Knowledge -Practice gap in children's nutrition among mothers of youngchildren: An Urban–Rural Comparative Study

Abstract

Child nutrition is a fundamental determinant of growth, development, and overall health during early childhood. Inadequate nutrition during the under-five period can lead to long-term physical, cognitive, and developmental impairments that may persist into adulthood. Mothers, as primary caregivers, play a pivotal role in ensuring appropriate feeding practices and nutritional care for young children. Therefore, assessing maternal knowledge and practices regarding child nutrition is essential, particularly across diverse socio-cultural settings such as urban and rural communities. The present study aimed to assess and compare the knowledge and practices related to child nutrition among mothers of under-five children residing in selected urban and rural areas of District Patiala, Punjab, and to examine the association between knowledge and practices with selected socio-demographic variables.A descriptive comparative research design was adopted for the study. The research was conducted in June 2025, and a total of 70 mothers of under-five children were selected using purposive sampling, comprising 35 mothers from urban areas and 35 from rural areas. Data were collected using a self-structured questionnaire that included socio-demographic characteristics and items assessing maternal knowledge and practices related to child nutrition. Statistical analysis was carried out using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation, along with inferential statistics including the t-test.Findings revealed that the socio-demographic characteristics of urban and rural mothers were largely similar, with no statistically significant differences observed except for religion (p=0.001). The majority of mothers demonstrated average knowledge regarding child nutrition in both urban (54.3%) and rural (45.7%) areas, and no mothers were found to have poor knowledge. In terms of practices, good nutritional practices were more commonly observed among rural mothers (56.5%) compared to urban mothers (43.5%). A statistically significant difference was found in practice scores between urban and rural mothers (p=0.001), whereas no significant difference was noted in knowledge scores (p=0.933). Educational status and occupation showed a significant association with knowledge and practice scores among rural mothers (p<0.05).Although urban mothers exhibited slightly higher mean knowledge scores, rural mothers consistently demonstrated better nutritional practices. This highlights a gap between knowledge and practice, particularly in urban settings. The study underscores the need for targeted educational interventions and community-based nutrition programs to bridge this gap and promote optimal child nutrition practices, thereby improving health outcomes among under-five children.

Keywords: Child nutrition, maternal knowledge, feeding practices, urban mothers, rural mothers

45

Introduction

Early childhood nutrition plays a critical role in supporting optimal growth, cognitive development, immunity, and long-term health outcomes.[1] Malnutrition—both undernutrition and overnutrition—remains one of the leading causes of childhood morbidity and mortality worldwide.[2] The first 1,000 days of life are especially crucial, as nutritional deficiencies during this period can lead to stunting, impaired cognitive performance, and increased susceptibility to infections.[3] Parents play a central role in safeguarding child nutrition, as many common childhood health issues can be prevented through healthy feeding practices.[4] Nutrition is strongly influenced by socioeconomic status, maternal education, cultural norms, and access to healthcare services.[5] Children of educated mothers have been shown to have better dietary intake and lower risk of malnutrition.[6] Inadequate nutrition not only affects individual child potential but also undermines community health and long-term economic development.[7] According to the World Health Organization, malnutrition includes deficiencies, excesses, or imbalances in energy or nutrient intake.[8] Rural children are more prone to undernutrition due to poverty, limited healthcare access, and poor sanitation, while urban children increasingly face obesity risks due to processed food consumption and sedentary lifestyles.[9] [10] Feeding practices among mothers vary widely between urban and rural communities, influenced by cultural beliefs, availability of nutrition information, and access to health services.[11] [12] India continues to bear a substantial burden of malnutrition, despite economic growth and national nutrition programs. NFHS-5 reports high prevalence of stunting, wasting, and underweight among children under five.[13] Punjab, although relatively developed, exhibits concerning rates of childhood malnutrition, with 25.7% stunted, 21.6% underweight, and 17.2% wasted children.[14] Poor maternal knowledge regarding breastfeeding, complementary feeding, dietary diversity, and appropriate portion sizes further contributes to nutritional deficiencies among young children.[15] [16] Significant differences between rural and urban maternal feeding practices highlight the need for comparative research.[10]

