

1 **Birth anthropometry among three Asian ethnic groups in Singapore – new**  
2 **growth charts**

3

4 Sonoko Sensaki<sup>1</sup>, Mao Yinan<sup>3,4</sup>, Agnihotri Biswas<sup>1,2</sup>, Chinnadurai Amutha<sup>1,2</sup>, Zubair Amin<sup>1,2</sup>,  
5 Alex R Cook<sup>3,4</sup>, Jiun Lee<sup>1,2</sup>

6

7 1. Department of Neonatology, National University Health System, Singapore

8 2. Department of Paediatrics, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of  
9 Singapore, Singapore

10 3. Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore and National  
11 University Health System

12 4. Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, National University of Singapore

13

14 The authors report no conflict of interest.

15

16 Corresponding author: Mao Yinan | [maoyinan.jscz@gmail.com](mailto:maoyinan.jscz@gmail.com)

17

18 Word count: 3001

19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Objective**

22 We analyse birth anthropometry of Asian babies and its socioeconomic exposures, develop  
23 gestational age and gender-specific birth anthropometry charts and compare to the widely  
24 used Fenton chart.

25 **Design**

26 Retrospective observational study.

27 **Setting**

28 Department of Neonatology at the National University Hospital in Singapore.

29 **Population or sample**

30 We report data from 52 220 Chinese, Indian and Malay infants, born from 1991-1997 and  
31 from 2010-2017 in Singapore.

32 **Methods**

33 The BW, length and head circumference are each modelled with maternal exposures using  
34 general additive model. Anthropometry charts are built using smoothed centile curve and  
35 compared with Fenton charts using binomial test.

36 **Main outcome measures**

37 BW, head circumference, crown-heel length.

38 **Results**

39 In contrast to the marked differences in birth anthropometry among these ethnic populations,  
40 when exposed to a uniform socioeconomic environment, their intrauterine growth and birth  
41 anthropometry were almost identical. From the gestational age specific anthropometric charts,  
42 until about late prematurity, Asian growth curves, as derived from our cohort, mirrored that  
43 of Fenton's; thereafter, Asian babies showed a marked reduction in growth velocity.

44 **Conclusions**

45 These findings suggest comparative slowing of intrauterine growth among Asian babies  
46 towards term gestation. This phenomenon may be explained by two possible postulations,

47 firstly, restrictive effects of a smaller uterus of shorter Asian women towards term and  
48 secondly, early maturation and senescence of fetoplacental unit among Asians. In clinical  
49 practice the new birth anthropometry charts will more accurately identify true fetal growth  
50 restriction as well as true postnatal growth failure in preterm infants when applied to the  
51 appropriate population.

## 52 **Funding**

53 Singapore Population Health Improvement Centre (NMRC/CG/C026/2017\_NUHS).

## 54 **Keywords**

55 Gestational growth/ Foetal growth/ Anthropometric chart/ Birthweight/ Socioeconomic  
56 disparities/ Maternal health/ Singapore/ Centile curve/ Term gestation/ Quantile regression

57

## 58 **Introduction**

59 Birth anthropometry, especially birth weight (BW), is an important determinant of childhood  
60 and future adult health<sup>1-11</sup>. The developmental origins of health and disease theory posits that  
61 neonates with lower BW are at greater risk of perinatal mortality<sup>12</sup> and chronic conditions in  
62 later life such as type-2 diabetes<sup>1,2</sup>, obesity<sup>3-5</sup>, cardiovascular diseases<sup>6</sup>, hypertension<sup>7,8</sup>,  
63 certain cancers<sup>9</sup>, poor neurocognitive development<sup>10,11</sup>, and mental disorders<sup>13</sup>. Significant  
64 differences in BW and low BW incidence have been found among different countries and  
65 ethnicities<sup>14-16</sup>. Although such differences may be the result of modifiable exposures such as  
66 maternal nutrition<sup>17</sup>, perinatal care<sup>18</sup>, socioeconomic disparities<sup>18</sup>, or smoking<sup>19,20</sup>, some of  
67 the variability may have its origins in genetic differences<sup>21</sup>. Because standard growth charts  
68 were developed in populations in which European ancestry predominates, if these references  
69 are used as norms for babies with non-European ancestry, it is possible that babies of non-  
70 European ancestry that are of normal size for their ethnic heritage may erroneously be  
71 classified as small for gestational age, or as having microcephaly.

