Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Andreas Erich Zautner, University Hospital Magdeburg, Germany

REVIEWED BY Hagen Frickmann, Bundeswehr Hospital Hamburg, Germany Nduhiu Gitahi, University of Nairobi, Kenya Carrie Cowardin, University of Virginia, United States

\*CORRESPONDENCE Sarah Lindley McKune ⊠ smckune@ufl.edu

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

RECEIVED 19 July 2024 ACCEPTED 05 December 2024 PUBLISHED 07 January 2025

#### CITATION

Chen D, McKune SL, Yang Y, Usmane IA, Ahmed IA, Amin JK, Ibrahim AM, Seran AJ, Shaik N, Ojeda A, Hassen BM, Deblais L, Ahmedo BU, Hassen KA, Bhrane M, Li X, Singh N, Roba KT, French NP, Rajashekara G, Manary MJ, Hassen JY, Havelaar AH and on behalf of the CAGED Research Team (2025) *Campylobacter* colonization and undernutrition in infants in rural eastern Ethiopia — a longitudinal community-based birth cohort study. *Front. Public Health* 12:1467462. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2024.1467462

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Chen, McKune, Yang, Usmane, Ahmed, Amin, Ibrahim, Seran, Shaik, Ojeda, Hassen, Deblais, Ahmedo, Hassen, Bhrane, Li, Singh, Roba, French, Rajashekara, Manary, Hassen, Havelaar and on behalf of the CAGED Research Team. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# *Campylobacter* colonization and undernutrition in infants in rural eastern Ethiopia — a longitudinal community-based birth cohort study

Dehao Chen<sup>1,2†</sup>, Sarah Lindley McKune<sup>1,3\*†</sup>, Yang Yang<sup>4†</sup>, Ibsa Aliyi Usmane<sup>5</sup>, Ibsa Abdusemed Ahmed<sup>6</sup>, Jafer Kedir Amin<sup>7</sup>, Abdulmuen Mohammed Ibrahim<sup>7</sup>, Abadir Jemal Seran<sup>8</sup>, Nurmohammad Shaik<sup>9</sup>, Amanda Ojeda<sup>10</sup>, Bahar Mummed Hassen<sup>7</sup>, Loic Deblais<sup>11</sup>,

Belisa Usmael Ahmedo<sup>5</sup>, Kedir Abdi Hassen<sup>5</sup>, Mussie Bhrane<sup>5</sup>, Xiaolong Li<sup>1</sup>, Nitya Singh<sup>12</sup>, Kedir Teji Roba<sup>6</sup>, Nigel P. French<sup>13</sup>, Gireesh Rajashekara<sup>11</sup>, Mark J. Manary<sup>9</sup>, Jemal Yusuf Hassen<sup>8</sup>, Arie Hendrik Havelaar<sup>12</sup> and on behalf of the CAGED Research Team<sup>14</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Environmental and Global Health, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States, <sup>2</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States, <sup>3</sup>Center for African Studies, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States, <sup>4</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, United States, <sup>5</sup>College of Agriculture and Environmental Science, Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia, <sup>6</sup>College of Health and Medical Sciences, Haramaya, Ethiopia, <sup>8</sup>Office of Research Affairs, Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia, <sup>9</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, United States, <sup>10</sup>Department of Microbiology and Cell Science, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States, <sup>11</sup>Center for Food Animal Health, Department of Animal Sciences, College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, The Ohio State University, Wooster, OH, United States, <sup>12</sup>Department of Animal Sciences, Global Food Systems Institute, and Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States, <sup>13</sup>School of Veterinary Science, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, <sup>14</sup>Innovation Laboratory for Livestock Systems, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States

**Background:** *Campylobacter* is associated with environmental enteric dysfunction (EED) and malnutrition in children. *Campylobacter* infection could be a linchpin between livestock fecal exposure and health outcomes in low-resource smallholder settings.

**Methods:** We followed a birth cohort of 106 infants in rural smallholder households in eastern Ethiopia up to 13 months of age. We measured anthropometry, surveyed sociodemographic determinants, and collected stool and urine samples. A short survey was conducted during monthly visits, infant stool samples were collected, and *Campylobacter* spp. was quantified using genus-specific qPCR. In month 13, we collected stool and urine samples to assay for EED biomarkers. We employed regression analyses to assess the associations of household determinants with *Campylobacter* colonization, EED, and growth faltering.

**Results:** The *Campylobacter* load in infant stools increased with age. The mean length-for-age Z-score (LAZ) decreased from -0.45 at 3-4 months of age to -2.06 at 13 months, while the prevalence of stunting increased from 3 to 51%.

The prevalence of EED at 13 months of age was 56%. A higher *Campylobacter* load was associated with more frequent diarrhea. Prelacteal feeding significantly increased *Campylobacter* load in the first month of life. Over the whole follow-up period, *Campylobacter* load was increased by keeping chickens unconfined at home and unsanitary disposal of infant stools while decreased by mothers' handwashing with soap. Longitudinally, *Campylobacter* load was positively associated with food insecurity, introduction of complementary foods, and raw milk consumption. There were no significant associations between *Campylobacter* load, EED, and LAZ.

**Conclusion:** This study found that most determinants associated with increased *Campylobacter* infection were related to suboptimal feeding practices and hygiene. The findings related to livestock-associated risks were inconclusive. Although stunting, EED, and *Campylobacter* prevalence rates all increased to high levels by the end of the first year of life, no significant association between them was identified. While additional research is needed to investigate whether findings from this study are replicable in other populations, community efforts to improve infant and young child feeding practices and food hygiene, and water, sanitation, and hygiene (WaSH) at the household level, could reduce (cross-) contamination at the point of exposure.

KEYWORDS

*Campylobacter*, environmental enteric dysfunction, undernutrition, longitudinal study, prospective birth cohort, Ethiopia, smallholder livestock farming

### Introduction

Stunting [length-for-age (LAZ)/height-for-age Z-score < -2], affects 22% of children under five (CU5) globally and 30% in sub-Saharan Africa (1), is an indicator of chronic undernutrition and is associated with numerous morbidities, all-cause mortality, and reduced lifetime earnings (2–4). Agriculture-to-nutrition pathways, including household income, women's empowerment, and agricultural production, can be leveraged to reduce undernutrition (5). Particularly, animal-source food (ASF) consumption has been associated with reducing child stunting in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) (6).

Projected population and economic growth in Africa are expected to increase the demand for ASF fourfold between 2010 and 2050 (7). Ethiopia is home to the largest livestock population on the continent, most of which is produced through extensive smallholder farming systems (i.e., mixed crop-livestock, pastoral) (8). Resources are typically limited in such settings, and WaSH conditions often fail to meet international standards. This reality predisposes CU5 to environmental exposure to human and livestock feces, which are reservoirs of enteric pathogens (9).

Observational studies have associated enteric pathogens with child growth faltering (9, 10), which is hypothesized to be mediated through acute illness (e.g., diarrhea and fever) (11) and environmental enteric dysfunction (EED), a chronic and asymptomatic consequence of both symptomatic and asymptomatic enteric infections (12). EED is well established in the literature as a risk factor for stunting (12–15), and growing evidence points toward EED as an essential mediator between enteric infections and stunting (15). The gold standard for diagnosing EED is intestinal biopsy (16). Still, it is not practical in population-based studies in resource-poor settings, where biomarkers were used to assess different impaired gut functions of EED (17). However, a 2021 study from the Sanitation Hygiene Infant Nutrition

Efficacy (SHINE) trial found no consistent association between the examined EED biomarkers and linear growth (18) and a 2022 study in two African countries revealed few correlations between the evaluated EED biomarkers (19). Hence, challenges exist in the use of biomarkers to accurately measure EED.

As landmark randomized controlled trials focusing solely on reducing exposure to human feces through WaSH interventions found no significant effect on linear growth (20), researchers have called for a One Health Approach that considers exposure to human and animal feces (21, 22). A systematic review of benefits and risks of smallholder livestock production found *Campylobacter* spp. to be the primary zoonotic enteric pathogen associated with increased risks of both EED and undernutrition and proposed a modification to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) framework on child undernutrition that incorporates poor gut health as a third immediate determinant of undernutrition (9). These findings suggest that *Campylobacter* infection could be a critical link between livestock exposure and malnutrition in low-resource settings.

In 2018, the *Campylobacter* Genomics and Environmental Enteric Dysfunction (CAGED) research team conducted formative research, including a cross-sectional study of smallholder households in rural eastern Ethiopia (23). This study found a high prevalence of infection with diverse *Campylobacter* spp., EED, and stunting in children aged 12–14 months and identified several associated risk factors (24). These findings supported the design and implementation of a prospective longitudinal birth cohort study (25) to uncover the reservoirs and determinants of *Campylobacter* spp. colonizing infants, the results of which are presented here. Utilizing the modified UNICEF framework to identify possible putative determinants, this study examines associations in the first year of life between individual- and household-level determinants and *Campylobacter* infection. Given their importance to *Campylobacter*, we also explore symptoms of enteric illness (diarrhea and fever) as outcomes associated with *Campylobacter*.

We then examine EED and linear growth faltering as secondary outcomes. Note that the microbiological findings that detail the prevalence and load of *Campylobacter* from the CAGED longitudinal study have been described in a sister paper (26).

### **Methods**

### Study setting

The CAGED longitudinal study was conducted in Haramaya woreda (district), East Hararghe Zone, Oromia Region, Ethiopia. The study site is a rural, agriculture-based area where traditional cropbased agriculture has been replaced in recent years with cash crop production of khat. However, many farmers still cultivate some corn, and most have livestock. Data collection was scheduled to begin in April 2020 but was delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. After months of delay, preparation, and online training, data collection was initiated in December 2020, just 1 month after the start of the civil war in the Tigray Region, an armed conflict that continued throughout the data collection period (25).

### Study design and field procedures

The study protocol has been described in full elsewhere (25). This study was powered to estimate the prevalence of Campylobacter genus, a sample size of 100 allowed the prevalence estimates to have a precision of 10% at 95% confidence and a power of 80% (25). To account for a 20% attrition rate, we aimed to recruit a total sample of 120 newborn infants (25). Between December 2020 and June 2021, we enrolled six cohorts at 4-week intervals, each consisting of up to 20 randomly selected infants from a birth registry, resulting in a total of 115 infants. Participating families were followed every 4 weeks (hereafter called monthly follow-up) until the infants were approximately 13 months of age (through May 2022). We measured infant's length and weight at quarterly visits following enrollment using the same procedures described in the formative research (24). Despite extensive efforts to engage with culturally sensitive approaches, some mothers were reluctant to hand over newborn infants to local enumerators for measurement at birth. In addition, birth length measures are error-prone due to infants being bent and curled up (27). For these reasons, we excluded length measures shortly after birth from our analyses.

