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Interventions to tackle stunting in infants and children living in urban slums – do they work?

Effectiveness on stunting (length/height) – not very much or not compelling

1. Neervoort et al 2013, N=81, school lunch & supplements v control, 12% v 22% stunting, no father and smaller family = more stunting ??? Higher mother education = more wasting ???
2. Semba et al 2013, N=80k, fortified milk & noodle intake = less stunting, but stunting declined with age and greater expenditure on ALL food; shorter mother = more stunting.
3. Berger et al 2008, N=139k, vitamin A supplement v control, 9.4% v 10.7% stunting, but intervention group also received vaccinations and other medical care.
4. Iannotti et al 2013, N=589, nutrient supplement (fat, A, B₁₂, Fe, Zn), length-for-age z score +0.13, BUT at age 6 months this equals <6.5 mm, close to measurement error.
5. Penny et al 2005, N=336, nutritional education, less stunting 8/171 intervention v 26/165 control, BUT both groups continued to decline in zHT through age 18 months.
6. Attanasio et al 2005, N=??, conditional cash transfer, zHT +0.16 = <8 mm, only effective for infants <2 years, not for ages 2+, cash program increased food intake and weight by 0.6 kg.