72 The three main population centers of Asia—East, South East, and South—which as a group  
73 contain about half of the world’s population, display striking differences in BW: neonates  
74 weigh 3200g in China on average, 2900g in Indonesia, and between 2600g and 2800g in  
75 India<sup>14</sup>. Singapore, a city state off the southern tip of the Malay peninsula, is a microcosm of  
76 Asia as a whole, with a Chinese majority and large minorities of Indians and Malays.  
77 Although there remain socio-economic<sup>22</sup> and health<sup>23</sup> disparities between Singaporeans of  
78 these three ethnic groups, these differences are much less pronounced than between people in  
79 territorial China, India and Singapore’s neighbors in the Malay Archipelago. Singaporean  
80 birth cohorts thus provide two unique opportunities: firstly, a controlled opportunity to  
81 quantify differences in birth anthropometry between East, South East and South Asians, and,

82 secondly, given the high per capita income and excellent health outcomes in Singapore <sup>24</sup>, to  
83 compare norms of birth anthropometry among Asians to international, i.e. European, levels.

84 To this end, we investigated the epidemiology of birth anthropometry of all 52 220 infants  
85 born at Singapore's National University Hospital over the period 1991-1997 and 2010-2017,  
86 with the twin objectives of investigating determinants of birth anthropometry and  
87 investigating differences between local and international growth charts.

88

## 89 **Methods**

### 90 **Population**

91 We extracted information from a database of a birth screening program originally intended to  
92 investigate birth defects<sup>25</sup>. All infants (n = 52 220) born in 1991-1997 and 2010-2017 at  
93 National University Hospital, Singapore were included. The institutional review board  
94 (National Healthcare Group Domain Specific Review Board) approved waiver of informed  
95 consent for the current study as this was a retrospective study using anonymised data (NHG  
96 DSRB Ref: 2018/00389).

### 97 **Birth anthropometry**

98 All birth anthropometry measurements were recorded by trained hospital staff. BW was  
99 measured using calibrated digital weighing scales accurate to the nearest gram. Head  
100 circumference (HC) was measured by using the occipitofrontal circumference with a non-  
101 stretchable measuring tape. Length was measured from the top of the head to the soles of the  
102 feet using a stadiometer to the nearest centimetre. Gestational age was determined by early  
103 ultrasound dating or by last menstrual period. Gender-specific birth anthropometry charts  
104 were constructed for the cohort.

### 105 **Determinants of fetal growth**

106 Trained interviewers collected data using structured questionnaires. The data fields included  
107 household income, maternal education, existing maternal diabetes mellitus (DM), smoking,  
108 alcohol consumption, and coffee intake. Maternal height, blood pressure, and hemoglobin  
109 value were collected from clinical record at delivery. Hypertension was determined as having  
110 a blood pressure greater than 140/90 mmHg. Anaemia was defined as haemoglobin level less

111 than 11 g/dL. Variables for determinants of fetal growth that were available for both cohorts  
112 were gestational age, gender, maternal ethnicity, number of births, birth order and maternal  
113 diabetes. Data on maternal age, height, hypertension, anemia, education, duration of marriage,  
114 household income, smoking, alcohol and coffee intake were available only for 1991-1997  
115 cohort.

## 116 **Statistical analysis**

117 Possible erroneous data entry, measurement, or recording of BW, head circumference and  
118 crown-heel length were excluded from analysis by z score fences with five standard  
119 deviations, after excluding non-positive entries. Based on general medical experience, we  
120 cleaned up covariates outside chosen boundaries by replacing the values with NA to avoid  
121 impact of outliers in analysis: gestational age (<23 or > 42 weeks), maternal age (<10 years),  
122 maternal height (<138 or >200 cm), systolic blood pressure (< 70 or > 250 mm Hg), diastolic  
123 blood pressure (<40 or > 180 mm Hg), haemoglobin level (0 or > 40 g/dL).

124 All statistical analyses were carried out by a trained statistician (one of the authors). For each  
125 response variable (BW, head circumference, crown-heel length), we first fitted general linear  
126 regression model for single covariates (sex of child, maternal race, number of births, birth  
127 order, gestational DM, hypertension, anaemia, household income, maternal education,  
128 smoking, alcohol, daily coffee consumption, coffee consumption during pregnancy, maternal  
129 age, and maternal height), and then compared that with a general additive model with  
130 combined covariates, including gestational age.

