the statistical difference in the  
179 effect of MMS or small-quantity LNS on GWG across categories of potential effect modifiers with  $P <$   
180 0.05 considered as indicative of effect modification.

181         As a secondary analysis, we calculated GWG z-score using the INTERGROWTH-21 maternal  
182 weight gain standards (25) and further examined the association of this z-score with MMS and small-  
183 quantity LNS among normal-weight women.

184         Random-effect meta-analyses were conducted as a sensitivity analysis for continuous outcomes.  
185 To evaluate whether our results were driven by the JiVitA-3 trial (28) due to its large sample size, or the  
186 Women First trial (29) due to the provision of extra calories by its study design, we conducted sensitivity  
187 analysis for GWG percent adequacy excluding these two trials. In another sensitivity analysis, we  
188 excluded pregnant women who had the last weight measure in the second trimester and restricted our  
189 analysis to those who had the final weight measure in the third trimester. In a similar analysis, we  
190 restricted our analysis to women who had imputed first-trimester weight to evaluate the potential bias by  
191 use of the imputation.

192         All individual trials were approved by their respective ethics committees. Two-tailed p-values <  
193 0.05 were considered significant. Statistical analyses were performed using SAS version 9.4 (SAS  
194 Institute) and Stata version 16.

195

## 196 **RESULTS**

197 **General characteristics of the included studies**

198 A summary of the characteristics of each trial included in the analysis is shown in **Table 1**. We  
199 identified 17 randomized controlled trials that met our eligibility criteria, and 16 of them with a combined  
200 sample size of 50,927 pregnant women were included in this analysis (22, 23, 28-41) (**Supplemental**  
201 **material: PRISMA IPD flow diagram**). For interventions, 12 of 16 trials included had an MMS arm, 2  
202 trials had a small-quantity LNS arm, and another 2 trials had both MMS and small-quantity LNS arms.  
203 The only eligible trial not included in the analysis due to non-response to invitation had an MMS arm  
204 (42). In all trials, women in the control arm were provided daily supplementation of iron with (n=15) or  
205 without folic acid (n=1) by the study team or had access to prenatal supplementation from local health  
206 services. Of the included trials, six were cluster-randomized (23, 28, 30, 37, 38, 40) and the remainder  
207 were individually randomized. Pregnant women were enrolled before or at 20 weeks of gestation in 14 of  
208 16 trials. The participants' characteristics and cumulative incidence of binary outcomes by trial are  
209 presented in **Supplemental Table 2** for the analysis of MMS and **Supplemental Table 3** for the analysis  
210 of small-quantity LNS. We updated our search in August 2022 and did not find any new eligible trial  
211 published.

212

213 **Continuous outcomes: percent adequacy and total GWG**

214 The mean GWG percent adequacy was 77%, ranging from 60% to 107% across the 16 trials  
215 included in the analysis. Pregnant women who received maternal MMS had greater percent adequacy of  
216 GWG and estimated total GWG at delivery than those in the control arm (**Table 2**). Study-specific results  
217 demonstrated that in nine of the 14 trials, MMS had positive effects on percent adequacy of GWG. The  
218 weighted mean difference (WMD) from fixed-effects meta-analyses was 0.86% (95% CI: 0.28%, 1.44%;  
219  $I^2=13.3%$ ) (**Figure 1**) and the WMD in estimated total GWG at delivery was 209 g (95% CI: 139, 280;  $I^2$   
220  $=52.5%$ ) (**Figure 2**).

221 Individual data from four trials of small-quantity LNS were included in the analysis. In the study-  
222 specific analysis, maternal small-quantity LNS was positively associated with GWG percent adequacy in

223 three of the four trials, and two of them were statistically significant. The overall WMD from the fixed  
224 effects meta-analysis comparing women who received small-quantity LNS with those in the control arm  
225 was 1.51% (95% CI: -0.38%, 3.40%;  $I^2 = 69.5\%$ ) (**Table 2, Figure 3**). For estimated absolute GWG at  
226 delivery, the WMD from the fixed-effect meta-analysis between women who received small-quantity  
227 LNS and those in the control arm was 152 g (95% CI: -71, 376;  $I^2 = 42.2\%$ ) (**Table 2, Figure 4**).  
228 Random effects meta-analysis produced similar results on the effect of MMS or small-quantity LNS on  
229 continuous outcomes (**Table 2**).

230

### 231 **Binary outcomes: severely inadequate, inadequate, and excessive GWG**

232 On average, 70% of women in the analysis had inadequate GWG and 45% had severely  
233 inadequate GWG. Compared to women in the control arm, women in the MMS arm had a 2.9% reduced  
234 risk of severely inadequate GWG (fixed effect RR: 0.971; 95% CI: 0.956, 0.987,  $I^2 = 57.6\%$ ) and a 1.4%  
235 reduced risk of inadequate GWG (RR: 0.986; 95% CI: 0.978, 0.995,  $I^2 = 48.4\%$ ). No significant  
236 association was found between MMS and risks of excessive (RR: 1.042; 95% CI: 0.975, 1.113) GWG  
237 (**Table 3 and Supplemental Figures 1, 2, 3**). There were no significant associations of maternal small-  
238 quantity LNS with the risk of severely inadequate (fixed effect RR: 0.952; 95% CI: 0.903, 1.005),  
239 inadequate (RR: 0.992; 95% CI: 0.962, 1.022), or excessive (RR: 1.131; 95% CI: 0.970, 1.318) GWG  
240 (**Table 3 and Supplemental Figures 4, 5, 6**). Results from random-effects meta-analysis were similar to  
241 those from fixed-effects meta-analysis (**Table 3**).

242

### 243 **Potential effect modifiers**

244 Adherence to the assigned regimen modified the effect of MMS on percent adequacy of GWG.  
245 Maternal MMS was associated with greater percentage adequacy of GWG among women with adherence  
246 of 90% or more (WMD: 1.4%; 95% CI: 0.6%, 2.1%), but not among women with adherence less than  
247 90% (WMD: 0.1%; 95% CI: -0.9%, 1.1%; P for interaction = 0.04) (**Table 4**). Maternal MMS had a  
248 greater effect on percentage adequacy of GWG among women enrolled at 20 weeks of gestation age or

249 later (WMD: 2.3%; 95% CI: 0.8%, 3.7%) than those enrolled earlier (WMD: 0.7%; 95% CI: 0.1%, 1.3%;  
250 P for interaction = 0.054).

