Supplementary Material

Supplementary 1: STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of crosssectional studies

Supplementary 2: Spatial autocorrelation analyses for the 3 anthropometric outcomes (univariate and bivariate)

Pairwise correlation for anthropometric outcomes and bivariate spatial autocorrelation

We have performed additional supplementary analyses (suing GeoDa: Anselin L, Syabri I, Kho Y. GeoDa: an introduction to spatial data analysis. Geographical analysis. 2006 Jan;38(1):5-22) which assesses pairwise correlation/association between the 3 outcomes as well as bivariate Moran's I to assess if there was significant spatial autocorrelation between the outcomes. This analysis suggests that there is no significant association between stunting and thinness/wasting while there is weak positive but significant spatial autocorrelation between stunting and obesity prevalence as well as weak negative spatial correlation between thinness and obesity (please see detailed analyses below).

```
. spearman stunted svy thin svy
```
Number of $obs =$ 256
Spearman's rho = 0.0729 **Spearman's rho = 0.0729** Test of Ho: stunted_svy and thin_svy are independent
Prob > Itl = 0.2452 $Prob$ > $|t|$ = . gllamm stunted_svy thin_svy, i(id) number of level 1 units = 256 number of level 2 units = 52 Condition Number = 14.594452 gllamm model log likelihood = 283.93295 --- stunted_svy | Coef. Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval] -------------+--- **thin_svy | .0385636 .0726234 0.53 0.595 -.1037757 .1809028** _cons | .1082981 .0061531 17.60 0.000 .0962381 .120358 -- Variance at level 1 -- .00637033 (.00056306)

Variances and covariances of random effects --

 $***$ level 2 (id)

```
 var(1): 2.643e-24 (5.133e-14)
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```


I: -0.0372 E[I]: -0.0196 mean: 0.0007 sd: 0.0690 z-value: -0.5492

```
. spearman stunted_svy obese_svy
Number of obs = 256<br>Spearman's rho = 0.2051
Spearman's rho = 0.2051
Test of Ho: stunted_svy and obese_svy are independent
 Prob > |t| = 0.0010
. gllamm stunted_svy obese_svy , i(id)
number of level 1 units = 256
number of level 2 units = 52
Condition Number = 10.565877
gllamm model 
log likelihood = 292.58012
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
stunted svy | Coef. Std. Err. z P>|z| [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
```


. spearman thin_svy obese_svy

Number of $obs =$ 256
Spearman's rho = -0.1424 Spearman's rho =

Test of Ho: thin_svy and obese_svy are independent

 $Prob > |t| = 0.0227$

. gllamm thin_svy obese_svy , i(id)

number of level 1 units = 256 number of level 2 units = 52

Condition Number = 10.976401

gllamm model

log likelihood = 324.36079

--

Variance at level 1

--

.00447574 (.00044278)

Variances and covariances of random effects

--

***level 2 (id)

var(1): .00018259 (.00023176)

--

permutations: 99999 pseudo p-value: 0.020230

I: -0.1441 E[I]: -0.0196 mean: 0.0057 sd: 0.0710 z-value: -2.1119

With regards to the shared temporal effect this we think can be retained as all 3 outcomes appear to have a negative coefficient associated with increasing panel or wave.

```
. gllamm stunted_svy year , i(id)
```
number of level 1 units = 256 number of level 2 units = 52 Condition Number = 31.724715

gllamm model

log likelihood = 293.64743

--

--

--

Variance at level 1

.00590475 (.00052191)

Variances and covariances of random effects --

***level 2 (id)

var(1): 8.887e-19 (4.854e-11)

. gllamm thin_svy year , i(id)

number of level 1 units = 256 number of level 2 units = 52

Condition Number = 37.175479

gllamm model

log likelihood = 327.11892

Univariate spatial autocorrelation

Based on the univariate Moran's I statistics for each anthropometric outcome there appeared to be significant spatial heterogeneity present for all 3 outcomes.

permutations: 99999 pseudo p-value: 0.000020

I: 0.4027 E[I]: -0.0196 mean: -0.0202 sd: 0.0923 z-value: 4.5834

l: 0.5600 E[I]: -0.0196 mean: -0.0198 sd: 0.0918 z-value: 6.3149

Supplementary 3: Win BUGS code for Bayesian space-time binomial model