131 In the image of Fenton 2013 growth charts<sup>26</sup>, we created growth charts using generalized  
132 additive models for location, scale and shape<sup>27</sup> using the gamlss package in R<sup>28</sup>. We used  
133 natural cubic splines on gestational age and assumed a Gaussian distributional family to

134 produce smoothed estimates of the centile curves at the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, 90<sup>th</sup> and 97<sup>th</sup>  
135 percentiles; this was repeated for different demographic strata (sex and ethnicity). Reference  
136 centile curves for each week of gestational age were derived from the cpeg-gcep website  
137 implementation of the Fenton chart <sup>29</sup>. We tested differences in the aforementioned centiles  
138 of BW, head circumference and birth length at each gestational week between the two  
139 cohorts. Specifically, the measurement corresponding to a given Fenton centile was used to  
140 classify the Singapore data as above or below target, and the Fenton centile used as the  
141 hypothesized proportion below target for the Singapore data in a binomial test.

142



143 **Results**

144 Baseline characteristics are presented in Table 1. Participants in combined cohort included 25  
145 017 female (48%) and 27 203 male (52%) births, which is in accordance with the elevated  
146 sex ratio at birth in Singapore<sup>30</sup>. The ethnic breakdown consisted of 22 248 Chinese (43%),  
147 16 006 Malay (31%), 8 543 Indian (16%) and 5 423 of other races (10%). Based on either the  
148 1991-1997 cohort or combined cohort, Figure 1a presents mean BW by demographics, parity,  
149 maternal comorbidities, and risk factors [analyses for length (Figure 1b) and HC (Figure  
150 1c)]. In the combined cohort, mean BW was 3103g (95% CI: 3096, 3109), 3075g (95% CI:  
151 3067, 3083) and 3052g (95% CI: 3041, 3062), for Chinese, Malays and Indians, respectively.  
152 Maternal education and household income were associated with birth anthropometry in a  
153 gradient-dependent manner. Babies born to mothers with university education were likely to  
154 be heavier by 109g (95% CI 89, 130) as compared to mothers with primary education.  
155 Similarly, there was a difference of 91g (95% CI 74, 108) in mean BW between children  
156 whose households had an income more than \$3000 as compared to ones below \$1500. In  
157 univariate analysis, maternal ethnicity, birth order, household income, maternal education,  
158 age, height, DM, hypertension, anaemia, smoking, alcohol, were all associated with BW, HC,  
159 and length (Figure 1).

160 Table 2 shows the results of univariate and multivariate analysis for the association between  
161 each determinant factor and birth measurements. Based on combined cohort and after  
162 adjustment for confounders, Malay and Indian babies were slightly lighter than Chinese (by -  
163 22g, 95% CI: -30, -14 for Malay, by -33g, 95% CI: -42, -23 for Indian). Boys were heavier  
164 than girls (by 107g, 95% CI 100, 113). Multiple births had lower BW than singletons (-320g,  
165 95% CI: -343, -298). Increasing birth order was associated with higher BW. Babies in 2010-  
166 2017 cohort were heavier than 1991-1997 cohort (by 12g, 95%CI: 5, 19). Mothers with

167 gestational DM have heavier babies (by 97g, 95% CI: 86, 107), but hypertension and anaemia  
168 were not significantly associated with BW after adjustment. Mothers who smoked during  
169 pregnancy had infants with lower BW than those who never smoked (by -116g; 95% CI: -180,  
170 -51). There was no significant difference in BW between mothers who were ex- or non-  
171 smokers. Mothers with alcohol and coffee intake did not show significant differences in their  
172 children's BW. BW increased by 135g (95% CI:125,145) for every additional 10cm in  
173 maternal height. Similar to BW, our cohort's length and HC had statistically significant  
174 association with ethnicity, sex, number of births, birth order, DM, household income,  
175 maternal education, height, and smoking (Table 2).