A Long Survey with mothers and their male partners was conducted at baseline and near the end of the study to collect information including demographics, livelihoods, wealth, animal ownership, management, diseases, WaSH conditions, and child health. During monthly visits, mothers responded to a Short Survey focusing on dynamic indicators, including infant health, diets, food security, contact with animals, and the environment; infant stool samples were collected concurrently. All interview, survey, and anthropometry data were collected on tablets using the REDCap mobile app and were uploaded to a secure REDCap database at the University of Florida<sup>1,2</sup>. All survey instruments are available in the supplementary material of the study protocol manuscript (25).

At the end of the follow-up period, samples were collected to assess biomarkers of EED as previously reported (24). Briefly, stool samples were collected to measure fecal myeloperoxidase (MPO) and immediately flash-frozen using liquid nitrogen and stored at  $-0^{\circ}$ C until further use. To assess gut permeability, a solution of 1,000-mg lactulose in 10-ml sterile water was administered to the infant for 5 min, and urine was collected over a period of 4 hours. All samples were transported to the United States on dry ice for further analysis. MPO was measured using a commercially available enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (MPO RUO, Alpco, Salem, NH, United States). Lactulose in urine was assessed using high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC).

### Sampling and laboratory procedures

The collection and preservation of infant stool samples and molecular detection and quantification of Campylobacter by quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) have been described elsewhere (26). The primers employed detect a large range of species in the Campylobacter genus, including the well-studied species Campylobacter jejuni and Campylobacter coli as well as a wide range of other thermotolerant and non-thermotolerant species such as the recently described Candidatus Campylobacter infans (28). This PCR assay was previously shown to be more sensitive to detect Campylobacter in stool samples from children than culture and enzyme immunoassay. There were no false-positive reactions with DNA from related genera (29). Based on the standard curve of qPCR, *Campylobacter* load [unit: log<sub>10</sub>(gene copies per 50 ng of DNA)] was calculated as a linear function of cycle threshold (Ct) values: 10.51- $0.24 \times Ct$  (26). The calibration was linear in the full tested range (Ct: 12-42). We chose not to use a Ct-cutoff value to calculate the load of Campylobacter in the following data analyses to avoid left censoring.

### Data analyses

#### Health outcomes

The primary outcome evaluated in this study is the *Campylobacter* load of infants (including those with and without clinical symptoms). We categorized the ages when the infant stool samples were collected into quartiles to assess temporal variations of the *Campylobacter* load and its determinants.

Secondary outcomes include EED, linear growth faltering, diarrhea, and fever. EED was categorized using a composite indicator based on the percentage of lactulose excretion (%L) and fecal MPO (24). Cut-off values for %L were  $0.2 < \%L \le 0.45\%$  for moderate gut permeability and %L > 0.45 for severe gut permeability. The thresholds for MPO were 2,000 ng/mL for moderate gut inflammation and the third quartile of the observed data at 3,364 ng/mL for severe gut inflammation. EED was defined as moderate if either %L or MPO was categorized as severe, and as severe if both %L *and* MPO were in a severe category. A decrease in LAZ characterized the linear growth faltering. We modeled changes in LAZ using two models: one uses the overall decrease between the first and last available LAZ scores as the outcome, referred to as the decrease in LAZ, and is a non-longitudinal

<sup>1</sup> http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046408001226

<sup>2</sup> https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046419301261

model. The other is a longitudinal model, using the LAZ at each visit as the outcome. We use the phrases "linear growth faltering" and "decrease in LAZ" interchangeably. As the anthropometric measurements were conducted on different days than the short surveys and stool sample collection, we employed k-means clustering to categorize the ages at anthropometric measurements into five groups. Neonatal outcomes include the *Campylobacter* load in the first month of life (day range: 7–39) and the first available LAZ. A case of diarrhea or fever was declared when the mother reported the infant having symptoms on the day of the interview or the day before. The definition of diarrhea provided to the mother was the infant having three or more loose or watery stools in 24 hours.

#### Identification of putative determinants

We applied the modified UNICEF framework of child undernutrition, as proposed in our systematized review (9), to identify putative determinants of the health outcomes of interest (Campylobacter infection, EED, and linear growth faltering). These included variables from the household surveys that fell into domains of immediate causes (inadequate dietary intake and diseases), underlying causes (household food insecurity, inadequate care and feeding practices, and unhealthy household environment and inadequate health services), and basic causes (social/cultural, economics/livelihood, human capital, basic demographics) from the original UNICEF framework, as well as variables that reflected the domains of benefits (as determined by the agriculture-to-nutrition pathways), risks (of enteric infections from livestock exposure), and control measures (to the risks), as illustrated in the review. For the conceptual overlap between risks and unhealthy household environment underlying Campylobacter infection, we assigned the determinants related to livestock (feces) exposure to risks, given our study's interest in smallholder farming. Determining eligible variables for analyses involved cross-checking the framework's domains and the variables in the household surveys, generating a suite of putative determinants for the health outcomes of Campylobacter infection, EED, and linear growth faltering. Some determinants may affect the downstreaming outcomes of poor gut health and undernutrition through other mediators, but may not be directly associated with an increased risk of Campylobacter infection. These determinants include vitamin A and iron supplementation, treatment for malnutrition, use of oral rehydration solution, visiting a health center for diarrhea or fever, vaccination, and receiving prenatal care and its location; thus, we only tested their associations with EED and LAZ to simplify interpretation. We examined the enteric symptoms of diarrhea and fever as possible outcomes of Campylobacter infection. We also considered both enteric symptoms as determinants of growth faltering. While fever was considered a putative determinant for EED, diarrhea was not, as diarrhea is a causative factor for elevated EED biomarkers.

#### Composite variables

Composite variables were calculated by combining answers from two or more survey questions, and such variables have been validated in other studies. We generated the following composite variables:

- Minimum Dietary Diversity of Infant and Young Children (MDD-IYC) (30), from which the consumption status of ASF was extracted.
- 2. Household food insecurity access score (HFIAS) and household food insecurity access (HFIA) category (31).

- 3. Joint Monitoring Program (JMP) WaSH service ladders for drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene (32).
- 4. Tropical Livestock Units (TLU), a composite variable that quantifies the holding of all farmed animals in a household by converting the counts of different livestock types into standardized units based on their relative body weight and summing them into a single value (33).
- 5. *Anthropometric Z*-scores [i.e., LAZ and weight-for-age *Z* (WAZ) scores], calculated using the R package anthro (34).
- 6. Adapted from our formative research (24), we defined a livestock location risk score for each of the four livestock species (cattle, chicken, sheep, or goat). This score was designed to characterize the increasing likelihood of contact between a livestock species and study participants during the day or night. A score of 0 was assigned to any household that did not have the livestock species in question or reported keeping them outside the house at all times; a score of 1 was assigned to any household that reported keeping the livestock species inside the house and confined; and a score of 2 was assigned to any household that reported keeping the livestock species inside the house unconfined.
- 7. To characterize assets, informed by the literature (35), we employed a latent trait model (using the R package *ltm* (36)) to calculate a factor score for ownership of sellable household assets for each household.
- 8. We characterized the age of introducing complementary feeding as the infant's age at the monthly visit when the mother first reported giving the infant complementary foods. This definition of complementary feeding is based on operational definitions of the WHO (37), which do not consider prelacteal feeding.
- 9. Complementary feeding refers to an infant receiving any solid, semisolid, or soft foods at any time (note that this differs from appropriate complementary feeding, which should occur after 6 months of age).
- 10. Prelacteal feeding means feeding any substances other than breastmilk given to the infant during the first 3 days after birth.

We dichotomized some composite variables to facilitate interpretation and minimize the impact of data sparsity. We used accepted cutoffs for meeting MDD as  $\geq$ 5, an HFIA category of 1 as food secure, and an anthropometric Z-score < -2 as stunted. In the JMP drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene ladders, *unimproved*, *open defecation*, and *no facility* were treated as reference categories, respectively, with all other categories within each ladder merged. Infant stool disposal was binarized as a low-risk category, including infant using toilet or latrine, stool put or rinsed into toilet or latrine or drain or ditch, and a high-risk category, including stool thrown in the garbage, buried, or left in the open. The quartile score for assets was binarized by its median.

#### **Regression analyses**

The average *Campylobacter* load, EED, and the change in LAZ for each infant over the follow-up period were separately regressed on all selected baseline determinants, except for infant feeding practices at birth. As we were interested in the short-term effects of feeding practices at birth (colostrum feeding, early initiation of breastfeeding, and prelacteal feeding) on *Campylobacter* infection and on linear growth, we assessed their relationship with the *Campylobacter* load in the first month (age range: 7–39) and the first available LAZ measurement in the regression analysis. EED at endline was regressed on all the selected baseline determinants and the average of longitudinal (time-varying) determinants of the whole follow-up.

To assess the longitudinal associations between the time-varying determinants and health outcomes, we regressed the average *Campylobacter* load on the average of each time-varying determinant within each age quartile, under the assumption that the effect of each determinant was immediate to the change of *Campylobacter* load. We used the same approach to regress separately the outcomes of current fever and diarrhea on *Campylobacter* load. In contrast, the LAZ of each visit was regressed on the average value of each determinant from birth up to that visit, under the assumption that stunting is the result of a chronic process and the effect of each determinant on growth accumulates over time.

We employed linear-mixed models with an individual-level random intercept to account for dependency in repeated measures (using the R package lme4 (38)). For each outcome (except diarrhea and fever), we conducted backward elimination to select a multivariable model, starting with determinants having adjusted *p*-values <0.2 from a variable screening step where the outcome was regressed on each determinant separately while adjusting for sex and socioeconomic status (SES, binarized household asset score) as fixed confounders. Infant age group was also adjusted as a fixed confounder in the linearmixed models for Campylobacter load and LAZ, while the age at EED sampling was adjusted as a fixed confounder in the logistic models for EED. These fixed confounders were also constantly kept in the multivariable models, i.e., they are not subject to backward elimination in the multivariable selection. In the models for EED, we categorized variables of proportion of vitamin A supplementation (categories:  $\geq$ 0.15; >0 and < 0.15; and = 0) and proportion of infants with fever (categories:  $\geq 0.3$  and < 0.3) to improve the interpretability of the associated effects and the readability of their confidence intervals. For most variables, there was a higher level of missingness at the baseline than at the endline. For variables that are the same between baseline and endline among >80% of the studied households, and if the baseline value was missing but the endline value was available, we used the endline value to impute the missing baseline value. After this simple ad hoc imputation, we conducted complete case analyses, that is, missing data were dropped under the assumption of missing completely at random. All analyses were conducted in R (version 4.1.0) (39).

