

**Effect of three micronutrient supplement strategies for pregnant and lactating women and their infants on motor, language, socio-emotional, and executive function scores at age 18 months**

Statistical Analysis Plan Addendum 2 to iLiNS-DYAD-G Main SAP

**Table of contents**

1.0 Study Objectives and Hypotheses..... 5

2.0 Definition of the 18-month developmental outcomes ..... 5

    3.0 Analysis Principles and Outliers..... 6

    4.0 Hypothesis testing..... 7

    5.0 Background Characteristics of Participants and Baseline Comparisons ..... 7

    6.0 Potential Covariates ..... 8

    7.0 Potential effect modifiers..... 8

    8.0 Calculating scores and z-scores ..... 9

## Micronutrient supplementation during pregnancy and infancy and 18-month development

Version number	1
Version date	July 05, 2014
Author	Elizabeth Prado
Implementation date of current version	

**Version History Log**

This table will detail the version history for this document. It will detail the key elements of the changes to the versions.

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date implemented</b>	<b>Details of significant changes</b>

## 1.0 Study Objectives and Hypotheses

The primary aim of the study was to compare the effects of three types of micronutrient supplements among Ghanaian pregnant and lactating women and to assess the effect of LNS-P&L given to pregnant and lactating women and LNS-20gM provided to children from 6 to 18 months of age on child growth and micronutrient status. A secondary aim was to similarly study the impact of LNS on various other (secondary) outcomes in the same target group.

The aim of the secondary analyses described in this addendum is to compare infants in 3 different intervention groups:

- a) Daily iron and folic acid during pregnancy, and calcium (Ca) only (akin to a placebo) during the first 6 months postpartum, with no supplementation for offspring during infancy
- b) Daily multiple micronutrients (1-2 RDA of 18 vitamins and minerals) during pregnancy and the first 6 months postpartum, with no supplementation for offspring during infancy
- c) Daily LNS during pregnancy and the first 6 months postpartum (LNS-P&L with similar vitamin and mineral content as the daily multiple micronutrients, plus Ca, P, K, Mg and essential fatty acids), with LNS for offspring (LNS-20gM with 22 vitamins and minerals with concentrations based on RNIs for infants) during infancy

on the following outcomes:

1. 18-month motor development, language development, socio-emotional development, executive function, and interaction with caregivers
2. Prevalence of severe and moderate to severe delay in motor development, language development, socio-emotional development, and executive function

The null hypotheses were that:

1. The three groups of infants whose mothers received the three micronutrient treatments will not differ in 18-month scores in gross and fine motor development, language development, socio-emotional development, executive function, and interaction with caregivers, and
2. Infants whose mothers received LNS during pregnancy and lactation, and who received LNS from 6 to 18 months of age will not differ in 18-month scores in gross and fine motor development, language development, socio-emotional development, executive function, and interaction with caregivers from infants in the other two groups.
3. Hypotheses 1-2 will also be examined with regard to the prevalence of severe and moderate to severe delay in motor development, language development, socio-emotional development, and executive function.

## 2.0 Definition of the 18-month developmental outcomes

The gross motor score is calculated as the sum of 35 Kilifi Developmental Inventory (KDI) gross motor items, each scored 0 or 1 (sum of *Form C7a Q 5.1-5.2* and *5.6-7.12*). Severe delay is defined as the bottom 10% of our sample. Moderate to severe delay is defined as the bottom 25% of our sample.

The fine motor score is calculated as the sum of 34 KDI fine motor items, each scored 0 or 1 following Abubakar et al. (2008). Severe delay is defined as the bottom 10% of our sample. Moderate to severe delay is defined as the bottom 25% of our sample.

The psychomotor score is calculated as the sum of 69 KDI fine and gross motor items, each scored 0 or 1. Severe delay is defined in two ways: (1) the bottom 10% of our sample and (2)  $< -3$  SD below the mean according to published norms from Kenya (Abubakar et al. 2008). Moderate to severe delay is defined in two ways: (1) the bottom 25% of our sample and (2)  $< -2$  SD below the mean according to published norms from Kenya (Abubakar et al. 2008).

Language development is quantified as

- a. Vocabulary score, calculated as the sum of *Form C7c LANGVOCAB1* through *LANGVOCAB100*. Severe delay is defined as the bottom 10% of our sample. Moderate to severe delay is defined as the bottom 25% of our sample.
- b. Expressive vocabulary  $> 10$  words vs.  $\leq 10$  words, derived from the vocabulary score
- c. Word combining (Has the child started combining words into sentences? 0 = not yet, 1 = sometimes, 2 = often) *Form C7c Q 14.1*

Socio-emotional development is calculated as the sum of *Form C7b PSED1* through *PSED19*. Severe delay is defined as the top 10% of our sample (a lower score indicates more advanced socio-emotional development). Moderate to severe delay is defined as the top 25% of our sample.

Executive function is calculated as

- a. A not B task total number correct, *Form C7a Q16.12*. Severe delay is defined as the bottom 10% of our sample. Moderate to severe delay is defined as the bottom 25% of our sample.
- b. A not B task total errors after set 1, *Form C7a Q16.13*
- c. A not B task total trials completed, *Form C7a Q 16.11*. If this variable is not normally distributed, another statistical approach will be used, such as creating a dichotomous variable

Interaction with caregivers is calculated as the sum of the activities with adults in the past three days (*Form C7d Q 6.1.1* through *Q 6.6.3*).