176 Growth charts for BW, length and HC from the combined cohort constructed using quantile  
177 regression are presented in Figure 2 alongside the comparable quantiles from the Fenton  
178 study. There was a striking similarity in the distributions of the three anthropometrics among  
179 ours and Fenton's data up to gestational age of 37 weeks. However, after 37 weeks, these  
180 trajectories diverged markedly, with statistically significant differences between all five  
181 reference quantiles (3<sup>rd</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, median, 90<sup>th</sup>, 97<sup>th</sup>). These deviations were more pronounced in  
182 the higher reference quantiles (97<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup>) as compared to lower ones (10<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>). These  
183 deviations cannot be solely explained by the fact that Fenton charts were likely smoothed  
184 beyond the term gestation to match postnatal growth. In particular, the growth velocity of  
185 babies in our cohort decelerates starting around 36 weeks gestation as they approach term  
186 compared to the analogous Fenton data. Until about late prematurity growth curves from our  
187 cohort mirror that of Fenton's signifying similar rate and magnitude of intrauterine growth  
188 between European and Asian babies.

189

190 **Discussion**

191 **Main Findings**

192 Our study presents the relationship between birth anthropometry and its contributing factors  
193 among three ethnic groups in Singapore using birth cohort data from 1991-1997 and 2010-  
194 2017. It is important to establish ethnic differences in birth anthropometry because these  
195 parameters are often used to judge the status of maternal and child health in the community.

196 Racial differences in BW, incidence of low BW babies and prematurity rates have been  
197 demonstrated in the United States<sup>31</sup>. Although this particular study argued against the  
198 influence of genetic factors governing lower BW among American-born blacks compared to  
199 African-born blacks and believed social and maternal health factors were responsible for the  
200 observed differences, a large cohort of over 10 million births demonstrated that BW and  
201 neonatal mortality among non-Hispanic whites and Hispanics were similar but non-Hispanic  
202 blacks had significantly lower BW and higher neonatal mortality<sup>32</sup>. This effect cannot be  
203 explained by socioeconomic and environmental influence alone. In the Asian context, a  
204 WHO study<sup>14</sup> showed marked difference in BW among ethnic Chinese, Indian and  
205 Indonesian populations residing in their country of origin. Our findings concur with the claim,  
206 as the differences in BW between Singapore's three main ethnicities in the combined cohort  
207 were significant (though of a small magnitude), with Indians and Malays being lighter than  
208 Chinese (by -33g, 95% CI: -42, -23, by -22, 95% CI: -30, -14 respectively) after controlling  
209 for important confounders (sex of child, number of births, birth order, diabetes) . Interestingly,  
210 the difference among ethnicities was not apparent in 1991 – 1997 cohort, with Indians  
211 showing marginally lower BW than Chinese (-27g, 95% CI: -48, -6) and there was no  
212 difference between Chinese and Malays before adjustment. After controlling for important  
213 confounders, there were no significant difference between Chinese and Indians, and only

214 small difference (+40g, 95% CI: 26, 53) between Malays and Chinese. As a result, one may  
215 postulate that the large reported difference in birth anthropometry between these three Asian  
216 ethnicities in their country of origin <sup>14</sup> were due to environmental factors including  
217 socioeconomic status (SES) and perinatal care rather than genetic factors.

218 Consistent with previous research <sup>18,33–37</sup>, we found BW to be associated with maternal height,  
219 household income, maternal education, smoking during pregnancy, existing DM and parity.  
220 These remained significant after adjustment in multivariate models. After adjusting for  
221 confounders, household income and maternal education were independently associated with  
222 birth anthropometry even in a high-income country like Singapore (1991 per capita GDP of  
223 ~USD15 000 ranked Singapore 24<sup>th</sup> highest in the world <sup>38</sup>). Other SES-related factors which  
224 were not studied here such as maternal nutrition, psychosocial health, workload, and perinatal  
225 care might also mediate the relationship between SES and birth anthropometry.

## 226 **Interpretation**

227 BW at term in our population was substantially lower than international standards (e.g.,  
228 female infant at 40 weeks with a BW at 50<sup>th</sup> percentile: Fenton 3415g, Singapore 3220g)  
229 despite Singapore's generally excellent maternal and child health indicators and  
230 socioeconomic standing. Our growth curves for the distribution of birth anthropometrics  
231 (Figure 2) showed that, until 37 weeks gestational age, Asian babies grew in a remarkably  
232 similar fashion as those reported in the seminal Fenton charts but there was a significant and  
233 marked divergence after this. This may suggest the initiation of growth restriction at a  
234 consistent point in gestation in this cohort. We postulate that this restriction from the  
235 gestational age of 37 weeks may result from anatomical constraints due to the generally  
236 smaller Asian height, pelvic and uterine size. This postulation is supported by previous  
237 studies that indicated the shorter average gestational length by 1 week in Asian than Western