251 We found that small-quantity LNS increased percent adequacy of GWG among women with  
252 overweight and obesity (WMD: 15.5%; 95% CI: 7.0%, 23.9%), but not among underweight (-0.2%; 95%  
253 CI: -3.4%, 2.9%) and normal-weight women (0.6%; 95% CI: -1.4%, 2.6%, P for interaction = 0.04)  
254 (**Table 4**). Also, small-quantity LNS increased percent adequacy of GWG among women with height  
255 shorter than 150 cm (WMD: 5.3%; 95% CI: 2.7%, 7.9%), but not among taller women (WMD: -1.2%;  
256 95% CI -3.6%, 1.3%; P for interaction < 0.001) (**Table 4**). We did not find any other factors that modified  
257 the effect of MMS or small-quantity LNS on GWG.

258

#### 259 **Results from secondary and sensitivity analyses**

260 No association was found between the INTERGROWTH-21 GWG z-score and MMS or small-  
261 quantity LNS among normal-weight women (**Supplemental Figures 7 and 8**). With more than 23,000  
262 study subjects, the JiVtA-3 trial from Bangladesh had a much larger sample size than other trials and was  
263 weighted heavily in the meta-analysis. In a sensitivity analysis excluding this trial, we found that MMS  
264 was still associated with GWG percent adequacy with a WMD of 1.06% (95% CI: 0.10%, 2.02%)  
265 (**Supplemental Figure 9**). Similarly, we conducted a sensitivity analysis excluding the Women First trial  
266 from the meta-analysis because it was not a typical small-quantity LNS trial since individuals in the  
267 intervention arm who were underweight or had weight gain that did not meet expectation received  
268 additional daily lipid-based protein-energy supplement. The result in GWG percent adequacy remained  
269 non-significant with a WMD of 0.47% (95% CI: -1.63%, 2.56%) (**Supplemental Figure 10**).

270 There were 3,148 (6.2%) women for whom the last weight measure was in the second trimester.  
271 In sensitivity analysis, we removed these women and restricted our analysis to those who had weight  
272 measures in the third trimester. The significant association between MMS and GWG percent adequacy  
273 persisted (**Supplemental Figure 11**), as did the lack of association between small-quantity LNS and  
274 GWG percent adequacy (**Supplemental Figure 12**). When we restricted our analysis to women with

275 imputed first-trimester weight, point effect estimates for MMS (**Supplemental Figure 13**) and small-  
276 quantity LNS (**Supplemental Figure 14**) were not materially different from their original estimates and  
277 not significant.

278

## 279 **DISCUSSION**

280 In these meta-analyses using individual participant data, mean GWG percent adequacy according  
281 to the IOM recommendation was 77%; 45% of pregnant women had severely inadequate GWG and 70%  
282 had inadequate GWG. MMS increased GWG percent adequacy and total weight gain at delivery and  
283 reduced the risks of severely inadequate and inadequate GWG. The beneficial effect of maternal MMS  
284 was only observed among those with  $\geq 90\%$  adherence to the assigned regimen. Only 4 eligible trials  
285 were identified to examine the effect of small-quantity LNS on GWG. No association was found in the  
286 overall analysis, but small-quantity LNS was associated with greater GWG adequacy in the subgroups of  
287 women with overweight or obesity and those with height  $< 150$  cm. Neither MMS nor small-quantity  
288 LNS was associated with excessive GWG.

289 Our estimate that 70% of pregnant women had inadequate GWG in the current analysis is  
290 consistent with the previous findings from similar settings. In a recently published meta-analysis of  
291 studies conducted among pregnant women in sub-Saharan Africa, the percentage of inadequate  
292 gestational weight gain was greater than 50% in 9 of 16 studies (43). Using data from Demographic and  
293 Health Surveys, Wang et al (20) reported that the mean estimated GWG did not meet the minimum  
294 recommendation by the IOM in most developing regions and countries. Data from individual studies  
295 indicated inadequate GWG among 74% of pregnant women in Bangladesh (14) and 52% in Tanzania  
296 (44). In the current meta-analysis, we found that prenatal MMS was associated with a 209-gram increase  
297 in total GWG at delivery and a 1.4% reduced risk of inadequate GWG. Although the effect size seems  
298 small, given the high proportion ( $\sim 70\%$ ) of inadequate GWG in LMICs, the small reduction in risk would  
299 correspond to shifting 1% of total number of pregnant women in these settings from inadequate GWG to  
300 adequate GWG. With the expectation that the fetus constitutes 27% of GWG (45), we estimate that 55

301 gram of the 209-gram increase in GWG would be fetal growth and manifest as higher birthweight, a  
302 number consistent with previously reported effect sizes of MMS on birthweight from individual trials (28,  
303 30, 32, 33, 46).

304 Previous randomized controlled trials in pregnant women have focused on the effect of MMS on  
305 birth outcomes, rather than GWG. Several meta-analyses have been conducted to assess the effect of  
306 prenatal MMS on birth outcomes (6, 47-49), and it has consistently been shown that the provision of  
307 MMS reduced the risk of low birthweight and small-for-gestational-age birth (8, 9). In response to the  
308 new evidence from randomized controlled trials, in 2020, the WHO updated their guidelines on prenatal  
309 nutritional interventions and recommended the use of MMS in the context of rigorous implementation  
310 research to establish the impact of switching from iron and folic acid supplements to MMS containing  
311 iron and folic acid (50). Our findings that MMS increases GWG and reduces the risks of severely  
312 inadequate GWG compared to iron and folic acid provide further evidence supporting the WHO's  
313 updated recommendation. This position is further reinforced by the results of a systematic review of over  
314 1.3 million pregnancies reporting that inadequate weight gain was associated with an increased risk of  
315 small-for-gestational-age births and preterm birth (18). Since birth outcomes have long been prioritized  
316 over maternal outcomes, more efforts should be made in future research to study the determinants and  
317 consequences of maternal outcomes of pregnancy.

318 There are several plausible mechanisms through which prenatal micronutrient supplements can  
319 impact GWG. First, nutritional supplements may reduce the risk of infections and morbidities during  
320 pregnancy (51, 52). Micronutrients included in the prenatal supplements might help improve immune  
321 function, increase iron absorption, and reduce the risks of anemia, pre-eclampsia, and eclampsia during  
322 pregnancy (53, 54). Second, supplementation with micronutrients may improve appetite, leading to  
323 increases in food intake by influencing gut microbiome as well as peptide hormone levels and  
324 neurotransmitters that affect satiety and appetite (55, 56). Third, micronutrients included in the  
325 supplements directly improve fetal development and growth, thereby leading to greater GWG (57, 58).  
326 For example, iron, zinc, vitamin C, and B-vitamins are involved in protein and energy metabolism, DNA

327 and RNA synthesis, and cell division (59-62); further, antioxidants, including vitamins C and E, protect  
328 against free radical generation and damage caused by increased oxidative stress during pregnancy (63,  
329 64), which has been associated with adverse pregnancy outcomes, including low birthweight and preterm  
330 birth (65, 66).