```
model 
{ 
         for(i in 1 : N) {
                  for(j in 1 : T)\{ #Likelihood 
                   student[i,j] \sim \text{dbin}(p1[i,j],\text{child}[i,j]) logit(p1[i,j])<-alpha1+phi1[i]+gamma1[j]+nu1[i,j] 
                   thin[i,j] ~ dbin(p2[i,j],child[i,j])
                   logit(p2[i,j])<-alpha2+phi2[i]+gamma2[j]+nu2[i,j] 
                  exceedance2[i,j]<-step(p2[i,j]-0.05) # reduce and maintain wasting to \leq 5\%obese[i,j] \sim \text{dbin}(p3[i,j],\text{child}[i,j]) logit(p3[i,j])<-alpha3+phi3[i]+gamma3[j]+nu3[i,j] 
 } 
         exceedance1[i,5]<-step((1-p1[i,5]/p1[i,3])-0.17) #17% is target reduction by 2017 from 2012
         \text{exceedance3}[i,5] < \text{step}(p3[i,5]/p3[i,3]-1) \text{#} no increase in obesity from 2012 to 201
                                                             # no increase in obesity from 2012 to 2017
          } 
# - Space 
phi1[1:52]~car.normal(adj[],weights[],num[],tau.phi[1]) 
phi2[1:52]~car.normal(adj[],weights[],num[],tau.phi[2]) 
phi3[1:52]~car.normal(adj[],weights[],num[],tau.phi[3]) 
for(k in 1:240) {weights[k]\le-1}
# - Time: 
gamma1[1:T]~car.normal(adj.t[],weights.t[],num.t[],tau.gamma[1]) 
gamma2[1:T]~car.normal(adj.t[],weights.t[],num.t[],tau.gamma[2]) 
gamma3[1:T]~car.normal(adj.t[],weights.t[],num.t[],tau.gamma[3]) 
for(t in 1:1) { 
         weights.t[t] \leq 1;
         adj.t[t] \leq t+1;
         num.t[t] < 1} 
for(t in 2:(T-1)) {
         weights.t[2+(t-2)*2] <- 1;
         adj.t[2+(t-2)*2] <- t-1 
         weights.t[3+(t-2)*2] <- 1;
         adj.t[3+(t-2)*2] <- t+1;
         num.t[t] \leq 2
         } 
for(t in T:T) \{weights.t[(T-2)*2 + 2] <-1;
         adj.t[(T-2)*2 + 2] <- t-1;
         num.t[t] \leq 1
         } 
#Space-time Interaction terms 
for(i in 1:N}{
         for(i in 1:T)\{nu1[i,j]~dnorm(0, tau.nu[1])nu2[i,j]~dnorm(0, tau.nu[2]) 
         nu3[i,j]~dnorm(0, tau.nu[3])
```
}

#Hyperprior specification

}

for(i in 1:3){ tau.phi[i]~dgamma(0.5, 0.0005) tau.gamma[i]~dgamma(0.5, 0.0005) tau.nu[i]~dgamma(0.5, 0.0005) }

alpha1~dflat() alpha2~dflat() alpha3~dflat()

} }

Supplementary 4: a) Model random effects posteriors and b) sensitivity analysis of hyper parameter

selection

a)

Spatial random effects (phi)

Obesity

Unstructured effects (2017) (nu)

Obesity

b)

We concluded an additional sensitivity analysis to confirm whether the choice of hyper parameter may have affected the prevalence estimates. For the variance parameters, namely σ^2_v , σ^2_{ϕ} , σ^2_{γ} we assumed Gamma(0.5,0.0005) distributions as recommended by Wakefield (Wakefield J, Best N, Waller L. Bayesian approaches to disease mapping. Spatial epidemiology: methods and applications 2000:104-07.) for the Baysian prevalence/exceedance probability estimates presented in the main text. We also tested whether changes to this prior may have affected the estimates. Other choices for this prior (Lawson A, Browne W, Vidal Rodeiro C. Disease Mapping with WinBUGS and MLWin. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons; 2003) that are commonly used include.

Gamma (0.001, 0.001)

Gamma (0.01,0.01)

Pairwise scatterplots of the posterior prevalence for the various gamma distribution choices for the hyper parameters below suggest that the model estimates were largely insensitive to the choice of distribution assumed:

Supplementary 5: a) Model convergence [Gelman-Rubin statistics/plots]

tau.nu[1] chains 1:2

Supplementary 6: Model fit and out of sample validation

Overall model fit