238 pregnancies<sup>39,40</sup>, and the shorter gestation associated with shorter maternal height<sup>33,41–43</sup>. The  
239 shorter gestational length in Asian pregnancies is plausibly explained by the earlier  
240 maturation and senescence of the feto-placental unit in relation to maternal pelvic size<sup>33,41–43</sup>  
241 or a shorter cervical length<sup>44</sup>. These findings may suggest that Asian normal gestational  
242 length might be shorter than that of European mothers as an evolutionary adaptation to  
243 smaller size. If it is indeed true that gestational length is race or ethnicity specific—a  
244 hypothesis that deserves further evaluation—we may need to change the definition of “term  
245 gestation” using ethnic-specific cut-off points. This proposal would potentially affect our  
246 clinical management, including the timing of delivery, classification of prematurity as well as  
247 perinatal management individualised to race or ethnicity. Separately our new birth  
248 anthropometry charts will impact clinical practice by more accurately defining normality in  
249 BW, length and head circumference. For example bedside glucose screening rates for at-risk  
250 infants will likely change as there would be fewer babies being labelled as small-for-  
251 gestational age (SGA)<sup>45–47</sup>. Surveillance for microcephaly was one key clinical characteristic  
252 used for detection of congenital Zika infection. Local HC charts would be needed for such a  
253 purpose<sup>48–50</sup>. Postnatal growth failure (PNGF), defined as a body weight below the 10<sup>th</sup>  
254 percentile or a temporal weight loss of more than 1 or 2 standard deviation (SD) after birth, is  
255 seen commonly in infants born very preterm and affects their future neurodevelopment<sup>51,52</sup>.  
256 The use of growth charts appropriate for a particular population is thus useful for timely  
257 identification of PNGF and applying early nutritional intervention<sup>53–55</sup>.

## 258 **Strengths and Limitations**

259 The strength of this study lies in the availability of a detailed and accurate database which  
260 allowed the examination of population data of three major Asian ethnicities. A comparatively  
261 uniform exposure to socioeconomic, cultural and healthcare influences of developed world

262 standards allowed a level playing field for both inter-ethnic comparisons. This model  
263 provided a unique opportunity to unmask influences of genetic potential on fetal growth  
264 without being heavily confounded by external factors. A wide range of prenatal and perinatal  
265 determinants of fetal growth such as socio-economic status and maternal lifestyle factors  
266 (smoking, alcohol, and coffee intake) could be studied, variables which are sometimes not  
267 accurately captured in big population-based studies.

268 Our cohorts from 1991–97 and 2010–17 allow comparison to the original cohort used to  
269 develop the widely used Fenton chart (of 1991–2007, and revised in 2013<sup>26</sup>). Biological  
270 factors may not have changed much in the 2 decades that separate our 2 cohorts. However,  
271 SES, health care practices, management of high-risk pregnancy and maternal behavior have  
272 changed over the last two decades in Singapore. Some studies have demonstrated improving  
273 socioeconomic environment as well as increased maternal Body Mass Index (BMI),  
274 gestational weight gain, increased maternal height, less maternal smoking during pregnancy,  
275 and higher maternal education level to be responsible for progressive increase in BW<sup>56–60</sup>.  
276 Contrary to this, several developed countries have reported a progressive decline in BW  
277 among the 21<sup>st</sup> century babies<sup>59–61</sup>. This is likely multifactorial and possible causes could be  
278 attributable to changes in obstetric practices, increased proportion of pregnancies with  
279 maternal comorbidities and changes in maternal demographics resulting in earlier births and  
280 smaller babies<sup>59–61</sup>. The adjusted differences in BW, length and head circumference were  
281 small but significantly different between our 2 cohorts, with the newer cohort being slightly  
282 larger. We are currently comparing more detailed data between the 2 cohorts to unravel the  
283 underlying reasons.