331 Small-quantity LNS was provided as the intervention supplement in 4 trials included in the  
332 analysis. However, it should be noted that women enrolled in the intervention arm of the Women First  
333 trial received an extra daily lipid-based protein-energy supplement, which provided 300 Kcal and 11 g  
334 protein per day, if they had a BMI < 20 kg/m<sup>2</sup> at any time during the study period or had weight gain in  
335 the second or third trimester less than the IOM guidelines (29). To avoid the possibility that our pooled  
336 results were driven by the Women First trial, in sensitivity analyses, we excluded this trial from the meta-  
337 analysis and found that the results attenuated towards the null and remained statistically nonsignificant.  
338 Consistent with the previous meta-analysis published in 2018 (8), we did not find an association between  
339 small-quantity LNS and GWG with participant data from two more trials included (29, 36). However, we  
340 found that small-quantity LNS was associated with a greater adequacy of GWG in the subgroup of  
341 women with overweight or obesity and the subgroup with short height (less than 150 cm). Women with  
342 overweight or obesity have lower GWG recommendation than women with underweight or normal  
343 weight according to IOM guideline, this may at least partially explain why the effect of small-quantity  
344 LNS on GWG percent adequacy, which was assessed based IOM recommendation, was greater in this  
345 subgroup. Women with short height might tend to have low socioeconomic status and suffer from long-  
346 term undernutrition and concurrent nutritional deprivation (67, 68), and thereby potentially benefit more  
347 in GWG from the prenatal small-quantity LNS. As a highly nutrient-dense supplement, LNS could be a  
348 good source of macronutrients and micronutrients for malnourished pregnant women in LMICs. The  
349 effect of medium quantity LNS and other balanced energy protein interventions among pregnant women  
350 in food insecurity contexts warrants further research (69).

351 Our study has several strengths. It is the first individual participant data meta-analysis to  
352 synthesize the effect of nutrient supplementation on GWG. Although weight gain during pregnancy is

353 widely used in prenatal clinics as an indicator of the adequacy of maternal nutrition, it is often not  
354 reported as one of the primary outcomes in randomized controlled trials among pregnant women. By  
355 contacting each principal investigator for their originally collected data, we were able to include trials  
356 from 14 LMICs. Furthermore, our analysis is the first meta-analysis to examine the effect of small-  
357 quantity LNS, which provides less than 120 kcal per day, on GWG among pregnant women. Although  
358 most of the energy is supplied from fat, the energy contents of different types of LNS vary widely.  
359 Previous meta-analyses usually included LNS trials in which larger quantities of energy were provided (8,  
360 9). By confining our analysis to trials of small-quantity LNS, our pooled results were more likely to  
361 reflect the effect of the multiple micronutrients plus essential fatty acids included in the LNS.

362         Limitations of these analyses should be noted. First, a direct measure of GWG during the entire  
363 pregnancy period was not always available because of the lack of pre-pregnancy weight and large  
364 variance in gestational age at enrollment and last weight measure before delivery. To overcome this  
365 limitation, we estimated early pregnancy weight at 9 weeks of gestation for women without weight  
366 measure in the first trimester by applying a validated statistical modeling approach to their individual  
367 weight measures during pregnancy. We then developed several GWG outcome metrics including GWG  
368 percent adequacy and estimated total GWG at delivery according to the IOM GWG guideline. We further  
369 calculated GWG Z-score by applying the INTERGROWTH-21<sup>st</sup> GWG standards in normal-weight  
370 women (25), and obtained similar results when we examined the association of GWG Z-score with MMS  
371 and small-quantity LNS among normal-weight women, indicating that our findings are robust. However,  
372 random or systematic measurement errors in weight and gestational age during pregnancy and their  
373 influence on the results could not be ruled out. Second, we were not able to examine whether food  
374 insecurity was an effect modifier of the associations between prenatal nutrient supplements and GWG  
375 given limited data on food insecurity. We did perform stratified analysis by baseline BMI categories and  
376 found that baseline BMI modified the effect of small-quantity LNS, but not MMS, on GWG adequacy.  
377 Third, even with two more trials included compared to the previous meta-analysis on LNS, our sample  
378 size is still relatively small, and this may have limited our power to detect the effect of small-quantity

379 LNS on GWG among underweight and normal weight women.

380 In conclusion, by using individual participant data we conducted a two-stage meta-analysis and  
381 found that the provision of prenatal MMS increases GWG compared to iron and folic acid supplements  
382 only in LMICs. Given that previous trials of maternal MMS have been mainly focused on birth outcomes,  
383 our result on GWG might help to explain and further understand its beneficial effect on birth outcomes  
384 observed previously. This finding provides additional evidence to support the recently updated WHO  
385 guidelines on prenatal MMS and lends support to switching prenatal supplements to MMS instead of iron  
386 and folic acid alone. The contribution of LNS of different quantities and balanced energy protein  
387 supplements to GWG and birth outcomes warrants further study.

388

### 389 **Acknowledgements**

390 The authors' contributions: EL, DQ, AMD, NP, MW, and WWF designed the study (project  
391 conception, development of overall research plan, and study oversight) with substantial input from  
392 technical advisory group members (PC, KGD, GK, SHK, and TA). All members of GWG Pooling Project  
393 Consortium contributed data, provided feedback on the study methods and interpretation of the findings,  
394 and critically reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual content. VS, BB, and DQ provided  
395 technical support and coordination for data collection, data management and harmonization. DQ, EL,  
396 AMD, and NP had access to the pooled data. EL led the statistical analysis, drafted and revised the  
397 manuscript. EL and WWF have the primary responsibility for the final content. All authors reviewed and  
398 contributed to the final manuscript.

399 We thank Sun-Eun Lee, Jian Yan, and Karen T Cuenco at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation  
400 for their support of the Gestational Weight Gain Pooling Project. We thank Nita Bhandari at the Society  
401 for Applied Studies for her support as a member of the technical advisory group.