### Results

#### Descriptive statistics

Of the 115 infants enrolled in the study, four households withdrew from the study, three infants died from causes unrelated to the study, and two moved outside of the study area, leaving 106 infants who completed follow-up and were included in the analysis. Of the 1,378 planned household visits, 1,111 (81%) had infant's stool samples assayed by qPCR, 1,035 (75%) had a monthly short survey, and 980 (71%) had both. Only 13% and 2% of infants had stool samples collected and short surveys completed for all 13 visits, respectively. We present the characteristics of the study population in Table 1.

Forty-eight percent of infants were females, and 11% were underweight at enrollment (age range: 4–27 days). The mothers were, on average, 27 years old, all of whom were Muslim, and 28% had received some formal education. Most households were engaged in a combination of on-farm activities (e.g., animal, crops, and khat production), with khat production dominating as the primary livelihood for 86% of households and an average TLU of 0.62. Almost all infants were fed colostrum, and 66% had early initiation of breastfeeding (within 1 h) after birth; 67% received prelacteal feeding. Few households had access to safely managed drinking water (1.1%) and sanitation facilities (1.1%), and only 21% of households had access to basic hygiene facilities. More than three quarters of mothers reported hand washing before feeding the infant, after fieldwork, and after infant defecation; however, soap use was only reported by one-third of mothers. Most infant stools were reportedly disposed of as garbage or into a drain. During the daytime, all farm animals except chickens were kept outside the household or confined if inside. More farm animals (goats, sheep, cattle, and chickens) were kept inside at night than during the day. The proportion of households confined chickens when kept inside the home (41%) was higher than other livestock and was the same during the day- or nighttime. While 59% of households were observed to have livestock droppings in household/homestead, nearly 90% of households reported collecting animal waste. Forty-four percent of households reported slaughtering their livestock (goat, sheep, or chicken), and all these households reported washing hands before and/or after slaughtering. Further details of household characteristics were reported in Supplementary Table 1.

In the first month of life (day range: 7–39), the average *Campylobacter* load in infant stools was 1.87 [standard deviation (SD): 1.01, unit: log(gene copies/50 ng of DNA)], whose corresponding prevalence was 32% (95% CI: 24–42%), under a Ct cutoff of 35. The *Campylobacter* load increased steadily from 1.95 (SD: 0.97) in the first age quartile to 3.83 (SD: 1.14) in the fourth age quartile, see Figure 1A. The average load corresponding to each anthropometry visit also demonstrated a steadily increasing trend, see Figure 1B.

The mean LAZ decreased from -0.45 (SD = 1.08) in age group 1 (mean age = 94 days) to -2.06 (SD = 0.93) in age group 5 (mean age = 428 days), see Figure 2A. Meanwhile, the prevalence of stunting increased steadily from 3% (95% CI: 1-11%) to 51% (95% CI: 40-61%) in the same time frame, see Figure 2B. EED measurements were conducted at an average age of 418 (SD = 35) days, and the prevalence of EED was 56% (95% CI: 46-65%), of which 25% (95% CI: 17-34%) were severe EED. Current diarrhea and fever prevalence rates were higher in the later age quartiles than in the first (Figure 3). Generally, the levels or prevalence of many time-varying determinants increased as the infants aged (Figure 4). However, we observed consistently low proportions of iron supplementation and treatment for malnutrition, a consistently high proportion of breastfeeding, and the highest proportions of vaccination (including polio and rotavirus vaccines) in the second age quartile. The introduction of complementary feeding was reported at a mean age of 187 days (range: 46-319). Based on the HFIAS score, the proportion of the study population that was food secure decreased as infants aged.

### Regression analysis

#### Campylobacter

Variable screening results of the individual- and household-level determinants (both with and without adjustment for

TABLE 1 Characteristics of the study population in the 106 households.