284 **Conclusion**

285 This study of birth anthropometry and its contributing factors among three Asian ethnic  
286 groups in Singapore showed that, contrary to published data, the three main maternal  
287 ethnicities among our population did not appear to be a strong predictor of birth  
288 anthropometry after controlling for other determinants like health, education and  
289 socioeconomic demographics. We also detected an apparent slowing of intrauterine growth  
290 velocity after 37 weeks gestation when comparing with international standards (Fenton), and  
291 as such the latter growth charts may not be appropriate for Singaporeans and perhaps Asians  
292 in general. We postulate that this observed apparent growth restriction in our cohort during  
293 the later weeks of pregnancy may be due to small Asian uterine and pelvic size, and early  
294 maturation and senescence of the fetoplacental unit. Thus as a developmental adaptation, the  
295 normal Asian gestational length may well be slightly shorter than that in ethnic Europeans.  
296 Our data from a defined geopolitical area with stable racial and ethnic demography exposed  
297 to relatively uniform and high quality health, nutrition, socioeconomic factors forms an  
298 important baseline for future studies on developmental origins of health and diseases as well  
299 as for studying intergenerational trends. Our new growth charts allow more accurate  
300 determination of abnormality in birth size for the Asian population and has the potential to  
301 bring about better patient care practices.

## 302 **Acknowledgement**

303 This research is supported by the Singapore Ministry of Health's National Medical Research  
304 Council under the Centre Grant Programme: Singapore Population Health Improvement  
305 Centre (NMRC/CG/C026/2017\_NUHS).

## 306 **Disclosure of Interests**

307 All authors declare no conflict of interests.

308 **Contribution to Authorship**

309 LJ proposed the original concept and designed the study. LJ, SS, CA and ZA acquired the  
310 data. MYN and AC performed the statistical analysis. SS, AC, LJ, AB, ZA and MYN  
311 provided input on study design, analysed and interpreted the data. SS, AC and LJ drafted the  
312 manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the submitted manuscript.

313 **Details of Ethics Approval**

314 The National Healthcare Group Domain Specific Review Board (DSRB) approved the study  
315 (DSRB Reference: 2018/00389 valid till 6 May 2022).

316



317 **References**

- 318 1. Rich-Edwards JW, Colditz GA, Stampfer MJ, et al. Birthweight and the risk for type  
319 2 diabetes mellitus in adult women. *Ann Intern Med.* 1999;130(4 Pt 1):278-284.
- 320 2. Hovi P, Andersson S, Eriksson JG, et al. Glucose regulation in young adults with very  
321 low birth weight. *N Engl J Med.* 2007;356(20):2053-2063. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa067187
- 322 3. Oken E, Gillman MW. Fetal origins of obesity. *Obes Res.* 2003;11(4):496-506.  
323 doi:10.1038/oby.2003.69
- 324 4. Jeffery AN, Metcalf BS, Hosking J, Murphy MJ, Voss LD, Wilkin TJ. Little Evidence  
325 for Early Programming of Weight and Insulin Resistance for Contemporary Children:  
326 EarlyBird Diabetes Study Report 19. *Pediatrics.* 2006;118(3):1118-1123.  
327 doi:10.1542/peds.2006-0740
- 328 5. Gillman MW, Rifas-Shiman S, Berkey CS, Field AE, Colditz GA. Maternal  
329 gestational diabetes, birth weight, and adolescent obesity. *Pediatrics.* 2003;111(3):e221-226.
- 330 6. Rich-Edwards JW, Stampfer MJ, Manson JE, et al. Birth weight and risk of  
331 cardiovascular disease in a cohort of women followed up since 1976. *BMJ.*  
332 1997;315(7105):396-400.
- 333 7. Sipola-Leppänen M, Karvonen R, Tikanmäki M, et al. Ambulatory blood pressure  
334 and its variability in adults born preterm. *Hypertension.* 2015;65(3):615-621.  
335 doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.114.04717
- 336 8. Loos RJ, Fagard R, Beunen G, Derom C, Vlietinck R. Birth weight and blood  
337 pressure in young adults: a prospective twin study. *Circulation.* 2001;104(14):1633-1638.
- 338 9. Ahlgren M, Wohlfahrt J, Olsen LW, Sørensen TIA, Melbye M. Birth weight and risk  
339 of cancer. *Cancer.* 2007;110(2):412-419. doi:10.1002/cncr.22773
- 340 10. Richards M, Hardy R, Kuh D, Wadsworth ME. Birth weight and cognitive function in  
341 the British 1946 birth cohort: longitudinal population based study. *BMJ.*  
342 2001;322(7280):199-203.
- 343 11. Stein REK, Siegel MJ, Bauman LJ. Are children of moderately low birth weight at  
344 increased risk for poor health? A new look at an old question. *Pediatrics.* 2006;118(1):217-  
345 223. doi:10.1542/peds.2005-2836
- 346 12. McIntire DD, Bloom SL, Casey BM, Leveno KJ. Birth weight in relation to morbidity  
347 and mortality among newborn infants. *N Engl J Med.* 1999;340(16):1234-1238.  
348 doi:10.1056/NEJM199904223401603
- 349 13. Abel KM, Wicks S, Susser ES, et al. Birth weight, schizophrenia, and adult mental  
350 disorder: is risk confined to the smallest babies? *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2010;67(9):923-930.  
351 doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2010.100
- 352 14. Kelly A, Kevany J, de Onis M, Shah PM. A WHO Collaborative Study of Maternal  
353 Anthropometry and Pregnancy Outcomes. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet.* 1996;53(3):219-233.
- 354 15. Kleinman JC, Kessel SS. Racial differences in low birth weight. Trends and risk  
355 factors. *N Engl J Med.* 1987;317(12):749-753. doi:10.1056/NEJM198709173171207
- 356 16. Anderson JG, Rogers EE, Baer RJ, et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Preterm  
357 Infant Mortality and Severe Morbidity: A Population-Based Study. *Neonatology.*  
358 2018;113(1):44-54. doi:10.1159/000480536
- 359 17. Black RE, Allen LH, Bhutta ZA, et al. Maternal and child undernutrition: global and  
360 regional exposures and health consequences. *Lancet.* 2008;371(9608):243-260.  
361 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61690-0
- 362 18. Kramer MS, Séguin L, Lydon J, Goulet L. Socio-economic disparities in pregnancy  
363 outcome: why do the poor fare so poorly? *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol.* 2000;14(3):194-210.
- 364 19. Brooke OG, Anderson HR, Bland JM, Peacock JL, Stewart CM. Effects on birth  
365 weight of smoking, alcohol, caffeine, socioeconomic factors, and psychosocial stress. *BMJ.*  
366 1989;298(6676):795-801.