402

### 403 **Declaration of interests**

404 We declare no competing interests.

## References

1. Cunningham FG, Williams JW. Williams obstetrics. 24th ed. / [edited by] F. Gary Cunningham ... [et al.]. ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Medical, 2018.
2. Edtion ed. In: Rasmussen KM, Yaktine AL, eds. Weight Gain During Pregnancy: Reexamining the Guidelines. Washington (DC), 2009.
3. Bailey RL, West KP, Jr., Black RE. The epidemiology of global micronutrient deficiencies. *Ann Nutr Metab* 2015;66 Suppl 2:22-33. doi: 10.1159/000371618.
4. Darnton-Hill I, Mkpuru UC. Micronutrients in pregnancy in low- and middle-income countries. *Nutrients* 2015;7(3):1744-68. doi: 10.3390/nu7031744.
5. Lee SE, Talegawkar SA, Merialdi M, Caulfield LE. Dietary intakes of women during pregnancy in low- and middle-income countries. *Public Health Nutr* 2013;16(8):1340-53. doi: 10.1017/S1368980012004417.
6. Smith ER, Shankar AH, Wu LS, Aboud S, Adu-Afarwuah S, Ali H, Agustina R, Arifeen S, Ashorn P, Bhutta ZA, et al. Modifiers of the effect of maternal multiple micronutrient supplementation on stillbirth, birth outcomes, and infant mortality: a meta-analysis of individual patient data from 17 randomised trials in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet Glob Health* 2017;5(11):e1090-e100. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30371-6.
7. Keats EC, Neufeld LM, Garrett GS, Mbuya MNN, Bhutta ZA. Improved micronutrient status and health outcomes in low- and middle-income countries following large-scale fortification: evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2019;109(6):1696-708. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqz023.
8. Das JK, Hoodbhoy Z, Salam RA, Bhutta AZ, Valenzuela-Rubio NG, Weise Prinzo Z, Bhutta ZA. Lipid-based nutrient supplements for maternal, birth, and infant developmental outcomes. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2018;8(8):Cd012610. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012610.pub2.
9. Goto E. Effectiveness of Prenatal Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplementation to Improve Birth Outcomes: A Meta-analysis. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2019;101(5):994-9. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.19-0287.
10. Han Z, Lutsiv O, Mulla S, Rosen A, Beyene J, McDonald SD, Knowledge Synthesis G. Low gestational weight gain and the risk of preterm birth and low birthweight: a systematic review and meta-analyses. *Acta obstetrica et gynecologica Scandinavica* 2011;90(9):935-54. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0412.2011.01185.x.
11. Durie DE, Thornburg LL, Glantz JC. Effect of second-trimester and third-trimester rate of gestational weight gain on maternal and neonatal outcomes. *Obstet Gynecol* 2011;118(3):569-75. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182289f42.
12. Soltani H, Lipoeto NI, Fair FJ, Kilner K, Yusrawati Y. Pre-pregnancy body mass index and gestational weight gain and their effects on pregnancy and birth outcomes: a cohort study in West Sumatra, Indonesia. *BMC women's health* 2017;17(1):102-. doi: 10.1186/s12905-017-0455-2.
13. Siega-Riz AM, Viswanathan M, Moos MK, Deierlein A, Mumford S, Knaack J, Thieda P, Lux LJ, Lohr KN. A systematic review of outcomes of maternal weight gain according to the Institute of Medicine recommendations: birthweight, fetal growth, and postpartum weight retention. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology* 2009;201(4):339 e1-14. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2009.07.002.
14. Kac G, Arnold CD, Matias SL, Mridha MK, Dewey KG. Gestational weight gain and newborn anthropometric outcomes in rural Bangladesh. *Matern Child Nutr* 2019;15(4):e12816. doi: 10.1111/mcn.12816.
15. Bauserman MS, Bann CM, Hambidge KM, Garces AL, Figueroa L, Westcott JL, Patterson JK, McClure EM, Thorsten VR, Aziz SA, et al. Gestational weight gain in 4 low- and middle-income countries and associations with birth outcomes: a secondary analysis of the Women First Trial.

- Am J Clin Nutr 2021;114(2):804-12. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqab086.
16. Davis RR, Hofferth SL. The association between inadequate gestational weight gain and infant mortality among U.S. infants born in 2002. *Maternal and child health journal* 2012;16(1):119-24. doi: 10.1007/s10995-010-0713-5.
  17. LifeCycle Project-Maternal O, Childhood Outcomes Study G, Voerman E, Santos S, Inskip H, Amiano P, Barros H, Charles MA, Chatzi L, Chrousos GP, et al. Association of Gestational Weight Gain With Adverse Maternal and Infant Outcomes. *JAMA* 2019;321(17):1702-15. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.3820.
  18. Goldstein RF, Abell SK, Ranasinha S, Misso M, Boyle JA, Black MH, Li N, Hu G, Corrado F, Rode L, et al. Association of Gestational Weight Gain With Maternal and Infant Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2017;317(21):2207-25. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.3635.
  19. Coffey D. Prepregnancy body mass and weight gain during pregnancy in India and sub-Saharan Africa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2015;112(11):3302-7. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1416964112.
  20. Wang D, Wang M, Darling AM, Perumal N, Liu E, Danaei G, Fawzi WW. Gestational weight gain in low-income and middle-income countries: a modelling analysis using nationally representative data. *BMJ Glob Health* 2020;5(11). doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003423.
  21. Changamire FT, Mwiru RS, Peterson KE, Msamanga GI, Spiegelman D, Petraro P, Urassa W, Fawzi WW. Effect of multivitamin supplements on weight gain during pregnancy among HIV-negative women in Tanzania. *Matern Child Nutr* 2015;11(3):297-304. doi: 10.1111/mcn.12018.
  22. Adu-Afarwuah S, Lartey A, Okronipa H, Ashorn P, Ashorn U, Zeilani M, Arimond M, Vosti SA, Dewey KG. Maternal Supplementation with Small-Quantity Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements Compared with Multiple Micronutrients, but Not with Iron and Folic Acid, Reduces the Prevalence of Low Gestational Weight Gain in Semi-Urban Ghana: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *The Journal of nutrition* 2017;147(4):697-705. doi: 10.3945/jn.116.242909.
  23. Matias SL, Mridha MK, Paul RR, Hussain S, Vosti SA, Arnold CD, Dewey KG. Prenatal Lipid-Based Nutrient Supplements Affect Maternal Anthropometric Indicators Only in Certain Subgroups of Rural Bangladeshi Women. *The Journal of nutrition* 2016;146(9):1775-82. doi: 10.3945/jn.116.232181.
  24. Yang J, Wang D, Darling AM, Liu E, Perumal N, Fawzi WW, Wang M. Methodological approaches to imputing early-pregnancy weight based on weight measures collected during pregnancy. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2021;21(1):24. doi: 10.1186/s12874-021-01210-3.
  25. Cheikh Ismail L, Bishop DC, Pang R, Ohuma EO, Kac G, Abrams B, Rasmussen K, Barros FC, Hirst JE, Lambert A, et al. Gestational weight gain standards based on women enrolled in the Fetal Growth Longitudinal Study of the INTERGROWTH-21st Project: a prospective longitudinal cohort study. *BMJ* 2016;352:i555. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i555.
  26. World Health Organization. *Obesity - Preventing and Managing the Global Epidemic: Report on a WHO Consultation*. London: World Health Organization, 2000.
  27. World Health Organization. Internet: <https://www.who.int/tools/growth-reference-data-for-5to19-years/indicators/bmi-for-age> (accessed 4 Jul,2021 2021).
  28. West KP, Jr., Shamim AA, Mehra S, Labrique AB, Ali H, Shaikh S, Klemm RD, Wu LS, Mitra M, Haque R, et al. Effect of maternal multiple micronutrient vs iron-folic acid supplementation on infant mortality and adverse birth outcomes in rural Bangladesh: the JiVitA-3 randomized trial. *JAMA* 2014;312(24):2649-58. doi: 10.1001/jama.2014.16819.
  29. Hambidge KM, Westcott JE, Garces A, Figueroa L, Goudar SS, Dhaded SM, Pasha O, Ali SA, Tshetu A, Lokangaka A, et al. A multicountry randomized controlled trial of comprehensive maternal nutrition supplementation initiated before conception: the Women First trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2019;109(2):457-69. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqy228.
  30. Christian P, Khatry SK, Katz J, Pradhan EK, LeClerq SC, Shrestha SR, Adhikari RK, Sommer A, West KP, Jr. Effects of alternative maternal micronutrient supplements on low birth weight in