SerFinalMainMainSeriopainCallerNorsipaniMoriaMoriaMoriaMariaSeriopainMariaMariaSeriopain <t< th=""><th>Variable</th><th>n (%) or median (first, third quartiles)</th></t<>	Variable	n (%) or median (first, third quartiles)			
Male5(52%)Underwight annohmen12(11%)Non response1Kohris age20/202.0.300Non response0Religion1Kohris age0Non response0Non response0Non response0Non response0Non response0Some privary solication20/208.00Non response0Normary solication0Come privary solication0Come privary solication0Come privary solication0Come production0Come production0Come production0Come production0Come production0Come production0Nomber of patis0Nomber of patis0Nomber of patis0Nomber of patis0Nomber of solication0Nomber of solication0Nome compation0Nomber of solication0Nomber of solication0Nomber of solication0Nome compation0Nome compation0Non response0Non response0Nom solication0 <td>Sex</td> <td></td>	Sex				
Underweight at ensiltentINot-response1Storker sage27.0 (22.0, 22.0)Not-response1Refigion1Malin10.6 (100%)Noar-response1Storker schwart1Storker schwart1St	Female	51 (48%)			
Non-response1Mother's get2.0.0.2.0.0.2.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0	Male	55 (52%)			
Non-response1Mother's get2.0.0.2.0.0.2.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0	Underweight at enrollment	12 (11%)			
Non-response1ReligionReligionNons-response1Nons-response1Some primary education90 (28%)Nons-response90 (28%)Nons-response90 (28%)Nons-response90 (28%)Nons-response90 (28%)Nons-response90 (26%)Comp production90 (26%)Corp production90 (26%)Corp production90 (26%)Corp production90 (26%)Petry rade90 (26%)Remitances1Topical Ivencio durinis90 (26%)Number of cattle90 (26%)Number of safets90 (26%)Numer of safets90 (26%) <tr< td=""><td></td><td colspan="2"></td></tr<>					
Rigian       Main     0.010(0%)       Non-copone     0.010(0%)       Mahri Action     0.000(0%)       Some privary education     0.020(0%)       Some privary education     0.010(0%)       Non-copone     0.010(0%)       Primary Education     0.010(0%)       Non-copone     0.010(0%)       Primary Education     0.010(0%)       Char production     0.010(0%)       Char production     0.010(0%)       Char production     0.010(0%)       Remitances     0.010(0%)       Nome production     0.000(0%)       Number of anle     0.000(0%)       Numer of anle     0	Mother's age	27.0 (22.0, 32.0)			
Rigian       Main     0.010(0%)       Non-copone     0.010(0%)       Mahri Action     0.000(0%)       Some privary education     0.020(0%)       Some privary education     0.010(0%)       Non-copone     0.010(0%)       Primary Education     0.010(0%)       Non-copone     0.010(0%)       Primary Education     0.010(0%)       Char production     0.010(0%)       Char production     0.010(0%)       Char production     0.010(0%)       Remitances     0.010(0%)       Nome production     0.000(0%)       Number of anle     0.000(0%)       Numer of anle     0	Non-response	1			
Median105(10%)Norinregome1Atherk education76(2%)Some privary education20(28%)Non-respons1Primary education1Animal production1(1.0%)Calip production0(06%)Calip production0(06%)Cap production0(06%)Cap production0(06%)Cop production0(06%)Non-respons1Remitances0(06.0%)Non-respons1Non-respons1Nomber of athe0(06.0%)Number of athe0(06.0%)Number of athes0(06.0%)Number of a					
Mater's elucation     Formary education     Formary education       Some privary education     G0 (20%)       Non-response     G1 (20%)       Primary leducation     G1 (10%)       Char production     G0 (60%)       Char production     G0 (60%)       Char production     G1 (10%)       Char production     G1 (10%)       Previor rade     G0 (60%)       Non-response     G1 (10%)       Remittances     G1 (10%)       Non-response     G1 (10%)       Non-response     G0 (2001,40)       Non-response     G0 (2001,40)       Non-response     G0 (2001,40)       Non-response     G0 (0, 1)       Non-response     G0 (0, 1)       Non-response     G0 (0, 2)       Non-response     G0 (0, 2)       Within 15     G1 (0, 2)       Within 15     G1 (0, 2)       Within 15     G1 (0, 2)       Non-response     G1 (10%)       Non-response     G1 (10%)       Non-response     G1 (10%)       Non-response     G1 (10%)		105 (100%)			
Noprinary education76(72%)Nome response29(28%)Nome response1Primary education1Animal production1(10%)Chap production9(06%)Corp production9(06%)Corp production0(10%)Nom-response1Nom-response1Nom-response1Nomber of gats0(0,1)Number of gats0(0,2)Number of gats0(0,2)Number of been prime0(0,2)Number of been prime9Outprime free prime9Colorum free prime9Outprime free prime1Prime prime8Age at complem prime1Unimproved7(7,5%)Innicid3(1,5%)Stefy mangel1	Non-response	1			
Some primary education9(28%)Non-response1Primary levelhood1Animal production0(10%)Chat production0(10%)Chat production0(65.7%)Rentinces0(10%)Non-response1Topsial levelsck anise0.00.20.1400Number of cattle0(0,1)Number of gaals0(0,2)Number of datkense0(0,3)Edity initiation of tracking0(0,3)Number of datkense0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Number of datkense0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Non-response9Otorum feeding0(10,1)Non-response9Otorum feeding0(3,1)Non-response9Age at complementary feeding9Non-response8Age at complementary feeding0(10,1)Indial Idade of UTUUNCEF Jeint Monitoring Program1Uningrovad7,7,5%)Indial Cattle of UTUUNCEF Level Action Starting Start	Mother's education				
Some primary education9(28%)Non-response1Primary levelhood1Animal production0(10%)Chat production0(10%)Chat production0(65.7%)Rentinces0(10%)Non-response1Topsial levelsck anise0.00.20.1400Number of cattle0(0,1)Number of gaals0(0,2)Number of datkense0(0,3)Edity initiation of tracking0(0,3)Number of datkense0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Number of datkense0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Starting Starting0(3,3)Non-response9Otorum feeding0(10,1)Non-response9Otorum feeding0(3,1)Non-response9Age at complementary feeding9Non-response8Age at complementary feeding0(10,1)Indial Idade of UTUUNCEF Jeint Monitoring Program1Uningrovad7,7,5%)Indial Cattle of UTUUNCEF Level Action Starting Start	No primary education	76 (72%)			
Primary livelihood       Asinal production     1(1.0%)       Asinal production     90(86%)       Cop production     90(86%)       Cop production     90(86%)       Cop production     6(5.7%)       Petty rade     0.016(5.7%)       Remittances     1(1.0%)       Remittances     1(1.0%)       Non-response     0.02(02.01.40)       Number of cattle     0.00.1)       Number of goads     0.00.1)       Number of goads     0.00.2)       Number of goads     0.00.2)       Number of steep     0.00.2)       Number of steep     0.00.3)       Within 1 h     64(66%)       Within 2-3 h     0.013(3%)       Non-response     9       Colorin feeding     0.013(3%)       Non-response     9       Peteted feeding     60(67%)       Non-response     8       Peteted feeding     60(67%)       Non-response     8       Age at complementary feeding     10       Unityroved     10       Baser		29 (28%)			
Animal production1(1.0%)Chat production90 (86%)Cop production90 (86%)Cop production6.5.7%)Petty tade7.6.7%)Petty trade10.0%)Non response1Toppical livesck units0.62 (20.140)Number of cattle0.0 (0,1)Number of state0.0 (0,1)Number of state0.0 (0,2)Number of sheep0.0 (0,2)Number of thicknes0.0 (0,3)Entry initiation of breastfeeding64 (66%)Within 19Non response9Ohor response9Non- response9Colorant feeding100 (95%)Non- response9Colorant feeding66 (67%)Non- response1Pelacteal feeding66 (67%)Non- response8Age at complementary feeding61 (31 (34))Initind9Chirting feeding61 (35%)Stely managed10 (95%)Initind9Stely managed11 (35%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed<	Non-response	1			
Animal production1(1.0%)Chat production90 (86%)Cop production90 (86%)Cop production6.5.7%)Petty tade7.6.7%)Petty trade10.0%)Non response1Toppical livesck units0.62 (20.140)Number of cattle0.0 (0,1)Number of state0.0 (0,1)Number of state0.0 (0,2)Number of sheep0.0 (0,2)Number of thicknes0.0 (0,3)Entry initiation of breastfeeding64 (66%)Within 19Non response9Ohor response9Non- response9Colorant feeding100 (95%)Non- response9Colorant feeding66 (67%)Non- response1Pelacteal feeding66 (67%)Non- response8Age at complementary feeding61 (31 (34))Initind9Chirting feeding61 (35%)Stely managed10 (95%)Initind9Stely managed11 (35%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed13 (13%)Stely managed<					
Crop production6 (57%)Petty trade7 (67%)Remittances1 (1.0%)Non-response1Tropical livestock units0 (62 (020,140)Number of cattle0 (0,0,1)Number of storep0 (0,0,2)Number of storep0 (0,0,2)Number of storep0 (0,0,2)Number of storep0 (0,0,2)Number of storep0 (0,0,3)Extreme of the stateding0 (0,0,3)Within 1 h64 (66%)Within 2-3 h20 (21%)Non response9Colostrum feeding0 (0 (05%)Non-response9Colostrum feeding100 (05%)Non-response8Ag at complementary feeding66 (67%)Unitingy vater ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7 (7,5%)Uningroved3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3	Animal production	1 (1.0%)			
Crop production6 (57%)Petty trade7 (67%)Remittances1 (1.0%)Non-response1Tropical livestock units0 (62 (020,140)Number of cattle0 (0,0,1)Number of storep0 (0,0,2)Number of storep0 (0,0,2)Number of storep0 (0,0,2)Number of storep0 (0,0,2)Number of storep0 (0,0,3)Extreme of the stateding0 (0,0,3)Within 1 h64 (66%)Within 2-3 h20 (21%)Non response9Colostrum feeding0 (0 (05%)Non-response9Colostrum feeding100 (05%)Non-response8Ag at complementary feeding66 (67%)Unitingy vater ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7 (7,5%)Uningroved3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3 (3	Chat production	90 (86%)			
Pety tade7(67%)Remittances1Non response1Tropical livestock units0.62 (0.00, 1.40)Number of cattle0.00, 2Number of gats0.00, 2Number of gats0.00, 2Number of sheep0.00, 2Number of sheep0.00, 3Statuston of breastfeeding0.00, 3Entry initizion of breastfeeding0.00, 3Within 1-3 h0.61 (66%)Non response9Colostrum feeding0.00 (9%)Non-response1Pelacteal feeding6.66 (67%)Non response0.00 (9%)Non response1Prelacteal feeding6.60 (67%)Non response1Unimproved7.(75%)Individue of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7.(75%)Linking3.01 (1.1%)Stafey managed1.1 (1.1%)Non response3.01 (3.1%)					
Remitances   1 (1.0%)     Non-response   1     Tropical livestock units   0.62 (0 20, 140)     Number of cattle   0 (0, 1)     Number of cattle   0 (0, 1)     Number of goats   1 (0, 2)     Number of sheep   0 (0, 2)     Number of chickens   0 (0, 3)     Early initiation of breastfeeding   0 (0, 3)     Within 1 h   64 (66%)     Within 2-3 h   20 (21%)     More than 24 h   13 (13%)     Non-response   9     Colostrum feeding   66 (67%)     Non-response   100 (95%)     Non-response   66 (67%)     Non-response   8     Age at complementary feeding   9     Unimproved   7(7.5%)     Lintied   34 (37%)     Sasic   51 (55%)     Safely managed   13 (1.1%)		7 (6.7%)			
Tropical livestock units     0.62 (0.20, 1.40)       Number of cattle     0 (0, 1)       Number of goats     1 (0, 2)       Number of sheep     0 (0, 2)       Number of chickens     0 (0, 3)       Early initiation of breastfeeding     0 (0, 3)       Within 1 h     64 (66%)       Nor response     9       Colostrum feeding     9       Non -response     9       Non -response     1       Prelacteal feeding     66 (67%)       Non -response     8       Age at complementary feeding     194 (165, 215)       Unimproved     7 (7.5%)       Limited     34 (37%)       Basic     51 (55%)       Safely managed     1 (1.1%)       Non -response     13 (13%)		1 (1.0%)			
Tropical livestock units     0.62 (0.20, 1.40)       Number of cattle     0 (0, 1)       Number of goats     1 (0, 2)       Number of sheep     0 (0, 2)       Number of chickens     0 (0, 3)       Early initiation of breastfeeding     0 (0, 3)       Within 1 h     64 (66%)       Nor response     9       Colostrum feeding     9       Non -response     9       Non -response     1       Prelacteal feeding     66 (67%)       Non -response     8       Age at complementary feeding     194 (165, 215)       Unimproved     7 (7.5%)       Limited     34 (37%)       Basic     51 (55%)       Safely managed     1 (1.1%)       Non -response     13 (13%)	Non-response	1			
Number of goats1 (0, 2)Number of sheep0 (0, 2)Number of chickens0 (0, 3)Early initiation of breastfeeding6 4 (66%)Within 1 h6 4 (66%)Within 2-3 h20 (21%)More than 24 h3 (13 (13%)Non-response9Colostrum feeding100 (05%)Non-response1Prelacteal feeding6 (66%)Non-response8Non-response8Non-response8Prelacteal feeding6 (66%)Non-response9Unimproved7 (7.5%)Indirect Protocol3 (11.1%)Safely managed11Safely managed11 (1.1%)Non-response3 (1.1%)Non-response3 (1.1%)Safely managed13 (1.1%)Non-response13 (1.1%)Non-response13 (1.1%)Safely managed13 (1.1%)Non-response13 (1.1%)Non-response13 (1.1%)Safely managed13 (1.1%)Non-response13 (1.1%)Non-response <td></td> <td>0.62 (0.20, 1.40)</td>		0.62 (0.20, 1.40)			
Number of sheep0 (0.2)Number of chickens0 (0.3)Early initiation of breastfeeding64 (66%)Within 1 h64 (66%)Within 2-3 h20 (21%)More than 24 h3 (13%)Non-response9Colostrum feeding100 (95%)Non-response66 (67%)Non-response8Age at complementary feeding66 (67%)Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7 (7.5%)Imited7 (7.5%)Safely managed11 (11%)Non-response3 (11.1%)Non-response3 (11.1%)	Number of cattle	0 (0, 1)			
Number of sheep0 (0.2)Number of chickens0 (0.3)Early initiation of breastfeeding64 (66%)Within 1 h64 (66%)Within 2-3 h20 (21%)More than 24 h3 (13%)Non-response9Colostrum feeding100 (95%)Non-response66 (67%)Non-response8Age at complementary feeding66 (67%)Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7 (7.5%)Imited7 (7.5%)Safely managed11 (11%)Non-response3 (11.1%)Non-response3 (11.1%)	Number of goats	1 (0, 2)			
Early initiation of breastfeeding     Within 1 h   64 (66%)     Within 2-3 h   0 (21%)     More than 24 h   0 (21%)     More than 24 h   1 (13%)     Non-response   9     Colostrum feeding   000 (95%)     Non-response   1     Prelacteal feeding   66 (67%)     Non-response   8     Age at complementary feeding   194 (165, 215)     Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program   7 (7.5%)     Limited   34 (37%)     Basic   51 (55%)     Safely managed   11.1%)     Non-response   13		0 (0, 2)			
Within 1 h64 (66%)Within 2-3 h20 (21%)More than 24 h30 (31%)Non-response9Colostrum feeding100 (95%)Non-response66 (67%)Non-response66 (67%)Non-response8Age at complementary feeding314 (165, 215)Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7 (7.5%)Limited34 (37%)Indire 251 (55%)Safely managed1 (1.1%)Non-response31	Number of chickens	0 (0, 3)			
Within 2-3 h     Description       More than 24 h     20 (21%)       More than 24 h     31 (13%)       Non-response     9       Colostrum feeding     100 (95%)       Non-response     100 (95%)       Non-response     66 (67%)       Non-response     66 (67%)       Non-response     8       Age at complementary feeding     0194 (165, 215)       Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program     7 (7.5%)       Limited     34 (37%)       Safely managed     31 (1.1%)       Non-response     31 (1.1%)	Early initiation of breastfeeding				
More than 24 h     In 13 (13%)       Non-response     9       Colostrum feeding     100 (95%)       Non-response     1       Prelacteal feeding     66 (67%)       Non-response     8       Age at complementary feeding     194 (165, 215)       Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program     7 (7.5%)       Limited     34 (37%)       Basic     51 (55%)       Safely managed     11.1%)       Non-response     13	Within 1 h	64 (66%)			
Non-response   9     Colostrum feeding   100 (95%)     Non-response   1     Prelacteal feeding   66 (67%)     Non-response   8     Age at complementary feeding   0194 (165, 215)     Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program   7 (7.5%)     Limited   34 (37%)     Basic   51 (55%)     Safely managed   11 (1.1%)     Non-response   13	Within 2–3 h	20 (21%)			
Colostrum feeding   100 (95%)     Non-response   1     Prelacteal feeding   66 (67%)     Non-response   8     Age at complementary feeding   0194 (165, 215)     Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program   7 (7.5%)     Limited   34 (37%)     Safely managed   51 (55%)     Non-response   13     Safely managed of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program   13	More than 24 h	13 (13%)			
Non-response1Prelacteal feeding66 (67%)Non-response8Age at complementary feeding194 (165, 215)Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7 (7.5%)Linited34 (37%)Basic51 (55%)Safely managed11 (1.1%)Non-response13	Non-response	9			
Prelacteal feeding   66 (67%)     Non-response   8     Age at complementary feeding   194 (165, 215)     Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program   7 (7.5%)     Linnited   34 (37%)     Basic   51 (55%)     Safely managed   1 (1.1%)     Non-response   13	Colostrum feeding	100 (95%)			
Non-response8Age at complementary feeding194 (165, 215)Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7 (7.5%)Luninproved7 (7.5%)Limited34 (37%)Basic51 (55%)Safely managed1 (1.1%)Non-response13	Non-response	1			
Age at complementary feeding   194 (165, 215)     Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program   7 (7.5%)     Linnited   34 (37%)     Basic   51 (55%)     Safely managed   11 (1.1%)     Non-response   13	Prelacteal feeding	66 (67%)			
Age at complementary feeding194 (165, 215)Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program7 (7.5%)Unimproved7 (7.5%)Limited34 (37%)Basic51 (55%)Safely managed1 (1.1%)Non-response33Sanitation ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program					
Drinking water ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program     Unimproved   7 (7.5%)     Limited   34 (37%)     Basic   51 (55%)     Safely managed   1 (1.1%)     Non-response   13		194 (165, 215)			
Limited 34 (37%)   Basic 51 (55%)   Safely managed 1 (1.1%)   Non-response 13					
Limited 34 (37%)   Basic 51 (55%)   Safely managed 1 (1.1%)   Non-response 13	Unimproved	7 (7.5%)			
Safely managed 1 (1.1%)   Non-response 13   Sanitation ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program 13					
Non-response 13   Sanitation ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program 13	Basic				
Non-response 13   Sanitation ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program 13	Safely managed				
Sanitation ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program		13			
	-				
		7 (7.5%)			

(Continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Variable	n (%) or median (first, third quartiles)			
Limited	34 (37%)			
Basic	51 (55%)			
Safely managed	1 (1.1%)			
Non-response	13			
Hygiene ladder of WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program				
Unimproved	72 (74%)			
Limited	5 (5.2%)			
Basic	20 (21%)			
Non-response	9			
Infant stool disposal				
Buried	15 (14%)			
Child used toilet/latrine	3 (2.8%)			
Left in the open	3 (2.8%)			
Put/rinsed into drain or ditch	37 (35%)			
Put/rinsed into toilet or latrine	14 (13%)			
Thrown into garbage	34 (32%)			
Mother using soap to wash hands	34 (32%)			
Mother handwashing before feeding an infant	88 (83%)			
Mother handwashing after fieldwork	86 (82%)			
Non-response	1			
Mother handwashing after cleaning infant post-defecation	80 (75%)			
Slaughter own animals	47 (44%)			
Chicken daytime location score				
Kept inside home and confined	2 (1.9%)			
Kept inside home and unconfined	43 (41%)			
No ownership or not kept inside home	61 (58%)			
Sheep nighttime location score				
Kept inside home and confined	45 (42%)			
Kept inside home and unconfined	2 (1.9%)			
No ownership or not kept inside home	59 (56%)			
Livestock droppings present in household/homestead	63 (59%)			

confounders) are summarized in Supplementary Table S1. Determinants with adjusted *p*-values <0.2 in the screening analyses were included in multivariable analyses. The final models for determinants of the outcomes of Campylobacter infection at different time scales is presented in Table 2. A lower average Campylobacter load over the follow-up period was significantly associated with mothers washing their hands with soap and a higher sheep nighttime risk score. In contrast, a higher chicken daytime risk score and not disposing of infant stool at a sanitation facility were associated with a higher Campylobacter load. In the first month after birth (day range: 7-39), an increasing Campylobacter load was strongly associated with prelacteal feeding and infant sex did not modify the effect for this association. The longitudinal model over age quartiles found that an increasing Campylobacter load was associated with complementary feeding, consumption of raw milk, and food insecurity.

Diarrhea and fever frequency were associated with a higher *Campylobacter* load, although the latter was not statistically significant after adjustment for confounders (Table 3).

#### Environmental enteric dysfunction

We found no significant associations between EED or individual indicators of gut function with *Campylobacter* load (Table 4).

An increased odds of EED was associated with increased infant age at sampling and mother's handwashing before infant feeding. A lower odds of EED were associated with an increasing number of sheep in the household, the mother washing her hands after the fieldwork, and being food secure (Table 5). A median level (0 < proportion < 0.15) of vitamin A supplementation increased the odds of EED compared to no supplementation at all (proportion = 0).



#### Length-for-age Z-score

Despite initial findings in a sex- and SES-adjusted linear-mixed model suggesting that the average *Campylobacter* load had a significant strong effect on increasing growth faltering (regression coefficient: 0.54, p < 0.001), this effect was no longer significant and had a drastic reduction in effect size after adjusting for age (regression coefficient: 0.01, p 0.897; Supplementary Table S1). There were no significant associations between the change in the LAZ score from baseline to endline and indicators of gut function (Table 6).

Variable screening results of the individual- and householdlevel determinants for the change in LAZ from baseline to endline (both with and without adjustment for confounders) are summarized in Supplementary Table S1. Determinants with adjusted p values <0.2 in the screening analyses were included in multivariable analyses. The final model for baseline determinants of LAZ is presented in Table 7. Change in LAZ was calculated as (first available LAZ – last available LAZ). Hence, positive regression coefficients indicate a *greater decrease* in LAZ and thus are associated with *poorer* nutrition outcomes. Longitudinally, a greater decrease in LAZ (poorer nutrition outcome) was associated with mothers' hand washing after cleaning infants' post-defecation and infants being female. In contrast, mothers having attended school, keeping chickens inside the household during the daytime (i.e., chicken daytime location risk score  $\geq 1$ ), and an infant being underweight at enrollment were associated with a smaller decrease in LAZ (better nutrition outcome). Longitudinally, a decrease in LAZ was associated with more household food insecurity (Table 7).



and red: stunted (LAZ < -2).

# Discussion

In this prospective birth cohort, infants experienced linear growth faltering during the first year of life. More than half of the infants were stunted (LAZ < -2) by endline (day range: 389–513), up from 3% in months 3 and 4 (day range: 79–121). More than half (56%; 95% CI: 46–0.65%) of infants had EED at the end of the longitudinal study, in which 25% (95% CI: 17–34%) had severe EED. More than 30% of infants were colonized with *Campylobacter* in the first month of life, and the prevalence increased continuously, reaching a plateau of nearly 90% between months 8 and 9 (26). Despite the high occurrence of *Campylobacter* infection, EED, and

stunting in this population, no association was found between *Campylobacter* load and EED, EED and stunting, or *Campylobacter* load and stunting.

Several determinants for *Campylobacter* load, EED, and LAZ were identified. The reported practice of soap use by mothers during handwashing was significantly associated with a lower *Campylobacter* load and the sheep nighttime location risk score, indicating that increased contact with sheep at night is associated with a lower *Campylobacter* load. Conversely, a higher chicken daytime location risk score and not disposing of infant stool at a sanitation facility, were both associated with an increased *Campylobacter* load. Prelacteal feeding contributed to an increase in *Campylobacter* load in the first





month of life. When longitudinal data were analyzed, risk factors associated with increased *Campylobacter* load included complementary feeding, consumption of raw milk, and food insecurity. Among time-varying determinants, a higher *Campylobacter* load was associated with more frequent concurrent diarrhea. Determinants for EED and LAZ were also identified. A greater probability of EED was associated with older infant age at the sampling, and mothers reporting handwashing prior to infant feeding. A lower probability of EED was associated with household food

security and the mother reporting handwashing after fieldwork. A larger decrease in LAZ of infants, a poorer health outcome, was associated with being female and the mother reporting handwashing after infant cleaning post-defecation. Mother having attended school, the infant being underweight at enrollment (age range: 4–27 days), and keeping chickens inside without confinement during daytime were associated with *less* decrease of LAZ, a better growth outcome. Among time-varying determinants, only food insecurity was associated with higher risks of linear growth faltering.

#### TABLE 2 Associations between Campylobacter load and determinants.

Outcome	Determinant	Regression coefficient [95% confidence interval (CI)]^	
		Screening analysis	Multivariable analysis
Campylobacter load in the	Baseline determinants		
first month of age	Prelacteal feeding	0.505 (0.067, 0.943)*^	0.505 (0.067, 0.943)*^
Average Campylobacter load	Baseline determinants		
during follow-up	Mother using soap to wash hands	-0.315 (-0.545, -0.086)*	-0.353 (-0.574, -0.133)*
	Sheep night time location risk score ( $\geq 1 \text{ vs. } 0)^{\#}$	-0.219 (-0.441, 0.003)	-0.292 (-0.502, -0.082)*
	Chicken daytime location risk score ( $\geq 1$ vs. 0) <sup>#</sup>	0.171 (-0.057, 0.398)	0.229 (0.016, 0.442)*
	Not disposing of infant stool at toilet/lavatory/ditch	0.211 (-0.011, 0.433)	0.219 (0.01, 0.427)*
Campylobacter load <sup>&amp;</sup>	Longitudinal determinants		
	HFIAS <sup>#</sup>	0.040 (0.019, 0.060)*	0.039 (0.019, 0.059)*
	Received complementary foods	0.393 (0.012, 0.774)*	0.518(0.142, 0.894)*
	Raw milk consumption	0.693 (0.206, 1.180)*	0.651(0.169, 1.132)*

 $^{B}$  Backward elimination suggested the final model was the single-exposure model.  $^{A}$  Adjusted for socioeconomic status at baseline and sex. #  $\geq$  1: household kept the livestock species inside the house confined or unconfined; 0: household did not have the livestock species or kept them outside the house. "HFIAS, household food insecurity access score. "The average Campylobacter load in an age quartile was regressed on each determinant's concurrent proportion/mean, adjusting for age quartile, sex, and socioeconomic status at baseline. Linear-mixed models with individual-level random intercepts were used for estimating the coefficients. \*p < 0.05.

