



Born Large for Gestational Age: Bigger Is Not Always Better

Valentina Chiavaroli, MD, José G. B. Derraik, PhD, Paul L. Hofman, MD, and Wayne S. Cutfield, MD

During the past 60-90 years, there has been a change in the growth trajectories of large for gestational age (LGA) babies and the associated health effects later in life. Subjects classified as large at birth in the 1920s were found to have reduced morbidity and mortality in their seventh decade compared with those born of lower birth weight.^{1,2} Indeed, across the birth weight range there was a progressive increase in cardiovascular and metabolic risk with a decrease in birth weight, even among those in the normal range.^{1,2} These findings suggested that, historically, larger size at birth provided metabolic advantages that contributed to improved health and possibly longevity.

Long-term outcomes in those born LGA have dramatically changed in the last 30 years, with LGA being now associated with early obesity and increased cardiovascular and metabolic risk.^{3,4} The association between birth weight and the risk of later adult diseases currently seems to be U-shaped.⁵ It is likely that this relatively recent increased risk of adult disease in those born large is related to the underlying factors influencing fetal growth as well as changes in postnatal environmental conditions. For instance, from 1910 to the late 1940s, events including the World Wars and the Great Depression were characterized by limited available nutrition to the wider population.^{6,7} Thus, in the past, babies were much less likely to be overnourished in utero, as shown by lower maternal weight gain and overweight/obesity rates during pregnancy,^{8,9} so that LGA babies were more likely to have been long and lean. Much greater rates of postterm births and increased sibship may represent risk factors for lean LGA babies.^{10,11} Before active obstetric intervention to avoid prolonged pregnancies, the postterm birth rate was 10%¹² compared with approximately 3% currently.¹³ Conversely, there has been a nutritional excess in utero in recent decades,¹⁴ leading to LGA neonates that are long and fat,¹⁵ with postnatal exposure to an “obesogenic” environment responsible for a further acceleration in growth.¹⁶

Why Are Babies Being Born Larger?

There has been a progressive increase in the prevalence of large babies during the last 3 decades¹⁷ that is now approximately 10% of all newborns¹⁸; however, the literature is conflicting regarding the definition of “large” at birth, which would indirectly estimate the severity of adiposity. Birth weight appears to be the most widely adopted variable to define large babies, because weight represents a crude

measure of fetal growth, involving length, head circumference, and fatness.¹⁹ The terms LGA and macrosomia have been used somewhat interchangeably, although different criteria have been adopted for both, leading to conflicting classifications. LGA babies usually are defined as having a birth weight >90th percentile according to gestational age and sex,²⁰ and macrosomia tends to refer to babies with a birth weight >4000 g.²¹ Because LGA is a more precise term, it is more commonly used to identify larger babies.

Greater birth weight and greater neonatal adiposity represent the expression of a complex fetal-maternal interaction, which is driven by fetal genetic factors and the intrauterine environment.²² Although the factors that have led to large birth weight in previous generations are unclear, the current underlying causes of LGA appear to be mainly attributable to nutritional excess in utero, which either directly or via epigenetic mechanisms results in increasing obesity postnatally.²³⁻²⁵ This increased in utero nutrition most likely reflects maternal nutrition, in particular obesity and maternal diabetes mellitus. Greater rates of maternal obesity and gestational diabetes represent some of the main components of a proposed “obesity cycle,” responsible for in utero programming of later adiposity and transgenerational amplification of obesity.^{14,26} This theory was first proposed by Pedersen,²⁷ who hypothesized that mothers who were obese and/or with diabetes provided increased nutrition to the fetuses, who then became larger with greater adiposity. Increasing fetal adiposity/overnutrition “programs” the fetuses to grow more rapidly postnatally and develop early obesity. As obesity tracks with age, these children are more likely to become obese adults.

The classification of infants as LGA based on customized percentiles for birth weight has been proposed,^{18,28,29} which have strengths and limitations. Customized percentiles incorporate maternal and infant factors, such as maternal weight, height, parity, gestational age, and infant sex, resulting in some LGA infants being recategorized as appropriate for gestational age (AGA).¹⁸ Ethnicity also could be taken into account, because, for example, American Indian and Pacific Islander mothers are at increased risk of having LGA infants.^{28,30} Adjusting for maternal height is reasonable, because a longer baby would be proportionally heavier but not necessarily fatter. In a large prospective cohort study, newborns defined LGA by customized percentiles had a 4-fold increase in risk of severe neonatal morbidity/mortality

AGA	Appropriate for gestational age
BMI	Body mass index
LGA	Large for gestational age

From the Liggins Institute, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

0022-3476/\$ - see front matter. Copyright © 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2015.11.043>

compared with those born macrosomic or defined as LGA by population percentiles.¹⁸