- rural Nepal: double blind randomised community trial. *BMJ* 2003;326(7389):571. doi: 10.1136/bmj.326.7389.571.
31. Friis H, Gomo E, Nyazema N, Ndhlovu P, Krarup H, Kaestel P, Michaelsen KF. Effect of multimicronutrient supplementation on gestational length and birth size: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind effectiveness trial in Zimbabwe. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2004;80(1):178-84. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/80.1.178.
  32. Osrin D, Vaidya A, Shrestha Y, Baniya RB, Manandhar DS, Adhikari RK, Filteau S, Tomkins A, Costello AM. Effects of antenatal multiple micronutrient supplementation on birthweight and gestational duration in Nepal: double-blind, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005;365(9463):955-62. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71084-9.
  33. Fawzi WW, Msamanga GI, Urassa W, Hertzmark E, Petraro P, Willett WC, Spiegelman D. Vitamins and perinatal outcomes among HIV-negative women in Tanzania. *The New England journal of medicine* 2007;356(14):1423-31. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa064868.
  34. Roberfroid D, Huybregts L, Lanou H, Henry MC, Meda N, Menten J, Kolsteren P, Group MS. Effects of maternal multiple micronutrient supplementation on fetal growth: a double-blind randomized controlled trial in rural Burkina Faso. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2008;88(5):1330-40. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.2008.26296.
  35. Moore SE, Fulford AJ, Darboe MK, Jobarteh ML, Jarjou LM, Prentice AM. A randomized trial to investigate the effects of pre-natal and infant nutritional supplementation on infant immune development in rural Gambia: the ENID trial: Early Nutrition and Immune Development. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2012;12:107. doi: 10.1186/1471-2393-12-107.
  36. Ashorn P, Alho L, Ashorn U, Cheung YB, Dewey KG, Harjunmaa U, Lartey A, Nkhoma M, Phiri N, Phuka J, et al. The impact of lipid-based nutrient supplement provision to pregnant women on newborn size in rural Malawi: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2015;101(2):387-97. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.114.088617.
  37. Zeng L, Dibley MJ, Cheng Y, Dang S, Chang S, Kong L, Yan H. Impact of micronutrient supplementation during pregnancy on birth weight, duration of gestation, and perinatal mortality in rural western China: double blind cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2008;337:a2001. doi: 10.1136/bmj.a2001.
  38. Bhutta ZA, Rizvi A, Raza F, Hotwani S, Zaidi S, Moazzam Hossain S, Soofi S, Bhutta S. A comparative evaluation of multiple micronutrient and iron-folic acid supplementation during pregnancy in Pakistan: impact on pregnancy outcomes. *Food and nutrition bulletin* 2009;30(4 Suppl):S496-505. doi: 10.1177/15648265090304S404.
  39. Persson LA, Arifeen S, Ekstrom EC, Rasmussen KM, Frongillo EA, Yunus M, Team MIS. Effects of prenatal micronutrient and early food supplementation on maternal hemoglobin, birth weight, and infant mortality among children in Bangladesh: the MINIMat randomized trial. *JAMA* 2012;307(19):2050-9. doi: 10.1001/jama.2012.4061.
  40. Isanaka S, Garba S, Plikaytis B, Malone McNeal M, Guindo O, Langendorf C, Adehossi E, Ciglenecki I, Grais RF. Immunogenicity of an oral rotavirus vaccine administered with prenatal nutritional support in Niger: A cluster randomized clinical trial. *PLoS medicine* 2021;18(8):e1003720. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003720.
  41. Ramakrishnan U, Gonzalez-Cossio T, Neufeld LM, Rivera J, Martorell R. Effect of prenatal multiple micronutrient supplements on maternal weight and skinfold changes: a randomized double-blind clinical trial in Mexico. *Food and nutrition bulletin* 2005;26(3):273-80. doi: 10.1177/156482650502600304.
  42. Shankar AH, Jahari AB, Sebayang SK, Aditiawarman, Apriatni M, Harefa B, Muadz H, Soesbandoro SDA, Tjiong R, Fachry A, et al. Effect of maternal multiple micronutrient supplementation on fetal loss and infant death in Indonesia: a double-blind cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet* 2008;371(9608):215-27.
  43. Asefa F, Cummins A, Dessie Y, Hayen A, Foureur M. Gestational weight gain and its effect on birth outcomes in sub-Saharan Africa: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*