Dbar = post.mean of -2logL; Dhat = -2LogL at post.mean of stochastic nodes

Comparison of survey prevalence versus model fitted prevalence by anthropometric measure

. spearman stunted_svy p1 if stunted_svy~=0

Number of $obs =$ 241
Spearman's rho = 0.9190 Spearman's rho = Test of Ho: stunted_svy and p1 are independent
 $Prob > |t| = 0.0000$ $Prob > |t| =$. spearman stunted svy p1 Number of $obs = 256$
Spearman's rho = 0.7729 Spearman's rho =

Test of Ho: stunted_svy and p1 are independent
 $Prob > |t| = 0.0000$ Prob $> |t|$ =

. spearman thin svy p2 if thin svy~=0

Number of obs = 191
Spearman's rho = 0.9019 Spearman's $rho =$ Test of Ho: thin_svy and p2 are independent $Prob > |t| = 0.0000$. spearman thin svy p2 Number of obs = 256
Spearman's rho = 0.2972 Spearman's rho = Test of Ho: thin_svy and p2 are independent $Prob > |t| = 0.0000$

. spearman obese svy p3 if obese svy~=0

Number of $obs =$ 243
Spearman's rho = 0.9485 Spearman's rho = Test of Ho: obese_svy and p3 are independent $Prob > |t| = 0.0000$. spearman obese svy p3 Number of $obs =$ 256
Spearman's rho = 0.8179 Spearman's rho = Test of Ho: obese_svy and p3 are independent
Prob > $|t| = 0.0000$ $Prob$ > $|t|$ =

Out of sample validation/prediction (10% random sample)

Of the 37 out of sample validation points, 31 (or 84%) of the observed prevalence of stunting where within the 95% uncertainty interval for the predicted posterior prevalence, 28/37 (78%) for thinness/wasting and 31/37 (84%) for obesity.

. spearman stunted_svy stuntedvpost if validation_sample2==1

Number of obs = 37 Spearman's rho = 0.4445

Test of Ho: stunted_svy and stuntedvpost are independent $Prob > |t| = 0.0058$

Supplementary 7: Description of the study sample across survey rounds

Supplementary 8: Sensitivity analyses for missing weight and height

Summary: A comparison of missing weight/height proportions by various socio-demographic variables suggests that many were likely missing at random. Distributions of race, gender, household income, low birthweight, food security status, mother education category and father education category were not significantly different when comparing children with missing weight/height measurements to those with a valid weight/height measurement (please see analysis output below). However, age did significantly differ by missing status in that infants (<1 year of age) were significantly more likely to have a missing weight/height measurement compared to children aged 1- 4 years. There also appeared to be significant differences in missing weight/height status by province of residence i.e. children in Mpumalanga, Western Cape fir example had higher proportions of missing weight/height measurements among children under 5 (p<0.001). Furthermore, missing weight/height measurements for children were more significantly more likely among those children with younger mothers (<25 years of age).

. svy: tab race missing height weight if race ~=0, row ci (running tabulate on estimation sample)

. svy: tab age missing height weight, row ci (running tabulate on estimation sample) Number of strata = 53 Number of obs = 19,201 Number of PSUs = 1,227 Population size = 28,456,616 Δ Design df Δ = 1,174 --- | missing_height_weight age_ | 0 1 Total ----------+-- 1 -4596 .5404 | [.4362,.4832] [.5168,.5638] | |
| 1 .8581 .1419 .141 | [.8308,.8816] [.1184,.1692] | 2 | .8764 .1236 1 $[.8573, .8933]$ $[.1067, .1427]$ | $\begin{array}{c|c}\n 3 & .8952 & .1048 \\