#### TABLE 3 Associations between enteric disease symptoms and Campylobacter load.

	Determinant	Regression coefficient (95% confidence interval [CI]) ^	
Outcome		Unadjusted analysis	Adjusted analysis
Fever	Campylobacter load	0.034 (0.014, 0.054) *	0.025 (-0.002, 0.052)
Diarrhea		0.040 (0.018, 0.062) *	0.041 (0.012, 0.071) *

<sup>^</sup>Using a linear mixed model with individual-level random intercept, the proportion of each symptom's occurrence was regressed as the outcome on the concurrent average Campylobacter load using crude and adjusted models (adjusting for age quartile, sex, and socioeconomic status at baseline). \**p* < 0.05.

#### TABLE 4 Associations between gut function indicators and Campylobacter load.

Outcome	Determinant	Unadjusted odds ratio [95% confidence interval (CI)]	Adjusted odds ratio (95% Cl)^
Environmental enteric dysfunction	Campylobacter load	1.136 (0.572, 2.257)	1.127 (0.557, 2.283)
Fecal myeloperoxidase		0.802 (0.404, 1.593)	0.736 (0.355, 1.527)
Lactulose percentage		0.649 (0.326, 1.291)	0.635 (0.315, 1.282)

^Adjusted for sex and socioeconomic status (indicated by a binary variable of household asset) at baseline, and age at EED sampling.

Similar to the MAL-ED study (55), we observed a sharp increase in *Campylobacter* prevalence in the first year of life; however, nearly all infants were colonized with *Campylobacter* by month 13, which was higher than the prevalence rates observed at that time across MAL-ED sites. Such prevalence increase may be driven by a high force of infection (FOI) of and/or a weakened clearance against *Campylobacter* (40). The observed difference between studies may also be due to the difference in sensitivity and specificity of assays used for testing *Campylobacter*. Thus, caution should be taken when attempting to compare pertinent results (e.g., prevalence) between studies. A high FOI is determined by frequent environmental exposures, as observed in our setting. Stunting-associated immunosuppressive effects might weaken clearance capacity. This also implies at least the potential for reverse causality (namely, stunting increases infection) as depicted in the "vicious cycles of diseases of poverty" (41). Our findings reveal that food insecurity was associated with both higher *Campylobacter* load and growth faltering which is in line with the role that this determinant plays as an underlying cause in the modified UNICEF framework for undernutrition (9). The significant contribution of raw milk consumption to increasing *Campylobacter* load is consistent with findings from our formative research, where we found a significant association between animal-sourced foods consumption (primarily consisting of raw milk) and increasing *Campylobacter* detection in young children (9). Our results indicate that complementary feeding may be a source of enteric infection by *Campylobacter*. The risk of complementary feeding may be reduced by optimizing or improving existing handwashing behaviors (such as the mother's handwashing with soap), as handwashing (particularly with soap) has been associated with the reduction of microbial contamination in complementary foods (42).

#### TABLE 5 Associations between environmental enteric dysfunction and determinants.

Outcome	Determinant	Odds ratio (95% Cl) <sup>^</sup>		
		Screening analysis	Multivariate analysis	
EED	Baseline determinants	Baseline determinants		
	Number of sheep (per head)	0.81 (0.626, 1.049)	0.715 (0.532, 0.960)*	
	Mother handwashing before feeding infant	3.313 (0.998, 10.994)	5.963 (1.24, 28.669)*	
	Mother handwashing after fieldwork	0.284 (0.082, 0.983)	0.179 (0.037, 0.858)*	
	Achieved MDD*	5.441 (0.929, 31.856)	10.904 (0.890, 133.569)	
	Longitudinal determinants <sup>§</sup>	Longitudinal determinants <sup>s</sup>		
	Proportion of Vitamin A supplementation <sup>^</sup>			
	≥0.15	2.161 (0.460, 10.158)	0.52 (0.067, 4.035)	
	>0 and < 0.15	3.815 (1.378, 10.563)*	5.62 (1.529, 20.651)*	
	Proportion being food secure	0.192 (0.027, 1.371)	0.028 (0.002, 0.502)*	
	Age (days) when an EED sample was taken*	1.005 (0.993, 1.018)	1.024 (1.005, 1.043)*	

\*EED, environmental enteric dysfunction; MDD, minimum dietary diversity; CI, confidence interval. <sup>8</sup>We regressed EED on the overall proportion of each individual for longitudinal determinants (i.e., achieved MDD, proportion of vitamin A supplementation, proportion being food secure). ^For multivariable analysis, we used likelihood-ratio test (LRT) to select the final model and reported Wald-typed 95% CIs. Note that "Achieved MDD" had a p-value of 0.049 by LRT in the final model. ^We categorized the proportion into three categories,  $\geq 0.15$ ; >0 and < 0.15; and = 0 (for the reference group) to strengthen the robustness of 95% CI of this variable. \*p < 0.05.

TABLE 6 Associations between change in LAZ from baseline to endline, Campylobacter load, and gut function indicators.

Outcome	Determinant	Unadjusted coefficient (95% confidence interval [CI])	Adjusted coefficient (95% Cl)^
Change in LAZ	Average Campylobacter load over the whole follow-up period	0.194 (-0.132, 0.520)	0.165 (-0.159, 0.489)
	Fecal myeloperoxidase	0.211 (-0.179, 0.601)	0.135 (-0.275, 0.546)
	Lactulose percentage	0.266 (-0.117, 0.649)	0.263 (-0.124, 0.650)
	Environmental enteric dysfunction	0.322 (-0.069, 0.713)	0.281 (-0.117, 0.678)

^Adjusted for sex and socioeconomic status (indicated by a binary variable of household asset) at baseline, and age at EED sampling.

#### TABLE 7 Associations between household determinants and decrease in LAZ.

Outcome	Determinant	Regression coefficient (95%, confidence interval (CI)) ^		
		Screening analysis	Multivariable analysis	
Decrease in LAZ <sup>&amp;</sup>	Baseline determinants			
	Mother having attended school	-0.317 (-0.755, 0.121)	-0.802 (-1.284, -0.319)*	
	Mothers' handwashing after cleaning infants, post-defecation®	0.596 (-0.067, 1.260)	1.042 (0.396, 1.688)*	
	Infant being female	0.147 (-0.228,0 0.521)	0.72 (0.239, 1.202)*	
	Chicken daytime location risk score $(\geq 1 \text{ vs. } 0)^{\text{#}}$	-0.413 (-0.796, -0.031)*	-0.61 (-1.036, -0.184)*	
	Underweight at enrollment	-0.573 (-1.159, 0.013)	-0.856 (-1.540, -0.172)*	
	Longitudinal determinant			
	HFIAS <sup>#,&amp;</sup>	0.061 (0.028, 0.093)*^	0.061 (0.028, 0.093)**	

<sup>^</sup>Adjusted for socioeconomic status at baseline and sex when assessing baseline determinants; in addition to these confounders, the age group at each LAZ visit was adjusted when assessing longitudinal determinants. <sup>@</sup>Compared to not handwashing after cleaning infants, post-defecation. <sup>\*</sup> > 1: household kept the livestock species inside the house confined or unconfined; 0: household did not have the livestock species or kept them outside the house. <sup>§</sup>HFIAS, household food insecurity access score; LAZ, length-for-age Z-score. <sup>§</sup>Backward elimination suggested the final model was the screening model. <sup>\*</sup>p < 0.05.

Being in proximity to sheep at night was found to be associated with lower *Campylobacter* load, whereas proximity to chicken throughout the day was found to be associated with higher *Campylobacter* load. These contradictory results for risks associated with animals suggest the relationships between animal ownership and *Campylobacter* colonization are highly complex and may be confounded by the lack of adjustment for *Campylobacter* specieslevel infection. We are undertaking an MLST-based attribution study that aims to tease out the relationships between livestock and *Campylobacter* infection at the species level. The practice of prelacteal feeding is common in LMICs despite its potential risks (43). A 2018 meta-analysis suggested the prevalence of this practice in Ethiopia was around 25% (44). A more recent study of children under 2 years conducted near our study area suggested that nearly half of the population received a prelacteal feeding (a cultural practice in the region), which was associated with a lack of knowledge about the risks related to the practice (45). In comparison, the prevalence of prelacteal feeding was even higher in our cohort (67%). Given that the practice is the sole significant feeding practice associated with an increased *Campylobacter* load in the first month of life, and this was independent of sex, future research may be needed to better understand what drives the practice, the cultural meanings assigned to the practice, and possible interventions to strengthen mothers' knowledge of its risks.

Comparing the common putative determinants in this study with our cross-sectional study (24), most of them were qualitatively similar. However, overall, we observed fewer livestock holdings in the longitudinal study, which may be related to the timing of our studies. The cross-sectional work was conducted in 2018, while the data presented here were collected after the onsets of both the COVID-19 pandemic and the civil war in Tigray, Ethiopia. Both disruptions and their consequential instability were likely to have caused financial distress, which may have triggered the selling of livestock for income.

The prevalence of child EED in our study population (56%) was similar to findings from the formative research (50, 95% CI: 40–60%), severe EED was higher (25%) but not significantly different from the formative research (17, 95% CI: 11–26%) (24). The lower odds of EED found to be associated with food security and mothers' handwashing after fieldwork both align and are consistent with broader understandings of EED and its relationship to hygiene and sanitation and other socioeconomic factors (12). The increased odds of EED being associated with mother's handwashing before feeding the infant and supplementation of vitamin A are additional counterintuitive findings that merit exploration but could also reflect residual confounding.

Despite having a lower prevalence of stunting at the first visit around 3–4 months old, the trend of LAZ in the study population is similar to that which was observed in Haydom, Tanzania (TZH) in the MAL-ED study (46), which was also rural and comprised of smallholder households who relied heavily on corn production as a cash crop (47). Our study population engaged in khat production, another cash crop, as their primary livelihood, the implications of which have been explored elsewhere, with no significant impact on infant nutrition having emerged (48, 49). However, the comparability of the LAZ trends between our site and TZH may reflect a typical trajectory of infant nutrition in rural smallholder households where cash crop agriculture dominates (50).