- 2020;15(4):e0231889. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0231889.
44. Liu E, Wang D, Darling AM, Perumal N, Wang M, Urassa W, Pembe A, Fawzi WW. Multivitamin Supplementation is Associated with Greater Adequacy of Gestational Weight Gain among Pregnant Women in Tanzania. *The Journal of nutrition* 2021. doi: 10.1093/jn/nxab448.
  45. Champion ML, Harper LM. Gestational Weight Gain: Update on Outcomes and Interventions. *Current diabetes reports* 2020;20(3):11. doi: 10.1007/s11892-020-1296-1.
  46. Huybregts L, Roberfroid D, Lanou H, Menten J, Meda N, Van Camp J, Kolsteren P. Prenatal food supplementation fortified with multiple micronutrients increases birth length: a randomized controlled trial in rural Burkina Faso. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2009;90(6):1593-600. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.2009.28253.
  47. Fall CH, Fisher DJ, Osmond C, Margetts BM, Maternal Micronutrient Supplementation Study G. Multiple micronutrient supplementation during pregnancy in low-income countries: a meta-analysis of effects on birth size and length of gestation. *Food and nutrition bulletin* 2009;30(4 Suppl):S533-46. doi: 10.1177/15648265090304S408.
  48. Haider BA, Bhutta ZA. Multiple-micronutrient supplementation for women during pregnancy. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2017;4(4):Cd004905. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004905.pub5.
  49. Keats EC, Haider BA, Tam E, Bhutta ZA. Multiple-micronutrient supplementation for women during pregnancy. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2019;3:CD004905. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004905.pub6.
  50. Edtion ed. WHO antenatal care recommendations for a positive pregnancy experience: Nutritional interventions update: Multiple micronutrient supplements during pregnancy. Geneva, 2020.
  51. Bendich A. Micronutrients in women's health and immune function. *Nutrition* 2001;17(10):858-67. doi: 10.1016/s0899-9007(01)00649-9.
  52. Christian P, Mullany LC, Hurley KM, Katz J, Black RE. Nutrition and maternal, neonatal, and child health. *Seminars in perinatology* 2015;39(5):361-72. doi: 10.1053/j.semperi.2015.06.009.
  53. Gomes F, Agustina R, Black RE, Christian P, Dewey KG, Kraemer K, Shankar AH, Smith ER, Thorne-Lyman A, Tumilowicz A, et al. Multiple micronutrient supplements versus iron-folic acid supplements and maternal anemia outcomes: an iron dose analysis. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2022. doi: 10.1111/nyas.14756.
  54. Oh C, Keats EC, Bhutta ZA. Vitamin and Mineral Supplementation During Pregnancy on Maternal, Birth, Child Health and Development Outcomes in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Nutrients* 2020;12(2). doi: 10.3390/nu12020491.
  55. Major GC, Doucet E, Jacqmain M, St-Onge M, Bouchard C, Tremblay A. Multivitamin and dietary supplements, body weight and appetite: results from a cross-sectional and a randomised double-blind placebo-controlled study. *The British journal of nutrition* 2008;99(5):1157-67. doi: 10.1017/S0007114507853335.
  56. Kyei-Arthur F, Situma R, Aballo J, Mahama AB, Selenje L, Amoafu E, Adu-Afarwuah SA-O. Lessons learned from implementing the pilot Micronutrient Powder Initiative in four districts in Ghana. (2055-0928 (Electronic)).
  57. Terrin G, Berni Canani R, Di Chiara M, Pietravalle A, Aleandri V, Conte F, De Curtis M. Zinc in Early Life: A Key Element in the Fetus and Preterm Neonate. *Nutrients* 2015;7(12):10427-46. doi: 10.3390/nu7125542.
  58. Kim HK, Han SN. Vitamin E: Regulatory role on gene and protein expression and metabolomics profiles. *IUBMB Life* 2019;71(4):442-55. doi: 10.1002/iub.2003.
  59. Kontic-Vucinic O, Sulovic N, Radunovic N. Micronutrients in women's reproductive health: II. Minerals and trace elements. *International journal of fertility and women's medicine* 2006;51(3):116-24.
  60. Kontic-Vucinic O, Sulovic N, Radunovic N. Micronutrients in women's reproductive health: I.

- Vitamins. *International journal of fertility and women's medicine* 2006;51(3):106-15.
61. Froese DS, Fowler B, Baumgartner MR. Vitamin B(12) , folate, and the methionine remethylation cycle-biochemistry, pathways, and regulation. *J Inherit Metab Dis* 2019;42(4):673-85. doi: 10.1002/jimd.12009.
  62. Ramakrishnan U, Gonzalez-Cossio T, Neufeld LM, Rivera J, Martorell R. Multiple micronutrient supplementation during pregnancy does not lead to greater infant birth size than does iron-only supplementation: a randomized controlled trial in a semirural community in Mexico. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2003;77(3):720-5.
  63. Duhig K, Chappell LC, Shennan AH. Oxidative stress in pregnancy and reproduction. *Obstetric medicine* 2016;9(3):113-6. doi: 10.1177/1753495x16648495.
  64. Chiarello DI, Abad C, Rojas D, Toledo F, Vázquez CM, Mate A, Sobrevia L, Marín R. Oxidative stress: Normal pregnancy versus preeclampsia. *Biochimica et biophysica acta Molecular basis of disease* 2020;1866(2):165354. doi: 10.1016/j.bbadis.2018.12.005.
  65. Tobała-Wróbel K, Pietryga M, Dydowicz P, Napierała M, Brązert J, Florek E. Association of Oxidative Stress on Pregnancy. *Oxidative medicine and cellular longevity* 2020;2020:6398520. doi: 10.1155/2020/6398520.
  66. Sultana Z, Maiti K, Aitken J, Morris J, Dedman L, Smith R. Oxidative stress, placental ageing-related pathologies and adverse pregnancy outcomes. *American journal of reproductive immunology (New York, NY : 1989)* 2017;77(5). doi: 10.1111/aji.12653.
  67. Dewey KG, Begum K. Long-term consequences of stunting in early life. *Matern Child Nutr* 2011;7 Suppl 3:5-18. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8709.2011.00349.x.
  68. Smith Fawzi MC, Andrews KG, Fink G, Danaei G, McCoy DC, Sudfeld CR, Peet ED, Cho J, Liu Y, Finlay JE, et al. Lifetime economic impact of the burden of childhood stunting attributable to maternal psychosocial risk factors in 137 low/middle-income countries. *BMJ Glob Health* 2019;4(1):e001144. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001144.
  69. Christian P, Smith ER, Zaidi A. Addressing inequities in the global burden of maternal undernutrition: the role of targeting. *BMJ Glob Health* 2020;5(3):e002186. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002186.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of 16 trials of MMS or small-quantity LNS included in the meta-analysis of the effect of prenatal nutritional supplements on GWG<sup>1</sup>