 1 & .6726 & .112\n \end{array}$ $[.8726, .9142]$ $[.0858, .1274]$ | 4 | .9015 .0985 1 | [.8847,.916] [.084,.1153] | Total | .8083 .1917 1 | [.7972,.8189] [.1811,.2028] --- Key: row proportion [95% confidence interval for row proportion] Pearson: Uncorrected chi2(4) = 3267.7805 Design-based F(3.41, 3999.27)= 238.9174 P = 0.0000 . svy: tab hh_inc missing_height_weight, row ci (running tabulate on estimation sample) Number of strata = 53 Number of obs = 18,289
Number of PSUs = 1,195 Population size = 26,887,499 Population size = $26,887,499$
Design df = $1,142$ Design df --- | missing_height_weight hh_inc | 0 1 Total ----------+-- 1 | .8032 .1968 1 | [.7792,.8251] [.1749,.2208] | 2 | .8286 .1714 1 | [.8012,.853] [.147,.1988] | 3 | .8289 .1711 1 $(1525, 1916)$ | 4 | .8076 .1924 1 | [.7751,.8365] [.1635,.2249] | $\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & & & & & & 1 \\ 5 & 1 & & & & 1 & 7862 & & & 2138 & & & 1 \end{array}$ | [.7578,.812] [.188,.2422] | Total | .8096 .1904 1 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\$ --- Key: row proportion [95% confidence interval for row proportion] Pearson: Uncorrected chi2(4) = 32.2620 Design-based F(3.67, 4186.36)= 1.9756 P = 0.1017 . svy: tab province missing_height_weight, row ci (running tabulate on estimation sample) Number of strata = 53 Number of obs = 19,201 Number of PSUs = 1,227 Population size = 28,456,616

-- foodsecur | missing_height_weight ity_proxy | 0 1 Total ----------+-- 1 $.7719$.2281 | [.7467,.7952] [.2048,.2533] | 2 | .8019 .1981 1 | [.7352,.8551] [.1449,.2648] | $\begin{array}{c|c}\n 3 & .7596 & .2404 \\
 \end{array}$ | [.6983,.8119] [.1881,.3017] | 4 | .8284 .1716 1 | [.7561,.8825] [.1175,.2439] | 5 | .7869 .2131 1 | [.6923,.8583] [.1417,.3077] | Total | .7751 .2249 1 | [.753,.7959] [.2041,.247] --- Key: row proportion [95% confidence interval for row proportion] Pearson: Uncorrected chi2(4) = 6.4682 Design-based F(3.04, 1168.67)= 0.8267 P = 0.4803 . svy: tab mthagegrp missing_height_weight, row ci (running tabulate on estimation sample) Number of strata = 53 Number of obs = $17,335$ Number of PSUs = 1,192 Population size = 26,432,345 Number of strata = $\begin{array}{rcl} 53 & \text{Number of obs} & = & 17,335 \\ \text{Number of PSUs} & = & 1,192 \\ \text{Design df} & = & 1,139 \end{array}$ --- RECODE of | mth_age_f | missing_height_weight
inal | 0 1 inal | 0 1 Total ----------+-- 1 | .6691 .3309 1 | [.628,.7077] [.2923,.372] | 2 | .7787 .2213 1 | [.7553,.8004] [.1996,.2447] | $\begin{array}{cccc} 3 & 1 & 8128 & 1872 & 1 \end{array}$ | [.7961,.8285] [.1715,.2039] | $\begin{array}{cccc} | & & & \\ 4 & | & & .8329 & .1671 & .1 \end{array}$ $[.8096, .8539]$ $[.1461, .1904]$ | $\begin{array}{c|c}\n5 & .8629 \\
1 & .1371\n\end{array}$ 1 | [.7939,.9113] [.0887,.2061] | Total | .8006 .1994 1 | [.7894,.8115] [.1885,.2106] --- Key: row proportion [95% confidence interval for row proportion] Pearson: Uncorrected chi2(4) = 169.4906 Design-based F(3.89, 4436.22)= 15.6564 P = 0.0000 svy: tab mth edu2 missing height weight, row ci (running tabulate on estimation sample) Number of strata = 53 Number of obs = 16,352
Number of PSUs = 1,169 Population size = 25,254,660 Population size = $25,254,660$ Design df $=$ 1.116 --- | missing_height_weight mth_edu2 | 0 1 Total ----------+--

0 | .8043 .1957 1 | [.7537,.8466] [.1534,.2463] | $\frac{1}{11}$.7848 .2152 .2152 | [.7529,.8136] [.1864,.2471] | 2 | .7976 .2024 1 | [.7848,.8098] [.1902,.2152] | $\begin{array}{cccc} | & & \\ 3 & | & & .8122 & .1878 & .1 \end{array}$ 1 | [.7734,.8457] [.1543,.2266] | Total | .7982 .2018 .2018 | [.7868,.8092] [.1908,.2132] --- Key: row proportion [95% confidence interval for row proportion] Pearson:
Uncorrected chi2(3) Uncorrected chi2(3) = 3.7648 Design-based F(2.41, 2688.60)= 0.5454 P = 0.6124 . svy: tab fth educat missing height weight, row ci (running tabulate on estimation sample) Number of strata = 53 Number of obs = $4,574$
Number of PSUs = 755 Population size = $8,485,206$ $\begin{array}{rcl}\n\text{Population size} & = & 8,485,206 \\
\text{Design of} & = & 702\n\end{array}$ Design df -- fth_educa | missing_height_weight t | 0 1 Total ----------+-- $0 \mid$.9417 .0583 1 | [.732,.9896] [.0104,.268] | $\frac{1}{1}$.7923 .2077 1 | [.7634,.8185] [.1815,.2366] | 2 | .803 .197 1 | [.759,.8406] [.1594,.241] | $3 \mid$.7618 .2382 1 | [.6661,.8368] [.1632,.3339] | Total | .7948 .2052 1 | [.7719,.8159] [.1841,.2281] --- Key: row proportion [95% confidence interval for row proportion] Pearson: Uncorrected $chi2(3)$ = 3.8826 Design-based $F(2.17, 1522.03) = 0.5250$ $P = 0.6062$

Supplementary 9: Full posterior prevalence estimates with 95% Bayesian uncertainty intervals (UIs) by district and year. Also includes exceedance probabilities for 17% reduction in stunting from wave 3 (2012) to wave 5 (2017) - to achieve 40% reduction from 2012 to 2025, 5% target threshold for wasting prevalence and no increase in obesity from wave 3 (2012) to wave 5 (2017) as per 2025 nutritional targets.

KwaZulu-Natal

KwaZulu-Natal

KwaZulu-Natal
KwaZulu-

Natal
KwaZulu-

Natal
KwaZulu-

KwaZulu-Natal

KwaZulu-Natal
KwaZulu-

KwaZulu-Natal
Eastern Cape

Eastern Cape Nelson Mandela

North West

Bay(NMA)
Ngaka Modiri

Molema(DC38

Natal

Natal

Free State Lejweleputswa(DC18) 3 14.8% 7.9% 23.7% N/A 7.4% 3.1% 13.8% 0.798 12.2% 6.3% 20.1% N/A Free State Mangaung(MAN) 3 17.6% 9.3% 28.5% N/A 7.0% 1.7% 18.0% 0.6214 15.6% 7.8% 26.0% N/A Limpopo | Mopani(DC33) | 3 | 23.9% | 14.7% | 34.6% | N/A | 9.0% | 3.9% | 16.5% | 0.92 | 26.7% | 17.0% | 37.8% | N/A Northern Cape Namakwa(DC6) 3 13.3% 6.6% 22.3% N/A 9.8% 4.1% 18.2% 0.9336 11.6% 5.5% 20.2% N/A

Mpumalanga Nkangala(DC31) 3 7.3% 3.3% 13.2% N/A 5.7% 2.1% 11.3% 0.5696 16.9% 9.5% 26.4% N/A Eastern Cape | O.R.Tambo(DC15) | 3 | 13.1% | 7.4% | 20.3% | N/A | 3.2% | 1.1% | 6.5% | 0.1062 | 30.8% | 21.9% | 40.7% | N/A

3 16.1% 9.1% 25.0% N/A 4.9% 1.7% 10.2% 0.4129 20.3% 11.8% 30.9% N/A

3 16.0% 9.8% 23.5% N/A 6.6% 2.9% 11.8% 0.7373 24.9% 16.9% 33.9% N/A

Supplementary 10: post hoc power analysis

We performed a post hoc power analysis to assess the minimum effect size detectable among infants which has the smallest number of observations. The post hoc power analysis suggests that the sample size in the smallest age group has the power to detect a small effect size ($w^{\sim}0.1$ based on Cohens rules of thumb [Cohen, 1988]) when using a chi-square test with 2x9 cells (maximum number of cells tested in our analyses i.e. binary nutritional classification versus province of residence) with 80% power and 5% alpha or type I error.

χ² tests - Goodness-of-fit tests: Contingency tables

Cohen, J (1988) Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

A summary guideline for effect size determinations is also provided in Kotrlik, JW and Williams, HA (2003) The incorporation of effect size in information technology, learning, and performance research. *Information Techology, Learning, and Performance Journal* **21(1)** 1-7.