Need of study

According to WHO, nearly 45% of deaths among children under five years are attributable to malnutrition, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.[16] Malnutrition includes not only undernutrition but also micronutrient deficiencies and the rising burden of childhood overweight.[17] India contributes significantly to global malnutrition levels. NFHS-5 reported that 35.5% of children under five are stunted, 19.3% wasted, and 32.1% underweight.[13] Punjab also shows concerning malnutrition levels, with 25.7% stunted, 21.6% underweight, and 17.2% wasted.[14] These figures highlight the continued challenges in child nutrition even in states considered relatively developed. Poor maternal knowledge regarding breastfeeding, complementary feeding, and dietary diversity is a major factor contributing to malnutrition.[15] Incorrect timing of complementary feeding, inadequate portion sizes, and low intake of micronutrient-rich foods are common concerns.[18] Maternal practices are also influenced by socioeconomic status, cultural norms, food availability, and access to health services. Rural mothers often follow traditional methods and may lack nutrition-related information, whereas urban mothers may rely more on packaged foods due to lifestyle influences.[10]

Material and Methods

The study adopted a comparative, non-experimental research design to assess and compare the knowledge and practices regarding child nutrition among mothers of under-five children residing in urban and rural areas. A total of 70 mothers were selected, with 35 from urban areas and 35 from rural areas, using a non-probability purposive sampling technique. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data on mothers' knowledge and practices related to nutrition. The key research variable was used to assess the knowledge and practice regarding child nutrition among mother of under five at urban and rural community area.

Results

The findings of the study indicated that the urban and rural groups were largely homogeneous in terms of baseline demographic characteristics. Religion was the only variable that showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups ($p < 0.05$), with Hindu mothers predominantly belonging to urban areas and Sikh mothers mainly representing rural areas. The data were normally distributed; therefore, parametric statistical tests were applied for further analysis. Assessment of maternal knowledge regarding child nutrition revealed no statistically significant difference between urban and rural mothers ($p > 0.05$), with both groups demonstrating similar distributions of average and good knowledge levels, indicating that area of residence did not influence knowledge scores. In contrast, maternal practices related to child nutrition differed significantly between the two groups. Rural mothers exhibited significantly better practices compared to urban mothers, with a higher proportion demonstrating good practices (56.5% versus 43.5%), and the mean practice scores were significantly higher among rural participants ($p < 0.001$), suggesting a strong influence of residence on maternal practices. Further analysis showed that educational status and occupation were the only demographic variables that had a significant Influence on maternal knowledge scores ($p < 0.05$), whereas other variables such as age, number of children, gender, religion, family type, and family income did not show a significant association. Between-group comparisons also revealed significant differences in knowledge scores based on educational status and occupation across urban and rural areas. With respect to maternal practices, the age of the youngest child was the only demographic variable that showed a significant association with practice scores ($p < 0.05$), while other demographic factors did not demonstrate a significant effect. However, independent samples analysis revealed highly significant differences in practice scores across all demographic variables ($p < 0.001$), with rural mothers consistently scoring higher than urban mothers. Overall, the results highlight that although maternal knowledge levels were comparable between urban and rural communities, maternal practices differed markedly, with rural mothers demonstrating more favorable practices related to child nutrition, underscoring the significant role of area of residence in influencing maternal practices.

Table 1: Comparison oflevel of knowledge regarding child nutrition among mothers

N=70

Level of	N	Urban (n=35)	Rural (n=35)	p-value

knowledge		F	%	F	%	
Poor	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.473[NS]
Average	35	19	54.3	16	45.7	
Good	35	16	45.7	19	54.3	

135 **Fisher's Exact test   NS=Non-significant at p>0.05;   *= Significant at p<0.05**

136

137 Table 1revealsno statistically significant difference between the two groups (p > 0.05),
138 with both urban and rural subjects having a similar distribution of average and good
139 knowledge levels.

140

141 **Table 2:Comparison oflevel of practices regarding child nutrition among**
142 **mothers**

143   **N=70**

Practices	N	Urban (n=35)		Rural (n=35)		p-value
		F	%	F	%	
Poor	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.005**
Average	8	8	100.0	0	0.0	
Good	62	27	43.5	35	56.5	

144 **Fisher's Exact test   NS=Non-significant at p>0.05;   **=Significant at p<0.01**

145 Table 2 showed a statistically significant difference between urban and rural mothers
146 (p = 0.005, p < 0.05), with a higher proportion of rural mothers demonstrating good
147 practices (56.5%) compared to urban mothers (43.5%).

148 **Table 3:Comparison of mean and standard deviation of knowledge scores**
149 **regarding child nutrition between respondents of Urban and rural community**
150 **areas**

151   **N=70**

Residence	N	Mean± SD	Mean difference	df	t	p-value
Urban	35	20.20± 4.16	0.086	68	8.36	0.933[NS]
Rural	35	20.29± 4.28				

152 **t=Independent Samples t-testNS=Non-significant at p>0.05; *= Significant at p<0.05**

153 Table 3 revealed that no statistically significant difference between the groups p >
154 0.05) suggesting that area residence had no effect on the knowledge scores of
155 mothers, and both groups had similar levels of knowledge.

156 **Table 4:Comparison of mean and standard deviation of practice scoresregarding**
157 **child nutritionbetween respondents of Urban and rural community areas**

158 **N=70**

Residence	N	Mean± SD	Mean difference	df	t	p-value
Urban	35	15.31± 1.87	3.257	68	8.36	0.001***
Rural	35	18.57± 1.35				

159 **t=Independent Samples t-testNS=Non-significant at p>0.05; ***=Significantat p<0.001**

160

161 Table 4showed statistically significant difference in mean practice scores between
162 urban and rural participants (p <0.001) indicating that residence has a significant
163 impact on maternal practice scores. Rural participants demonstrated significantly
164 better practices compared to their urban counterparts

165

166 **Table5:Comparison of mean knowledge scores and demographic variables in**
167 **urban and rural areasrespondents**
168 **N=70**

Variable	Urban (n=35)					Rural (n=35)				
	N	Mean	SD	F	p-value	N	Mean	SD	F	p-value
Age(years)										
18–25	7	21.57	2.5	0.63	0.540[NS]	12	20.08	3.91	0.83	0.448[NS]
26–32	26	19.73	4.49			20	19.95	4.66		
33–39	2	21.5	4.95			3	23.33	2.51		
t 0.12**p- value** 0.90[NS]										
Number of children										
1	11	21	3.43	0.570	0.570[NS]	7	21.43	4.57	1.208	0.298[NS]
2	16	19.38	4.41			24	20.08	4.23		
3	8	20.75	4.77			3	17.33	3.05		
≥ 4	0	–	–			1	26	–		
t -1.02**p- value**0.32[NS]										
Gender of child										
Male	17	19.65	4.78	0.453	0.453[NS]	21	19.95	4.33	0.320	0.581[NS]
Female	18	20.72	3.54			14	20.79	4.33		
t -0.065**p- value** 0.95[NS]										
Age of youngest child(years)										
0–1	0	–	–	0.33	0.72[NS]	4	16	3.83	1.360	0.260[NS]
1–2	18	20.28	4.39			14	20.43	3.81		
2–3	12	19.75	4.35			12	20.67	4.67		
3–4	4	21.75	3.5			3	22.33	2.51		
4–5	1	18	–			2	22.5	6.36		

Variable	N	Mean	SD	F	p-value	N	Mean	SD	F	p-value
t -0.49**p – value** 0.63[NS]										
Educational status										
No formal education	0	–	–	0.87	0.684[NS]	2	14.5	2.12	5.07	0.028*
Primary	6	18.33	2.06			5	16.6	4.39		
Matriculation	14	20.5	5.06			15	21.2	4.07		
Senior Sec.	11	20.45	4.29			8	20.63	4.06		
Graduation>	4	21.25	2.75			5	23	1.58		
t -0.009**p - value**0.99[NS]										
Religion										
Hindu	17	20.06	3.68	0.31	0.245[NS]	1	24	–	0.77	0.387[NS]
Muslim	2	25	1.41			0	–	–		
Sikh	16	19.75	4.62			34	20.18	4.3		
t -0.17**p- value** 0.86[NS]										
Occupation										
Homemaker	29	19.62	4.28	6.45	0.016[S]	28	20.68	4.07		0.036*
Govt. employee	0	–	–			2	12	1.41	3.42	
Private employee	6	23	2			3	21	3.6		
Self employed	0	–	–			2	22	0		
t 0.20 **p- value** 0.84[NS]										
Family income (in Rs.)										
< 10,000	3	19.33	1.15	0.09	0.964[NS]	4	15.75	4.42	1.87	0.162[NS]
10,000–20,000	13	20.54	4.52			16	20.69	4.19		
20,000–30,000	18	20.17	4.44			12	21.08	4.07		
> 30,000	1	19	–			3	21	3.6		
t 0.044**p- value** 0.97[NS]										
Type of family										
Nuclear	21	21.29	4.12	3.96	0.058[NS]	13	20.92	3.4	0.37	0.507[NS]
Joint	14	18.57	3.79			22	19.91	4.77		
t 1.99**p- value** 0.055[NS]										