Author, publication year	Country	Years of study	Control arm	Intervention arm(s)	Number of Participants included in analysis	Weeks of gestation at enrollment, median	BMI <sup>2</sup> , kg/m <sup>2</sup> , median	Adherence (%), median
Christian, 2003 <sup>3</sup>	Nepal	1998-2001	60mg iron+400 µg folic acid/day+1000 µg Vitamin A,	MMS	1193	9.6	18.9	93.7
Friis, 2004	Zimbabwe	1996-1997	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS	415	26.0	22.0	80.0
Osrin, 2005	Nepal	2002-2004	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS	1,108	15.9	19.2	98.1
Ramakrishnan, 2005	Mexico	1997-2000	60 mg iron/day	MMS	353	9.0	23.3	95.0
Fawzi, 2007	Tanzania	2001-2004	60 mg of iron + 250 µg folic acid/day	MMS	7,421	21.6	22.5	96.4
Zeng, 2008 <sup>3</sup>	China	2002-2006	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS	2,653	13.6	20.1	98.7
Roberfroid, 2008	Burkina Faso	2004-2006	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS	1,091	15.7	20.0	84.3
Bhutta, 2009 <sup>3</sup>	Pakistan	2002-2004	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS	1,507	12.9	20.6	81.4
Persson, 2012 <sup>4</sup>	Bangladesh	2001-2003	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS	2,329	9.0	19.7	70.0
Moore, 2012 <sup>4</sup>	The Gambia	2010-2012	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS	803	13.4	20.4	87.9
West, 2014 <sup>3</sup>	Bangladesh	2008-2012	27mg iron +600 µg folic acid/day	MMS	23,577	9.7	18.8	95.0

Author, publication year	Country	Years of study	Control arm	Intervention arm(s)	Number of Participants included in analysis	Weeks of gestation at enrollment, median	BMI <sup>2</sup> , kg/m <sup>2</sup> , median	Adherence (%), median
Ashorn, 2015	Malawi	2011-2013	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS; small-quantity LNS	1,321	17.1	20.8	92.1
Matias, 2016 <sup>3</sup>	Bangladesh	2011-2012	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	small-quantity LNS	3,343	13.4	19.5	80.0
Adu-Afarwuah, 2017	Ghana	2009-2011	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS; small-quantity LNS	1,114	15.9	23.1	80.9
Hambidge, 2019 <sup>5</sup>	Guatemala, India, and Pakistan	2013-2014	Iron+ folic acid.	small-quantity LNS	1,277	12.0	21.0	88.0
Isanaka, 2021 <sup>3</sup>	Niger	2014-2019	60 mg iron + 400 µg folic acid/day	MMS	1422	11.0	21.1	85.4

<sup>1</sup>MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; GWG, gestational weight gain;

<sup>2</sup> BMI, body mass index, observed during the first trimester or imputed for 9 weeks of gestation.

<sup>3</sup> Cluster-randomized trial

<sup>4</sup> Randomized controlled trial with factorial design, and intervention arms were collapsed based on MMS received or not.

<sup>5</sup> Data from the Democratic Republic of the Congo were excluded due to missing gestational age data. The pre-conceptional supplementation arm was excluded as the analysis focused on prenatal supplementation during pregnancy.

**Table 2.** The effect of prenatal nutritional supplements on percent adequacy of GWG and estimated total GWG at delivery<sup>1</sup>

Outcome		Intervention	
		MMS <sup>2</sup>	small-quantity LNS <sup>3</sup>
Percent Adequacy <sup>4</sup> , %	Number of studies	14	4
	Number of participants, total	45,507	6,237
	Number of participants, by intervention/control arms	22,940/22,567	2,335/3,902
	WMD <sup>5</sup> (95% CI) <sup>5</sup> , Fixed-effects	0.86 (0.28, 1.44)	1.51 (-0.38, 3.40)
	WMD (95% CI) <sup>5</sup> , Random-effects	0.90 (0.08, 1.71)	2.55 (-1.42, 6.52)
	I <sup>2</sup> (%) <sup>6</sup>	13.3	69.5
	P for heterogeneity	0.31	0.02
Total GWG <sup>1</sup> , gram	Number of studies	14	4
	Number of participants	45,455	6,026
	Number of participants, by intervention/control arms	22,914/22,541	2,287/3,739
	WMD (95% CI) <sup>5</sup> , Fixed-effects	209 (139, 280)	152 (-71,376)
	WMD (95% CI) <sup>5</sup> , Random-effects	186 (43, 329)	203 (-123,529)
	I <sup>2</sup> (%) <sup>6</sup>	52.5	42.2
	P for heterogeneity	0.01	0.16

<sup>1</sup> GWG, gestational weight gain;

<sup>2</sup> MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements;

<sup>3</sup> LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements;

<sup>4</sup> The percent adequacy of GWG was calculated by dividing the actual GWG at the last weight measure during pregnancy by the recommended GWG according to the Institute of Medicine (IOM) 2009 guideline, multiplied by 100.

<sup>5</sup> WMD(95% CI), weighted mean difference(95% confidence interval).

<sup>6</sup> I<sup>2</sup>(%), statistic index used to assess heterogeneity across trials, with thresholds of < 30%, 30-60%, and > 60% considered low, moderate, and high heterogeneity.

MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements.

**Table 3.** The effect of prenatal nutritional supplements on the risk of severely inadequate, inadequate, and excessive GWG<sup>1</sup>.

Outcome		Intervention	
		MMS <sup>2</sup>	small-quantity LNS <sup>3</sup>
Severely inadequate	Number of studies	14	4
	Number of participants, total	45,507	6,237
	Number of participants, by intervention/control arms	22,940/22,567	2,335/3,902
	RR (95% CI) <sup>4</sup> , Fixed-effects	0.971 (0.956, 0.987)	0.952 (0.903, 1.005)
	RR (95% CI) <sup>4</sup> , Random-effects	0.959 (0.922, 0.997)	0.935 (0.829, 1.055)
	I <sup>2</sup> (%) <sup>5</sup>	57.6	71.1
	P for heterogeneity	<0.01	0.02
Inadequate	Number of studies	14	4
	Number of participants, total	45,507	6,237
	Number of participants, by intervention/control arms	22,940/22,567	2,335/3,902
	RR (95% CI) <sup>4</sup> , Fixed-effects	0.986 (0.978, 0.995)	0.992 (0.962, 1.022)
	RR (95% CI) <sup>4</sup> , Random-effects	0.982 (0.963, 1.002)	0.976 (0.927, 1.028)
	I <sup>2</sup> (%) <sup>5</sup>	48.4	46.8
	P for heterogeneity	0.02	0.13
Excessive	Number of studies	14	4
	Number of participants, total	45,507	6,237
	Number of participants, by intervention/control arms	22,940/22,567	2,335/3,902
	RR (95% CI) <sup>4</sup> , Fixed-effects	1.042 (0.975, 1.113)	1.131 (0.970, 1.318)
	RR (95% CI) <sup>4</sup> , Random-effects	1.032 (0.944, 1.127)	1.127 (0.946, 1.342)
	I <sup>2</sup> (%) <sup>5</sup>	18.3	15.6
	P for heterogeneity	0.25	0.31

<sup>1</sup>GWG, gestational weight gain; The percent adequacy of GWG was calculated by dividing the actual GWG at the last weight measure during pregnancy by the recommended GWG according to the Institute of Medicine (IOM) 2009 guideline, multiplied by 100. Severely inadequate GWG was defined as % adequacy < 70, inadequate GWG as % adequacy < 90, and excessive GWG as % adequacy >125.