Previously published literature using enrollment weight (collected  $\leq$ 17 days of birth) as a surrogate measure for birth weight, found lower weight-for-age at this time increased the odds of being stunted (46). In contrast, being underweight within 27 days of birth in our cohort was associated with *less* growth faltering. This finding might suggest more attentive care or feeding practices of infants with visible clinical signs of being underweight, resulting in some catch-up

growth. Contrary to much literature that finds being male to be a risk factor for stunting (51), female infants had more growth faltering in our setting. Existing literature indicates that any effect of biological sex on linear growth may be modified by its complex interactions with social factors (51). Our study was conducted in a traditional, rural population of Sunni Muslims, where gender norms in society may be favorable for males (52), including infants. Given increasing evidence surrounding the importance of gender inequality as a predictor of child stunting, cultural norms may explain the increased risk of growth faltering among girls (53). A similar finding was observed in Bangladesh, a Muslim-majority country, where female children had lower LAZ (54). The associations between linear growth faltering and the determinants of chicken daytime risk score and the mother reporting handwashing following cleaning an infant after defecation, in opposite directions, are counterintuitive. The following hypothesized scenarios could explain these counterintuitive associations: First, more chickens might indicate higher access to a protein source or more female-controlled revenue, which might outweigh the risk for infant growth. There is increasing evidence that in this study setting women's empowerment is strongly associated with infant growth outcomes (48, 49). Second, mothers who report handwashing after cleaning infants post-defecation may be more likely to clean their own infants as opposed to having an older child or another person in the house clean the infant; or mother's hands could be re-contaminated in between the handwashing after cleaning the infant and other infant care practices, thereby exposing the infant to Campylobacter and increased growth faltering. Importantly, a large body of evidence supports the understanding that infant growth, and stunting in particular, is multicausal. Given the small sample size of this analysis, complex models with numerous interacting determinants are not possible. Thus, some of these associations may be spurious. Scenarios like those presented above could not be tested in this study through available instruments. However, additional investigations using parallel observational data collected from structured behavioral observations from the same population (see forthcoming literature from the Exposure Assessment of Campylobacter Infections in Rural Ethiopia [EXCAM] study https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.21.243123 92) aim to better understand some of the counterintuitive findings.

Built on the formative research, the data from this longitudinal study offers a more thorough understanding of the sociodemographic and exposure landscapes in the Haramaya woreda and similar smallholder settings. The repeated-measures short survey enabled our research team to study the health outcomes at different time scales and allowed a more accurate characterization of the timings related to Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF).

This study has limitations. This study was powered for prevalence estimation of the *Campylobacter* genus (25), limiting our ability to evaluate statistical significance in the regression analyses such as the key association between *Campylobacter* infection and growth faltering. This was further constrained by an increased level of missing data due at least in part to our fieldwork being disrupted by the global pandemic and civil unrest (25). Despite the adjustment for common confounders (sex, age, and SES) in the regression analyses, as previously mentioned, potential residual confounding, a common problem in survey-based observational studies, could bias the associations of interest. In addition, common survey biases might exist in the survey data. For example, recall bias could exist in the monthly complementary feeding status; and responses to questions about soap use, in our setting where soap use was rare, could be subject to social desirability bias. With a relatively small study population size, the screening of a large set of variables in regression analyses may be subject to type I errors from multiple comparisons. Since the definition of EED was solely based on %L and MPO, it might not suggest the impairments of other gut functions (e.g., translocation, intestinal barrier function).

In summary, this study uncovered an increasing Campylobacter load in the first year of life, a high prevalence of EED by 12-13 months of age, and a concurrent increasing level of growth faltering, none of which were significantly associated with the other, but all three of which were associated with food insecurity. Despite a growing consideration of exposure to livestock feces in both this research and current interventions to improve child growth (22), our findings around livestock risk factors were inconclusive. We found that even though livestock may be the reservoir of Campylobacter infections in infants, these relationships are highly complex and most determinants of the infection in this study were more proximal to the infant, i.e., related to improper IYCF practices and WaSH in our setting. This signifies a need to strengthen both IYCF practices and infant food safety and hygiene to reduce (cross-) contamination at the point of exposure and, ultimately, reduce the risk of infection and improve linear growth. Future research should aim to replicate findings in diverse populations to assess the generalizability of results and identify context-specific factors influencing Campylobacter transmission and health outcomes.

# **CAGED** Research Team

This study is a result of the CAGED Research Team. Beyond those named authors, other CAGED Research Team members include Cyrus Saleem, Efrah Ali Yusuf, Getnet Yimer, Kunuza Adem Umer, Karah Mechlowitz, Mawardi M. Dawid, Mahammad Mahammad Usmail, Wondwossen A. Gebreyes, Yenenesh Demisie Weldesenbet, Zelalem Hailu Mekuria.

### Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

### **Ethics statement**

The studies involving humans were approved by the University of Florida Internal Review Board (IRB201903141); the Haramaya University Institutional Health Research Ethics Committee (COHMS/1010/3796/20) and the Ethiopia National Research Ethics Review Committee (SM/14.1/1059/20). Written informed consent was obtained from all participating households (husband and wife), with mothers consenting to infant participation, using forms in the local language (Afan Oromo). The studies were conducted in accordance with the local legislation and institutional requirements.

# Author contributions

DC: Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Writing - original draft. SM: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Validation, Writing - original draft. YY: Formal analysis, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing - original draft. IU: Writing review & editing, Investigation, Project administration. IA: Data curation, Project administration, Writing - review & editing. JA: Investigation, Writing - review & editing. AI: Investigation, Resources, Writing - review & editing. AS: Investigation, Writing review & editing. NuS: Investigation, Writing - review & editing. AO: Conceptualization, Data curation, Project administration, Resources, Writing - review & editing. BH: Conceptualization, Data curation, Writing - review & editing. LD: Conceptualization, Data curation, Project administration, Resources, Writing - review & editing. BA: Investigation, Writing - review & editing. KH: Investigation, Writing - review & editing. MB: Investigation, Writing - review & editing. XL: Formal analysis, Writing - review & editing. NiS: Data curation, Writing - review & editing. KR: Investigation, Writing - review & editing. NF: Methodology, Writing - review & editing. GR: Methodology, Writing - review & editing. MM: Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Writing - review & editing. JH: Conceptualization, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Writing - review & editing. AH: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing - original draft.

# Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This project is funded by the United States Agency for International Development Bureau for Food Security under Agreement #AID-OAA-L-15-00003 as part of Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Livestock Systems, and by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation OPP#1175487. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed here are those of the authors alone.

# Acknowledgments

This study would not have been possible without the cooperation of study communities and local administration of the study kebeles. We would like to thank the study participants, their households, the Community Advisory Board, and all who supported the study directly or otherwise. We thank Sridevi Devaraj PhD at Texas Children's Hospital and Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX for analysis of lactulose in urine. Research reported in this publication was supported by the University of Florida Clinical and Translational Science Institute, which was partly supported by the NIH National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences under award number UL1TR001427. The content is solely the authors' responsibility and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

# Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

### Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations,

### References

 United Nations Children's Fund, World Health Organization, International bank for reconstruction and development/the World Bank. Levels and trends in child malnutrition: UNICEF/WHO/World Bank Group joint child malnutrition estimates: Key findings of the 2023. New York: UNICEF and WHO (2023). Available at: https://www.who.int/ publications-detail-redirect/9789240073791.

2. Olofin I, McDonald CM, Ezzati M, Flaxman S, Black RE, Fawzi WW, et al. Associations of suboptimal growth with all-cause and cause-specific mortality in children under five years: a pooled analysis of ten prospective studies. *PLoS One.* (2013) 8:e64636. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0064636

3. MAL-ED Network Investigators. Early childhood cognitive development is affected by interactions among illness, diet, enteropathogens and the home environment: findings from the MAL-ED birth cohort study. *BMJ Glob Health*. (2018) 3:e000752. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000752

4. Alderman H. The economic cost of a poor start to life. *J Dev Orig Health Dis.* (2010) 1:19–25. doi: 10.1017/S2040174409990158

5. Herthford A, Harris J. Improving nutrition through agriculture. Understanding and applying primary pathways and principles. Arlington, VA: USAID/Strengthening Partnerships, Results, and Innovations in Nutrition Globally (SPRING) Project, p. 16. (2014). Available at: https://www.spring-nutrition.org/sites/default/files/publications/ briefs/spring\_understandingpathways\_brief\_1\_0.pdf.

6. Headey D, Hirvonen K, Hoddinott J. Animal sourced foods and child stunting. *Am J Agric Econ.* (2018) 100:1302–19. doi: 10.1093/ajae/aay053

7. Enahoro DK, Tran N, Chan CY, Komarek AM, Rich KM. *The future of animal-source food demand and supply in Africa*. SocArXiv. (2021). Available at: https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/116954. (Accessed Nov 29, 2023).

8. Management Entity. *Ethiopia's livestock systems: Overview and areas of inquiry.* Gainesville. FL, USA: Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Livestock Systems. (2021). Available at: https://livestocklab.ifas.ufl.edu/media/livestocklabifasufledu/pdf-/LSIL\_ Livestock\_Systems\_Overview\_Ethiopia\_2021\_08.pdf.

