Supplemental Material

Supplemental Table 1. Comparison of household characteristics using unadjusted odds ratios for the likelihood of sustaining recovery for 12 months after recovery from MAM †

(Odds ratios and 95 % confidence intervals)

|  | Odds Ratio |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 95 % CI | *P\** |
| HH Characteristics and SES |  |  |  |
| Years of education completed by caregiver | 0•96 | 0•91, 1•02 | 0•206 |
| Number of rooms in the house | 0•92 | 0•78, 1•09 | 0•533 |
| Ownership of any livestock | 0•75 | 0•56, 1•01 | 0•055 |
| Number of HH assets owned (out of 11 total) | 1•00 | 0•91, 1•01 | 0•999 |
| Infant and Young Child Feeding |  |  |  |
| Continued breastfeeding | 0•64 | 0•38, 1•11 | 0•111 |
| Appropriate timing for introduction of solid food | 1•47 | 0•86, 2•50 | 0•160 |
| Minimum meal frequency | 0•90 | 0•77, 1•06 | 0•198 |
| Minimum dietary diversity score | 1•17 | 0•75, 1•84 | 0•475 |
| Food Security |  |  |  |
| Average HFIAS score throughout 1 year  | 0•97 | 0•89, 1•05 | 0•521 |
| Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene |  |  |  |
| Uses improved source for drinking water | 1•36 | 0•64, 2•87 | 0•422 |
| All water storage containers have lids | 1•70 | 1•2, 2•39 | 0•003 |
| Uses improved sanitation facility | 1•94 | 1•06, 3•54 | 0•033 |
| Used soap or ash during hand washing demonstration | 1•12 | 0•60, 2•08 | 0•727 |
| Caregiver’s hands observed to be “clean” | 1•76 | 1•03, 2•99 | 0•037 |
| Child’s hands observed to be “clean” | 1•37 | 0•87, 2•25 | 0•196 |
| Child bathed at least once per day during previous week | 1•01 | 0•96, 1•07 | 0•664 |

MAM, moderate acute malnutrition; CI, confidence interval; MUAC, mid-upper arm circumference; SFP, supplementary feeding program; WHZ, weight-for-height z-score; HFIAS, household food insecurity access scale

\* Odds ratios and *P* values were calculated using univariate logistic regression models, adjusting for clustering at the clinic sites. Given the total sample size of 312 and to achieve a statistical power of 80% and a two-sided significance level of 0.05, minimally detectable effect sizes were calculated retrospectively to be a between odds ratio of 1.9 and 2.1, with the exception of an odds ratio of 2.8 for the indicator, “uses improved sanitation facility”.

† See Tables 1–3 for more details on definitions of indicators