- 367 20. Wang X, Zuckerman B, Pearson C, et al. Maternal cigarette smoking, metabolic gene  
368 polymorphism, and infant birth weight. *JAMA*. 2002;287(2):195-202.
- 369 21. Mallia T, Grech A, Hili A, Calleja-Agius J, Pace NP. Genetic determinants of low  
370 birth weight. *Minerva Ginecol*. 2017;69(6):631-643. doi:10.23736/S0026-4784.17.04050-3
- 371 22. Lee WKM. The economic marginality of ethnic minorities: an analysis of ethnic  
372 income inequality in Singapore. *Asian Ethn*. 2004;5(1):27-41.  
373 doi:10.1080/1463136032000168880
- 374 23. Lim RBT, Zheng H, Yang Q, Cook AR, Chia KS, Lim WY. Ethnic and gender  
375 specific life expectancies of the Singapore population, 1965 to 2009 – converging, or  
376 diverging? *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13(1):1012. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-1012
- 377 24. GBD 2017 Disease and Injury Incidence and Prevalence Collaborators. Global,  
378 regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases  
379 and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the Global  
380 Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet*. 2018;392(10159):1789-1858. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
381 6736(18)32279-7
- 382 25. Tan KL, Chia HP. Congenital Anomalies in Singapore. *Congenit Anom*.  
383 1996;36(2):57-64. doi:10.1111/j.1741-4520.1996.tb00621.x
- 384 26. Fenton TR, Kim JH. A systematic review and meta-analysis to revise the Fenton  
385 growth chart for preterm infants. *BMC Pediatr*. 2013;13:59. doi:10.1186/1471-2431-13-59
- 386 27. Rigby RA, Stasinopoulos DM. Generalized additive models for location, scale and  
387 shape. :48.
- 388 28. R Core Development Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical*  
389 *Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2019. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 390 29. PediTools. *Fenton 2013 Growth Calculator for Preterm Infants*.  
391 <https://peditools.org/fenton2013/>
- 392 30. Chao F, Gerland P, Cook AR, Alkema L. Systematic assessment of the sex ratio at  
393 birth for all countries and estimation of national imbalances and regional reference levels.  
394 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2019;116(19):9303-9311. doi:10.1073/pnas.1812593116
- 395 31. David RJ, Collins JW. Differing Birth Weight among Infants of U.S.-Born Blacks,  
396 African-Born Blacks, and U.S.-Born Whites. *N Engl J Med*. 1997;337(17):1209-1214.  
397 doi:10.1056/NEJM199710233371706
- 398 32. Alexander GR, Kogan M, Bader D, Carlo W, Allen M, Mor J. US Birth  
399 Weight/Gestational Age-Specific Neonatal Mortality: 1995–1997 Rates for Whites,  
400 Hispanics, and Blacks. *Pediatrics*. 2003;111(1):e61-e66. doi:10.1542/peds.111.1.e61
- 401 33. Ozaltin E, Hill K, Subramanian SV. Association of maternal stature with offspring  
402 mortality, underweight, and stunting in low- to middle-income countries. *JAMA*.  
403 2010;303(15):1507-1516. doi:10.1001/jama.2010.450
- 404 34. Kim SY, Sharma AJ, Sappenfield W, Wilson HG, Salihu HM. Association of  
405 maternal body mass index, excessive weight gain, and gestational diabetes mellitus with  
406 large-for-gestational-age births. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2014;123(4):737-744.  
407 doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000000177
- 408 35. Shankaran S, Das A, Bauer CR, et al. Association between patterns of maternal  
409 substance use and infant birth weight, length, and head circumference. *Pediatrics*.  
410 2004;114(2):e226-234.
- 411 36. Mills JL, Graubard BI, Harley EE, Rhoads GG, Berendes HW. Maternal alcohol  
412 consumption and birth weight. How much drinking during pregnancy is safe? *JAMA*.  
413 1984;252(14):1875-1879.
- 414 37. Hinkle SN, Albert PS, Mendola P, et al. The association between parity and  
415 birthweight in a longitudinal consecutive pregnancy cohort. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*.  
416 2014;28(2):106-115. doi:10.1111/ppe.12099