9. Chen D, Mechlowitz K, Li X, Havelaar AH, SL MK. Benefits and risks of smallholder livestock production on child nutrition in low- and middle-income countries. *Front Nutr.* (2021) 8:836. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2021.751686

10. Rogawski ET, Liu J, Platts-Mills JA, Kabir F, Lertsethtakarn P, Siguas M, et al. Use of quantitative molecular diagnostic methods to investigate the effect of enteropathogen infections on linear growth in children in low-resource settings: longitudinal analysis of results from the MAL-ED cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health*. (2018) 6:e1319–28. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30351-6

11. Weisz A, Meuli G, Thakwalakwa C, Trehan I, Maleta K, Manary M. The duration of diarrhea and fever is associated with growth faltering in rural Malawian children aged 6-18 months. *Nutr J.* (2011) 10:25. doi: 10.1186/1475-2891-10-25

12. Budge S, Parker AH, Hutchings PT, Garbutt C. Environmental enteric dysfunction and child stunting. *Nutr Rev.* (2019) 77:240–53. doi: 10.1093/nutrit/nuy068

13. Owino V, Ahmed T, Freemark M, Kelly P, Loy A, Manary M, et al. Environmental enteric dysfunction and growth failure/stunting in global child health. *Pediatrics*. (2016) 138:e20160641. doi: 10.1542/peds.2016-0641

14. De MMB, Da SGAP. Environmental enteric dysfunction and growth. *J Pediatr*. (2019) 95:85–94. doi: 10.1016/j.jped.2018.11.004

15. Harper KM, Mutasa M, Prendergast AJ, Humphrey J, Manges AR. Environmental enteric dysfunction pathways and child stunting: a systematic review. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* (2018) 12:e0006205. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006205

16. Hodges P, Tembo M, Kelly P. Intestinal biopsies for the evaluation of environmental enteropathy and environmental enteric dysfunction. *J Infect Dis.* (2021) 224:S856–63. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiab372

17. Rogawski ET, Guerrant RL. The burden of enteropathy and "subclinical" infections. Pediatr Clin N Am. (2017) 64:815–36. doi: 10.1016/j.pcl.2017.03.003 or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

### Supplementary material

The Supplementary material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1467462/ full#supplementary-material

 Mutasa K, Ntozini R, Mbuya MN, Rukobo S, Govha M, Majo FD, et al. Biomarkers of environmental enteric dysfunction are not consistently associated with linear growth velocity in rural Zimbabwean infants. *Am J Clin Nutr.* (2021) 113:1185–98. doi: 10.1093/ ajcn/nqa416

19. Vonaesch P, Winkel M, Kapel N, Nestoret A, Barbot-Trystram L, Pontoizeau C, et al. Putative biomarkers of environmental enteric disease fail to correlate in a crosssectional study in two study sites in sub-Saharan Africa. *Nutrients*. (2022) 14:3312. doi: 10.3390/nu14163312

20. Pickering AJ, Null C, Winch PJ, Mangwadu G, Arnold BF, Prendergast AJ, et al. The WASH benefits and SHINE trials: interpretation of WASH intervention effects on linear growth and diarrhoea. *Lancet Glob Health*. (2019) 7:e1139–46. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30268-2

21. Prendergast AJ, Gharpure R, Mor S, Viney M, Dube K, Lello J, et al. Putting the "a" into WaSH: a call for integrated management of water, animals, sanitation, and hygiene. *Lancet Planetary Health*. (2019) 3:e336–7. doi: 10.1016/S2542-5196(19)30129-9

22. Gharpure R, Mor SM, Viney M, Hodobo T, Lello J, Siwila J, et al. A one health approach to child stunting: evidence and research agenda. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* (2021) 104:1620–4. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-1129

23. Terefe Y, Deblais L, Ghanem M, Helmy YA, Mummed B, Chen D, et al. Cooccurrence of *Campylobacter* species in children from eastern Ethiopia, and their association with environmental enteric dysfunction, diarrhea, and host microbiome. *Front Public Health*. (2020) 8:99. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00099

24. Chen D, Mckune SL, Singh N, Hassen JY, Gebreyes W, Manary M, et al. *Campylobacter* colonization, environmental enteric dysfunction, stunting, and associated risk factors among young children in rural Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study from the *Campylobacter* genomics and environmental enteric dysfunction (CAGED) project. *Front Public Health.* (2020) 8:1043. doi: 10.3389/fpubl.2020.615793

25. Havelaar AH, Brhane M, Ahmed IA, Kedir J, Chen D, Deblais L, et al. Unravelling the reservoirs for colonisation of infants with *Campylobacter* spp. in rural Ethiopia: protocol for a longitudinal study during a global pandemic and political tensions. *BMJ Open.* (2022) 12:e061311. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-061311

26. Deblais L, Ojeda A, Brhane M, Mummed B, Hassen KA, Ahmedo BU, et al. Prevalence and load of the *Campylobacter* genus in infants and associated household contacts in rural eastern Ethiopia: a longitudinal study from the *Campylobacter* genomics and environmental enteric dysfunction (CAGED) project. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* (2023) 89:e00424–3. doi: 10.1128/aem.00424-23

27. Johnson TS, Engstrom JL. State of the science in measurement of infant size at birth. *Newborn Infant Nurs Rev.* (2002) 2:150–8. doi: 10.1053/nbin.2002.35122

28. Bian X, Garber JM, Cooper KK, Huynh S, Jones J, Mills MK, et al. *Campylobacter* abundance in breastfed infants and identification of a new species in the global Enterics multicenter study. *mSphere*. (2020) 5:e00735–19. doi: 10.1128/mSphere.00735-19

29. Platts-Mills JA, Liu J, Gratz J, Mduma E, Amour C, Swai N, et al. Detection of *Campylobacter* in stool and determination of significance by culture, enzyme immunoassay, and PCR in developing countries. *J Clin Microbiol.* (2014) 52:1074–80. doi: 10.1128/JCM.02935-13

30. Data4Diets. *INDDEX Project*. (2023). Available at: https://inddex.nutrition.tufts. edu/data4diets (Accessed Nov 29, 2023).

31. Coates J, Swindale A, Bilinsky P. Household food insecurity access scale (HFIAS) for measurement of food access: Indicator guide: Version 3: (576842013–001). (2007).

32. World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund. WASH in the 2030 agenda - new global indicators for drinking water, sanitation and hygiene. Geneva, Switzeralnd: World Health Organization (2017).

33. Jahnke HE. Livestock production systems and livestock development in tropical Africa. Kielr Wissenschaftsverlag Vauk, pp. 188–190. (1982) Available at: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0308521X8390080X.

34. Schumacher D. Computation of the WHO child growth standards [R package anthro version 1.0.1]. Comprehensive R archive network (CRAN (2023). Available at: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=anthro (Accessed Nov 29, 2023).

35. Vandemoortele M. Measuring household wealth with latent trait modelling: an application to Malawian DHS data. Soc Indic Res. (2014) 118:877–91. doi: 10.1007/s11205-013-0447-z

36. Rizopoulos D. Ltm: an R package for latent variable modeling and item response analysis. J Stat Softw. (2007) 17:1–25. doi: 10.18637/jss.v017.i05

37. World Health Organization. United Nations Children's fund (UNICEF). Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices: Definitions and measurement methods. Geneva: World Health Organization (2021). Available at: https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240018389.

38. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. J Stat Softw. (2015) 67:1-48. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01

39. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing (2023).

40. Chen D, Havelaar AH, Platts-Mills JA, Yang Y. Acquisition and clearance dynamics of *Campylobacter* spp. in children in low- and middle-income countries. *Epidemics*. (2024) 46:100749. doi: 10.1016/j.epidem.2024.100749

41. Guerrant RL, DeBoer MD, Moore SR, Scharf RJ, Lima AAM. The impoverished gut—a triple burden of diarrhoea, stunting and chronic disease. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol.* (2013) 10:220–9. doi: 10.1038/nrgastro.2012.239

42. Müller-Hauser AA, Sobhan S, Huda TMN, Waid JL, Wendt AS, Islam MA, et al. Key food hygiene behaviors to reduce microbial contamination of complementary foods in rural Bangladesh. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* (2022) 107:709–19. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.21-0269

43. Oakley L, Benova L, Macleod D, Lynch CA, Campbell OMR. Early breastfeeding practices: descriptive analysis of recent demographic and health surveys. *Matern Child Nutr.* (2018) 14:e12535. doi: 10.1111/mcn.12535

44. Temesgen H, Negesse A, Woyraw W, Getaneh T, Yigizaw M. Prelacteal feeding and associated factors in Ethiopia: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int Breastfeed J.* (2018) 13:49. doi: 10.1186/s13006-018-0193-6

45. Adem A, Assefa N, Deresa M, Yuya M, Ayana GM, Negash B, et al. Prelacteal feeding practices and its associated factors among mother of children less than 2 years

of age in Kersa District, eastern Ethiopia. *Glob Pediatr Health.* (2021) 8:2333794X211018321. doi: 10.1177/2333794X211018321

46. MAL-ED Network Investigators. Childhood stunting in relation to the pre- and postnatal environment during the first 2 years of life: the MAL-ED longitudinal birth cohort study. *PLoS Med.* (2017) 14:2408. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002408

47. Mduma ER, Gratz J, Patil C, Matson K, Dakay M, Liu S, et al. The etiology, risk factors, and interactions of enteric infections and malnutrition and the consequences for child health and development study (MAL-ED): description of the Tanzanian site. *Clin Infect Dis.* (2014) 59:S325–30. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciu439

48. Mechlowitz K, Singh N, Li X, Chen D, Yang Y, Rabil A, et al. Women's empowerment and child nutrition in a context of shifting livelihoods in eastern Oromia. *Ethiopia Front Nutr.* (2023) 10:1048532. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2023.1048532

49. Mechlowitz K, Singh N, Li X, Chen D, Yang Y, Ahmed IA, et al. Examining the role of women's engagement in khat production on child nutritional outcomes using longitudinal data in East Oromia, Ethiopia [internet]. *medRxiv*. (2024) 2024:5073. doi: 10.1101/2024.04.05.24305073v1

50. Herthford A, Harris J. Improving nutrition through agriculture. Understanding and applying primary pathways and principles. Brief# 1. Arlington, VA: USAID/ Strengthening Partnerships, Results, and Innovations in Nutrition Globally (SPRING) Project (2014).

51. Thurstans S, Opondo C, Seal A, Wells JC, Khara T, Dolan C, et al. Understanding sex differences in childhood undernutrition: a narrative review. *Nutrients.* (2022) 14:948. doi: 10.3390/nu14050948

52. Gouda M, Potrafke N. Gender equality in Muslim-majority countries. *Econ Syst.* (2016) 40:683–98. doi: 10.1016/j.ecosys.2016.04.002

53. Marphatia AA, Cole TJ, Grijalva-Eternod C, Wells JCK. Associations of gender inequality with child malnutrition and mortality across 96 countries. *Glob Health Epidemiol Genom.* (2016) 1:1–8. doi: 10.1017/gheg.2016.1

54. Abdulla F, Rahman A, Hossain MM. Prevalence and risk predictors of childhood stunting in Bangladesh. *PLoS One*. (2023) 18:e0279901. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0279901

55. Amour C, Gratz J, Mduma E, Svensen E, Rogawski ET, McGrath M, et al. Epidemiology and impact of campylobacter infection in children in 8 low-resource settings: results from the MAL-ED study. *Clin Infect Dis.* (2016) 63:1171–79. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciw542