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| ***Author*** | ***Results***  ***FC=Food consumption; FS= Food Security; DD=Dietary Diversity; NS=Nutritional Status*** |
| Bukusuba | **FC:** UA households consumed more cereals (P=0.001), fruit (P=0.04), and vegetables (P=0.001) compared to non-farming households  **FS:** Engaging in urban or periurban agriculture was significantly associated with household food security (P=0.003)  **DD:** Households that engage in UA are significantly more likely to have a more diverse diet than those who do not engage in UA (p=0.016) (bivariate analysis only, not adjusted for confounders) |
| Burger | **FS:** Households engaged in UA were more likely to report insufficient food for adults and/or children (22.84% vs 15.08% in children; 25.58% vs 15.38% in adults) |
| Hillbruner | **FS:** Cultivation of fruits and vegetables (0.98 (0.57–1.68) for all households; 1.28 (0.47–3.51) for households in lowest expenditure quartile) and raising livestock (1.65 (0.86–3.14) for all households; 0.42 (0.10–1.69) for households in lowest expenditure quartile) were insignificant in both models examining seasonality, food security and nutritional status. |
| Masashua | **FC:** Farmers were able to access nutrients more frequently after engaged in UA than before.  **FS:** Smallholder farmers reported that household level food availability (65.5%) and accessibility (63.6%) has improved after becoming involved in vegetable production. |
| Maxwell; Alternative Food Security Strategy | **FS:** In very low income families, both farming and non-farming families report spending roughly equal amounts of money on food, despite farming families access to home-grown produce, potentially resulting in better short term food security.   In the working poor group, short-term food security indicators were the same regardless of farming status. However, farming families has decreased expenditure, potentially demonstrating UA as a form of fungible income.   For high income groups, patterns were not significant and more inconsistent.  **NS:** In the two lowest income groups (80% of sample), there is evidence of an association or trend between a household’s involvement in UA and children’s height-for-age. (p=0.001 and p=0.013 for very low and low-income families in dry season and p=0.061 and 0.007 in rainy season). |
| Maxwell; Does urban ariculture help prevent malnutrtion? | **NS:** When controlling for SES, children, particularly from the lowest SES group were significantly (p <0.05) less likely to be stunted or underweight compared to children in non-farming families.  There was no corresponding difference in wasting when comparing farming and non-farming families. |
| Mboganie-Mwangi | **FC:** While all three groups had energy intake <75% of estimated requirements, NGO supported farmers had higher energy (73%) and protein (132%) intake than community farmers (64% energy, 123% protein) and non-farmers (61% energy and 122% protein).  **FS:** 71% of NGO supported farmers, 35% of community farmers and 25% non-farmers report "always or most of the time [having] enough to eat."  **NS:** Higher proportion of wasted children (defined as weight-for-height <80%) in non-farming compared to farming households (8.3% compared to 2.9% respectively). Higher proportion of stunted children (height-for-age <90%) in non-farming households (38%), compared to farming households (31%) and NGO-supported farming households (17%). |
| Miura | **FC:** Frequency of home garden produce utilisation was positively related to the diversity of vegetables and fruit grown (P=0.014)  From the home gardens, 80.4% consumed leafy vegetables and fruits and 29.4% consumed root vegetables.  **FS:** People who ate produce from home gardens ate a wider variety of fruit and vegetables, yet consumed less protein.  **DD:** Home grown produce often replaced carb-rich foods thereby improving the dietary diversity in farmers' diets. |
| Mkwambisi | **NS:** Results extremely badly reported with text and tables presenting different figures. Suggestion that stunting prevalence is higher for farming households (37.5%) compared to non-farming households (27.1%). Insignificant difference in wasting and underweight prevalence between the two groups is reported. |
| USAID | **FC:** Comparing the baseline to the post-intervention survey, the average frequency of vegetable consumption rose from either "zero" or "occasionally" to approximately 3x a week   HNG participants ate vegetables an average of 2.88 times/week and 32.3% of participants age vegetables every day.  Animal protein consumption was not significantly changed and remained below standard. |
| Vasey | **FC:** Most important garden crops (in order of importance): Cassava, banana, plantain, sweet potato, aibiki, pumpkin, maize, beans, tam, taro, peanuts, bassicas, others minor crops  The direct contribution of garden production to family food energy consumption is 4-6% |
| Yeudall | **FC: 3.7% (1.4 to 6.0), 14.3% (11.1 to 17.6), and 12.6% (9.0 to 16.2) of Kcal consumed in non-farming, livestock farming, and crop-farming households came from home production.**  **FS:** No significant differences in the rates of food securitybetween farming and non-farming households.  **DD: Children from families that raised livestock had higher dietary diversity (11.7 (10.7-12.1)) than crop-farming families (11.4 (10.7-12.1)) and non-farming families (11.3 (10.2-12.4)). The difference between families that raise livestock and other farming and non-farming households is significant (p<.05)**  **NS:** No significant differences in any of the anthropometric measurements (WAZ, HAZ, BMIZ, MUACZ) between children from farming and non-farming households.However, there was a non-significant trend toward improved growth and body composition in children from families that raised livestock. |
| Zezza | **FC:** In Bangladesh and Guatemala, two of the four countries for which data on calorie consumption was available, a positive and significant relationship between calorie intake and UA participation was found. Participants in both countries ate more calories from meat, fruit, and vegetables and in Guatemala, also from diary and staple crops. In Malawi, a positive trend, but no statistically significant relationship was found and there was no association in Nicaragua.  **DD:** UA is positively associated with greater dietary diversity in 10 out of 15 countries when measured by the dietary diversity score and 11 out of 15 when measured by the simple food count. Wide variation in the magnitude association from 6-7% (Bangladesh, Nepal, Vietnam, Guatemala and Ecuador) to 34% (Albania). |