169 **F =One-way ANNOVA   t=Independent Samples t-test   NS=Non-significant at p>0.05**

170 ***=Significant at p<0.05**

171 Table 5 revealed that a significant mean difference (p<0.05) was observed only for
172 educational status and occupation, indicating their influence on knowledge scores. No
173 significant mean differences (p>0.05) were found across other demographic variables,
174 suggesting that variables such as age, number of children, gender, family type,
175 religion, and income did not affect the knowledge scores.Between groups,
176 independent samples t-tests revealed significant mean differences (p<0.05) in
177 educational status and occupation, suggesting these factors influenced maternal
178 knowledge scores across urban and rural communities.

179 **Table 6: Comparison of mean practice scores and demographic variables in**
180 **urban and rural areasrespondents**

181   **N=70**

Variable	Urban(n=35)					Rural (n=35)				
	N	Mean	SD	F	p-value	N	Mean	SD	F	p-value
Age(years)										
18–25	7	15.43	1.98	2.09	0.15[NS]	12	18.33	1.43	0.19	0.83[NS]

26–32	26	15.42	1.83			20	18.75	1.33		
33–39	2	13.5	2.12			3	18.33	1.52		

t =-7.32; p 0.001***

Number of children

1	11	15.45	1.63	0.11	0.935^{NS}	7	19	1.15	2.11	0.233^{NS}
2	16	15.19	1.87			24	18.54	1.35		
3	8	15.38	2.38			3	17.33	1.52		
≥ 4	0	–	–			1	20	–		

t =-6.63; p0.001***

Gender of child

Male	17	14.94	1.56	1.42	0.259^{NS}	21	18.62	1.28	0.067	0.804^{NS}
Female	18	15.67	2.11			14	18.5	1.5		

t =-8.49; p 0.001***

Age of youngest child(years)

0–1	0	–	–	0.13	0.981^{NS}	4	18	1.15	3.05	0.047*
1–2	18	15.22	2.07			14	18.29	1.26		
2–3	12	15.5	1.38			12	18.83	1.33		
3–4	4	15.25	2.87			3	20	0		
4–5	1	15	–			2	18	2.82		

t = -8.21p 0.001***

Educational status

No formal education	0	–	–	3.14	0.039^{NS}	2	19.5	0.7	2.42	0.110^{NS}
Primary	6	14.33	1.5			5	17.2	1.09		
Matriculation	14	15.14	1.99			15	18.53	1.3		
Senior Sec.	11	15.82	1.88			8	19	1.3		

t = -8.35p 0.001***

Religion

Hindu	17	15.24	2.01		0.667^{NS}	1	20	–		0.292^{NS}
Muslim	2	16.5	0.7	0.78		0	–	–	0.73	
Sikh	16	15.25	1.84			34	18.53	1.35		
Hindu	17	15.24	2.01			1	20	–		
Muslim	2	16.5	0.7			0	–	–		

t= -8.35p 0.001***

Occupation

Homemaker	29	15.21	1.91	0.55	0.465^{NS}	28	18.57	1.31	0.32	0.912^{NS}
Govt. employee	0	–	–			2	18	1.41		
Private employee	6	15.83	1.72			3	18.67	2.3		
Self employed	0	–	–			2	19	1.41		

t = -8.4 p < 0.001***

Family income (in Rs.)

< 10,000	3	16.33	2.3	0.607	0.745^{NS}	4	17.75	1.5	1.64	0.20^{NS}

	N	Mean	SD	F	p	N	Mean	SD	F	p
10,000–20,000	13	15	1.78			16	18.5	1.31		
20,000–30,000	18	15.39	1.97			12	19	1.2		
> 30,000	1	15	–			3	18.33	2.08		
t = -8.43 p 0.001***										
Type of family										
Nuclear	21	15.67	1.9	1.96	0.177[NS]	13	18.69	1.25	0.17	0.692[NS]
Joint	14	14.79	1.76			22	18.5	1.43		
t = -8.59 p 0.001***										

182 **F=One-way ANNOVA   t=Independent Samples t-test   NS=Non-significant at p>0.05**

183 *****=Significant at p<0.001**

184

185 Table 6 revealed that a significant mean difference(p<0.05) was observed for the age
186 of the youngest child, indicating its influence on practice scores. No significant mean
187 differences (p>0.05)were found across other demographic variables, suggesting that
188 variables such as age, number of children, gender, educational status, religion,
189 occupation, family income, and type of family did not affect the practice scores.
190 Between groups, independent samples t-tests revealed highly significant mean
191 differences across all variables (p<0.001), with rural participants consistently scoring
192 higher than urban participants implying area of residence significantly influenced the
193 measuredpracticescores, with rural participants showing better outcomes than urban
194 participants.

195 The findings revealed that religion was the only demographic variable showing
196 significant differences, with Hindu participants mainly from urban areas and Sikh
197 participants mainly from rural areas. Overall knowledge scores were similar across
198 residences, but rural mothers demonstrated significantly better child care and nutrition
199 practices. Within-group comparisons showed minimal variation across demographic
200 subgroups, whereas between-group comparisons indicated that educational status and
201 occupation influenced knowledge scores, with rural participants generally scoring
202 higher. Additionally, the age of the youngest child significantly affected practice
203 scores, while other demographic variables had no significant effect. Overall, rural
204 participants consistently outperformed urban participants, highlighting residence as a
205 key factor influencing maternal knowledge and child care practices.

206 **Discussion**

207 The findings revealed that both urban and rural mothers had almost equal levels of
208 knowledge regarding child nutrition, and no statistically significant difference was
209 observed between the two groups (p > 0.05). A study in Maharashtra also found that
210 health education initiatives improved complementary feeding practices more
211 effectively among rural mothers, supporting the current finding that rural mothers
212 showed better practices than urban mothers.[19]A comparative study in Mysuru,
213 Karnataka, reported that urban mothers had somewhat better practices compared to
214 rural mothers, though both groups demonstrated gaps in correct feeding
215 practices.[20]Similarly, research in Belgaum, Karnataka, found that urban mothers
216 initiated complementary feeding more appropriately than rural mothers.[21]Studies from
217 Thrissur, Kerala, also indicated that urban mothers adhered better to weaning
218 guidelines, whereas rural mothers often started earlier than recommended.[22]

219 Despite these variations, the role of maternal education has been consistently
220 emphasized. In the present study, education was significantly associated with
221 knowledge among rural mothers. This is supported by a multi-state study in India
222 which showed that higher maternal health literacy significantly reduced the risk of
223 underweight and stunting among children.[23] Regarding practices, demographic factors
224 such as occupation, type of family, and age of the youngest child were significantly
225 associated with better nutrition-related practices. Overall, while the present study
226 highlighted that rural mothers demonstrated better practices despite similar
227 knowledge levels, evidence from other regions shows mixed trends.

Conclusion

229 The study concluded that while both urban and rural mothers had comparable levels
230 of knowledge regarding child nutrition, rural mothers demonstrated significantly
231 better practices. Education, occupation, and family type influenced mothers'
232 knowledge and practices. The results highlight a gap between awareness and
233 implementation, particularly among urban mothers.

234 Effective community-based health education, practical demonstrations, and active
235 involvement of family members are necessary to bridge this gap. Strengthening
236 government nutrition programs and involving nurses and health workers in continuous
237 support can promote optimal feeding practices. A holistic, family-centered approach
238 is essential to improve child nutrition and support the growth and development of
239 under-five children.

Acknowledgement

Reference

247 1.Black RE, Victora CG, Walker SP, Bhutta ZA, Christian P, de Onis M, et al.
248 Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income
249 countries.   Lancet.   2013   [Internet];382(9890):427–51.Available
250 from:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60937-X2.

251 2.UNICEF, World Health Organization, World Bank Group. Levels and trends in
252 child malnutrition: key findings of the 2021 edition. Geneva: World Health
253 Organization;   2021   [Internet].   Available   from:
254 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240025257

255 3.Victora CG, de Onis M, Hallal PC, Blössner M, Shrimpton R. Worldwide timing of
256 growth faltering: revisiting implications for interventions. Pediatrics. 2010
257 [Internet];125(3):e473–80. Available from:https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-1519

258 4.Bhutta ZA, Das JK, Rizvi A, Gaffey MF, Walker N, Horton S, et al. Evidence-based
259 interventions for improvement of maternal and child nutrition: what can be done and
260 at   what   cost?   Lancet.   2013   [Internet];382(9890):452–77.   Available
261 from:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60996-4

262 5.Alderman H, Headey DD. How important is parental education for child nutrition?
263 World   Dev.   2017   [Internet];94:448–64.   Available
264 from:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.02.016