<sup>2</sup>MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements;

<sup>3</sup> LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements;

<sup>4</sup> RR(95%CI), risk ratio( 95% confidence interval).

<sup>5</sup>  $I^2$ (%), statistic index used to assess heterogeneity across trials, with thresholds of < 30%, 30-60%, and > 60% considered low, moderate, and high heterogeneity.

**Table 4.** The effect of prenatal nutrient supplements on percent adequacy GWG <sup>1</sup>, by potential modifiers

Subgroup	MMS <sup>2</sup> (14 trials)			small-quantity LNS <sup>3</sup> (4 trials)		
	n	WMD (95% CI) <sup>4</sup>	P for interaction <sup>5</sup>	n	WMD (95% CI) <sup>4</sup>	P for interaction <sup>5</sup>
Estimated pre-pregnancy BMI <sup>6</sup> (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )			0.48			0.04
<18.5	10,330	1.6 (0.7, 2.5)		1,116	-0.2(-3.4, 2.9)	
18.5-<25.0	31,671	0.8 (0.1, 1.4)		4,423	0.6 (-1.4, 2.6)	
≥25.0	3,506	2.8 (-0.1, 5.7)		698	15.5 (7.0, 23.9)	
Maternal adherence to regimen (%)			0.04			0.98
<90	16,208	0.1 (-0.9, 1.1)		1,265	-2.0 (-7.2, 3.2)	
≥90	25,421	1.4 (0.6, 2.1)		999	-2.1 (-6.3, 2.1)	
Maternal age (years)			0.79			0.44
<20	10,659	0.8(-0.3, 1.8)		1,657	9.1(-3.7,21.9)	
20-29	26,970	0.9 (0.1, 1.6)		3,289	2.7 (-1.9, 7.2)	
≥30	7,812	1.0 (-0.5, 2.4)		783	8.1 (2.9, 13.3)	
Gestational age at enrolment (weeks)			0.054			0.15
<20	37,922	0.7 (0.1, 1.3)		5,779	1.7 (-0.3, 3.6)	
≥20	7,252	2.3 (0.8, 3.7)		240	-4.7 (-13.2, 3.8)	
Parity			0.99			0.13
0	16,983	01.1 (-0.3, 2.5)		870	-3.0 (-9.3, 3.4)	
≥1	27,025	1.0 (0.2, 1.7)		3,671	2.3 (-1.4, 6.1)	
Maternal education(years)			0.51			0.89
<8	29,703	0.9 (0.2, 1.6)		4,027	1.8 (-0.9, 4.5)	
≥8	14,109	10.7 (-26.3,47.8)		2,206	1.9 (-3.8, 7.7)	
Maternal hemoglobin at enrolment (g/dl)			0.79			0.52
<11.0	7,402	0.4 (-1.7, 2.5)		1,506	2.4 (-1.1, 6.0)	
≥11.0	7,001	0.3 (-1.3, 1.9)		1,947	5.0 (-0.5, 10.5)	
Maternal height (cm)			0.26			<0.001
<150	16,754	0.5 (-0.3, 1.3)		2,348	5.3 (2.7, 7.9)	
≥150	28,753	1.2 (0.4, 1.9)		3,889	-1.2 (-3.6, 1.3)	
Infant sex						0.65
Female	21,881	1.0 (-0.3, 2.4)	0.66	2,947	1.2(-1.8, 4.3)	
Male	23,154	0.7 (-0.1, 1.5)		2,960	3.2 (-1.7, 8.1)	

<sup>1</sup> GWG, gestational weight gain; the percent adequacy of GWG was calculated by dividing the actual GWG at the last weight measure during pregnancy by the recommended GWG according to the Institute of Medicine (IOM) 2009 guideline, multiplied by 100.

<sup>2</sup> MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements;

<sup>3</sup> LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements;

<sup>4</sup> WMD(95% CI), weighted mean difference(95% confidence interval);

<sup>5</sup> P value for interaction was obtained from meta-regression analysis

<sup>6</sup> BMI, body mass index, observed during the first trimester or imputed for 9 weeks of gestation.

**Figure 1.** The effect of MMS on the percent adequacy of GWG. MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; GWG, gestational weight gain; percent adequacy of GWG was calculated by dividing the actual GWG at the last weight measure during pregnancy by the recommended GWG according to the Institute of Medicine (IOM) 2009 guideline, multiplied by 100. The sample size by MMS/control arms for each trial is 648/545, 210/205, 559/549, 176/177, 3701/3704, 535/556, 1323/1330, 713/794, 409/394, 1156/1173, 11994/11583, 443/447, 375/370, 682/740, respectively.

**Figure 2.** The effect of MMS on estimated total GWG at delivery. MMS, multiple micronutrient supplements; GWG, gestational weight gain; The total GWG at delivery was estimated by multiplying the percent adequacy of GWG by the IOM-recommended GWG at delivery, which was calculated based on the gestational age at delivery and BMI category for each individual woman. The sample size by MMS/control arms for each trial is 648/545, 210/205, 559/549, 176/177, 3701/3704, 526/549, 1323/1330, 696/775, 409/394, 1156/1173, 11994/11583, 443/447, 375/370, 682/740, respectively.

**Figure 3.** The effect of small-quantity LNS on the percent adequacy of GWG. LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; GWG, gestational weight gain; percent adequacy of GWG was calculated by dividing the actual GWG at the last weight measure during pregnancy by the recommended GWG according to the Institute of Medicine (IOM) 2009 guideline, multiplied by 100. The sample size by small-quantity LNS/control arms for each trial is 431/447, 865/2478, 369/370, 670/607, respectively.

**Figure 4.** The effect of small-quantity LNS on estimated total GWG at delivery. LNS, lipid-based nutrient supplements; GWG, gestational weight gain; The total GWG at delivery was estimated by multiplying the percent adequacy of GWG by the IOM-recommended GWG at delivery, which was calculated based on the gestational age at delivery and BMI category for each individual woman. The sample size by small-quantity LNS/control arms for each trial is 431/447, 817/2315, 369/370, 670/607, respectively.