There are issues, however, with customized percentiles. In the aforementioned study,¹⁸ mothers of large babies who were defined as AGA by customized percentiles had a 1.6-fold increase in the overall rate of cesarean delivery. Further, it is important to consider that prepregnancy maternal body mass index (BMI) is likely to be the main predictor of birth weight. Maternal obesity represents the main factor leading to fetal obesity at any maternal height,³¹ and the increasing prevalence of LGA infants mirrors increasing maternal adiposity. As a result, the use of percentiles adjusting for maternal weight may be misguided; if the mother is obese, the adjustment of the baby's weight would be inappropriate because it would likely normalize obesity-driven fetal growth and adiposity. In addition, certain ethnic groups have increased incidences of adult obesity that may contribute to increased size of their babies, and adjustment for ethnicity may lead to the inappropriate classification of newborns. Therefore, moving an LGA infant to an AGA category should not diminish birth-size related pathology, and recent reviews have criticized the substantive support for clinical use of customized percentiles in classifying babies as LGA.³²

Measurement of Adiposity in Babies

Birth weight does not define body composition, an issue critically important in LGA newborns. For more than 3 decades, ponderal index (g/cm^3) has been considered a practical approach to characterize neonatal adiposity,³³ which differs from BMI (kg/m^2) for providing greater adjustment for length and, thus, is a more reliable measure of neonatal adiposity.³⁴ In infants born LGA, ponderal index score was significantly greater than in those born AGA,³⁵⁻³⁷ and a greater ponderal index at birth also has been associated with increased adiposity in childhood.³⁸ Although this index appears easy to perform and inexpensive, its accuracy is limited by the variability in length measurement,^{39,40} and birth length still is not measured routinely in many centers.^{40,41} In addition, ponderal index does not distinguish between fat mass and lean mass and does not clarify which body compartment is overrepresented in LGA babies; indeed, a poor correlation has been shown between ponderal index and fat mass estimated by direct assessments of neonatal body composition.^{34,42,43}

Therefore, in recent years, direct techniques have been proposed to measure neonatal adiposity, such as dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry and air displacement plethysmography.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ These methods consistently have shown increased fat mass in LGA babies compared with AGA babies.^{45,46} Nevertheless, these studies have not estimated body fat distribution, which would help clarify whether greater birth weight is associated with increased central adiposity. Lean and fat mass have been reported differently (as total or percentage mass), which may have created confusion regarding the body composition of LGA infants. Greater adiposity in LGA infants has been found in combination with

an increased lean mass (as absolute values) measured by dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry, consistent with an increased muscularity compared with AGA infants.^{46,47} Specifically, breastfed LGA infants born to mothers without diabetes were found to have greater adiposity at birth and increased muscularity by age 4 months.⁴⁷ Similarly, an increase in lean mass in children born LGA through age 47 months also has been shown.⁴⁸ In other studies, the proportion of lean body mass as a percentage of body weight was lower in LGA babies with greater absolute values of lean mass.^{45,49}

Collectively, these studies of LGA infants suggest an increase in fat mass and often a smaller increase in lean mass, so that percentage body fat is increased, notably in those born to mothers who are obese and or with diabetes⁴⁵; however, more robust studies are needed to clarify the pattern of fat distribution and levels of adiposity in these babies, ideally by using direct methods for assessment of neonatal body composition.

Will a Large Baby Become a Fat Adult with an Increased Cardiometabolic Risk?

There are contradictory long-term outcomes reported in those born LGA for adiposity and cardiometabolic disorders.^{3,50-53} As discussed previously, this contradiction probably reflects subjects from different eras with different environmental factors affecting intrauterine nutrition, neonatal anthropometry, postnatal nutritional exposure, and growth trajectories during infancy and childhood.

Nutrition before conception and during pregnancy plays a fundamental role in influencing maternal weight gain, fetal growth, and neonatal outcomes,⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶ but the evidence is limited in the case of LGA births. A lower prevalence of LGA infants was observed among healthy mothers who followed a low-glycemic diet compared with those assigned to a high-glycemic diet (3.1% vs 33.3%).⁵⁷ Conversely, a randomized controlled trial involving women who had previously delivered a large infant showed that a low-glycemic diet did not reduce incidence of LGA babies,⁵⁸ although there was an associated reduction in gestational weight gain and in the prevalence of gestational diabetes.⁵⁸ Further, a recent meta-analysis showed that dietary interventions in pregnancy were associated with increased birth size (by both weight and length) and reduced incidence of low birth weight, but there was no significant effect on the prevalence of infants born LGA or small for gestational age.⁵⁵ Overall, it is difficult to differentiate the effects of maternal obesity from those of an obesogenic diet on the prevalence of LGA births because both tend to be closely intertwined.⁵⁶

The early postnatal nutritional environment, particularly breastfeeding, also has been suggested to be a modulator of long-term risks of obesity,⁵⁹ which may affect outcomes among those born LGA. Unfortunately, many epidemiologic studies do not report information on feeding practices in infants born LGA, such as data on early infant feeding and age at weaning into solid foods. Breastfeeding is associated with a

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6219180>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6219180>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)