265 6.Hoddinott J, Alderman H, Behrman JR, Haddad L, Horton S. The economic
266 rationale for investing in stunting reduction. Matern Child Nutr. 2013
267 [Internet];9(Suppl 2):69–82. Available from:https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12080

268 7.Yirga AA, Mwambi HG, Ayele DG, Melesse SF. Factors affecting child
269 malnutrition in Ethiopia. Afr Health Sci. 2019 [Internet];19(3):1897–1909. Available
270 from:https://doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v19i3.38

271 8.World Health Organization, UNICEF. Infant and young child feeding counselling:
272 an   integrated   course.   Geneva: WHO;   2006   [Internet].   Available
273 from:https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43599

274 9.Menon P, Headey D, Avula R, Nguyen PH. Understanding the geographical burden
275 of stunting in India: a regression-decomposition analysis of district-level data from
276 2015–16.   Matern   Child   Nutr.   2018   [Internet];14(4):e12620.   Available
277 from:https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12620

278 10.Srivastava S, Kumar S. Urban–rural differentials in child nutrition in India: a
279 cross-sectional study. Clin Epidemiol Glob Health. 2021 [Internet];12:100871.
280 Available from:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cegh.2021.100871

281 11.Victora CG, Bahl R, Barros AJD, França GVA, Horton S, Krasevec J, et al.
282 Breastfeeding in the 21st century: epidemiology, mechanisms, and lifelong effect.
283 Lancet.   2016   [Internet];387(10017):475–90.Available
284 from:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)01024-7

285 12.Ministry of Women and Child Development. Poshan Abhiyaan: National Nutrition
286 Mission. Government of India; 2018 [Internet]. Available from:https://icds-
287 wcd.nic.in/nnm/

288 13.Kavle JA, Landry M. Addressing barriers to optimal breastfeeding: an integrative
289 review.   Matern   Child   Nutr.   2018   [Internet];14(3):e12544.   Available
290 from:https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12544

291 14.International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), ICF. National Family Health
292 Survey (NFHS-5), 2019–21: Punjab. Mumbai: IIPS; 2021 [Internet].   Available
293 from:http://rchiips.org/nfhs/

294 15.Aguayo VM, Menon P. Stop stunting: improving child feeding, women's nutrition
295 and household sanitation in South Asia. Matern Child Nutr. 2016 [Internet];12(Suppl
296 1):3–11. Available from:https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12283

297 16.World   Health   Organization.   Malnutrition.   Geneva: WHO;   2021   [Internet].
298 Available from:https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/malnutrition

299 17.International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), ICF. National Family Health
300 Survey (NFHS-5), 2019–21: India. Mumbai: IIPS; 2021 [Internet]. Available
301 from:http://rchiips.org/nfhs/

302 18.Gupta N, Goel K, Shah P, Misra A. Childhood obesity in developing countries:
303 epidemiology, determinants, and prevention. Endocr Rev. 2012 [Internet];33(1):48–
304 70. Available from:https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2010-0028

305 19.Pawar PA, Katkade VB. A study to assess the knowledge and practice of mothers
306 regarding complementary feeding in rural and urban areas of Maharashtra.
307 ShodhKosh J Arts Humanit Soc Sci. 2023;5(2):123–130. Available
308 from:https://www.granthaalayahpublication.org/Arts-
309 Journal/ShodhKosh/article/view/6088

310 20.Girish T, Venkatesh G. Comparison of feeding practices among children under two
311 years of age in urban and rural areas of Mysuru, Karnataka. Int J Community Med
312 Public Health. 2023;10(3):1220–1226. Available
313 from:https://www.ijcmph.com/index.php/ijcmph/article/view/11359

314 21.Patil SS, Angadi MM. A cross-sectional study on complementary feeding practices
315 among mothers of under-five children in Belgaum. J Evid Based Med Healthc.
316 2015;2(70):1037–1043. Available
317 from:https://jebmh.com/abstract/658c3be291384525835df9ede19ec4cb

318 22.Nair MK, Augustine LF. Complementary feeding practices in Thrissur District,
319 Kerala. Natl J Community Med. 2012;3(2):222–227. Available
320 from:https://njcmindia.com/index.php/file/article/view/336

321 23.V, Kashyap S, Seth V, Agarwal S. Maternal health literacy in India: association
322 with child nutritional status. Matern Child Health J. 2016;20(5):1001–1011. Available
323 from:https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27306895/

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339