### 3.0 Analysis Principles and Outliers

The analysis principles and treatment of outliers will be same as that for the primary outcomes. In addition to the intention to treat analysis, we will also perform a per protocol analysis by examining the interaction between treatment group and adherence to supplement consumption. If the interaction term is significant at  $p < 0.1$ , we will further explore the nature of the interaction by examining the effect of treatment group at the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentile of adherence.

#### 4.0 Hypothesis testing

The analysis will begin with testing the null hypothesis of no difference between the three treatment groups using ANCOVA or logistic regression, and controlling for pre-specified covariates (see below). For all analyses, if the global null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 level, then we will perform post-hoc pairwise comparisons of all three groups using Tukey-Kramer adjustment. We will also use Scheffe's test to assess whether the LNS group differs from the non-LNS groups.

For each hypothesis, three models will be estimated:

1. No covariate adjustment
2. Adjustment for child age at developmental assessment
3. Adjustment for child age at developmental assessment and for any of the variables presented in section 6 showing statistically significant association (at  $p < 0.1$  level) with the developmental score.

The effects of potential effect modifiers will be assessed with an interaction term in the ANCOVA or logistic regression model. Significant interactions ( $p < 0.1$ ) will be further examined with stratified analyses, estimation of separate regression lines, or estimation of adjusted means at key points of the covariate, in order to understand the nature of the effect modification.

#### 5.0 Background Characteristics of Participants and Baseline Comparisons

The following group characteristics will be compared:

Group characteristics	From
Child sex	Covariate/Effect modifier
Mother's Age at enrollment (y)	Main SAP maternal
Mother's education (years of formal education)	Main SAP maternal/child
Mother's height (m)	Main SAP maternal/child
Mother's BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	Main SAP maternal/child
Women with a low BMI (< 18.5 kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	Main SAP maternal
Mother's mid upper arm circumf. (cm)	Main SAP maternal/child
Mother's Hemoglobin (g/L)	Main SAP maternal
Mother Anemic at enrollment (% [n])	Main SAP maternal
Mother's ZPP (μmol/mol heme)	Main SAP maternal
Elevated ZPP at enrolment (ZPP > 60)	Main SAP maternal
Iron deficiency anemia at enrolment (% [n])	Main SAP maternal
Positive rapid test for malaria (% [n])	Main SAP maternal
Parity	Main SAP child

Primiparous women (% [n])	Main SAP maternal
Gestational age at enrolment (wk)	Main SAP maternal/child
Proxy(s) household socioeconomic status (Assets index / Housing index)	Main SAP maternal/child
Proxy variable for household food insecurity	Covariate/Effect modifier
Season at enrolment being dry season (Nov-Apr)	Covariate/Effect modifier
One or several proxy indicators for diet quality	Covariate/Effect modifier
Mother's marital status married or cohabiting (% [n])	Main SAP maternal/child
Number of persons in the household	Main SAP child
Children <5 y in the household	Main SAP child
Child age at developmental assessment	Covar Dev Assessment

Analysis of background characteristics will be the same as that for the main outcomes:

- We will use frequencies and percentages to summarize categorical data. Percentages will be calculated based on the number of participants for whom data are available.
- Continuous variables will be summarized using either mean and SD for variables, or median and range.
- Where data for certain participants are missing, the number of participants included in the analysis will be indicated.

### 6.0 Potential Covariates

All variables listed above in section 5.0 will be considered as covariates plus the following:

Family care indicators score, if this is not different between groups  
Child's mood during testing, if this is not different between groups  
Child's interaction with tester during testing, if this is not different between groups  
Child's activity level during testing, if this is not different between groups  
Child's primary language  
Number of languages to which child has been exposed (1 or more than 1)  
The data collector who conducted the developmental assessment or interview

Only covariates significantly associated with an outcome at 10% level of significance in a bivariate analysis will be included in the final adjusted analysis. This means we may have different sets of covariates for each outcome.

### 7.0 Potential effect modifiers

In accordance with the main SAP, the following variables will be considered as effect modifiers:

- a. Composite variable for food security and/or socio-economic status
- b. Primiparity
- c. Maternal height



- d. Maternal BMI at enrollment (adjusted for gestational age)
- e. Maternal anemia at enrollment
- f. Gestational age at enrollment
- g. Season at enrollment
- h. Maternal age
- i. Maternal education
- j. Child sex
- k. One or several proxy indicators for diet quality

In addition, we will consider the following variables as effect modifiers:

- a. Family care indicators z-score

### **8.0 Calculating developmental scores and z-scores**

If a large percentage of data is missing for any item, we will exclude that item from the total score. For all other missing item scores, we will impute the scores based on the other items in the same subscale. We will use the imputation method described in Raghunathan et al. (2001).

Z-scores of developmental variables will be calculated based on the distribution of the iLiNS-DYAD-G sample, by standardizing the distribution to a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1.

### References

- Abubakar, A., Holding, P. A., Van Baar, A., Newton, C. R. J. C., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2008). Monitoring psychomotor development in a resource-limited setting: An evaluation of the Kilifi Developmental Inventory. *Annals of Tropical Pediatrics*, 28, 217-226.
- Raghunathan, T. E., Lepkowski, J. M., Van Hoewyk, J., & Solenberger, P. (2001). A multivariate technique for multiply imputing missing values using a sequence of regression models. *Survey Methodology*, 27(1), 85-95.