- 417 38. World Bank. *The World Bank Database*. <http://www.worldbank.org>
- 418 39. Patel RR, Steer P, Doyle P, Little MP, Elliott P. Does gestation vary by ethnic group?  
419 A London-based study of over 122,000 pregnancies with spontaneous onset of labour. *Int J*  
420 *Epidemiol.* 2004;33(1):107-113. doi:10.1093/ije/dyg238
- 421 40. Savitz DA. Commentary: Ethnic differences in gestational age exist, but are they  
422 'normal'? *Int J Epidemiol.* 2004;33(1):114-115. doi:10.1093/ije/dyh041
- 423 41. Derraik J, Savage T, Hofman P, Cutfield W. Shorter mothers have shorter  
424 pregnancies. *Int J Pediatr Endocrinol.* 2015;2015(Suppl 1):P109. doi:10.1186/1687-9856-  
425 2015-S1-P109
- 426 42. Myklestad K, Vatten LJ, Magnussen EB, Salvesen KÅ, Romundstad PR. Do parental  
427 heights influence pregnancy length?: a population-based prospective study, HUNT 2. *BMC*  
428 *Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2013;13:33. doi:10.1186/1471-2393-13-33
- 429 43. Zhang G, Bacelis J, Lengyel C, et al. Assessing the Causal Relationship of Maternal  
430 Height on Birth Size and Gestational Age at Birth: A Mendelian Randomization Analysis.  
431 *PLoS Med.* 2015;12(8):e1001865. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001865
- 432 44. Gagel CK, Rafael TJ, Berghella V. Is short stature associated with short cervical  
433 length? *Am J Perinatol.* 2010;27(9):691-695. doi:10.1055/s-0030-1253100
- 434 45. Mejri A, Dorval VG, Nuyt AM, Carceller A. Hypoglycemia in term newborns with a  
435 birth weight below the 10th percentile. *Paediatr Child Health.* 2010;15(5):271-275.  
436 doi:10.1093/pch/15.5.271
- 437 46. Adamkin DH, Committee on Fetus and Newborn. Postnatal Glucose Homeostasis in  
438 Late-Preterm and Term Infants. *Pediatrics.* 2011;127(3):575-579. doi:10.1542/peds.2010-  
439 3851
- 440 47. Abali S, Beken S, Albayrak E, et al. Neonatal Problems and Infancy Growth of Term  
441 SGA Infants: Does "SGA" Definition Need to Be Re-evaluated? *Front Pediatr.*  
442 2021;9:660111. doi:10.3389/fped.2021.660111
- 443 48. Heukelbach J, Werneck GL. Surveillance of Zika virus infection and microcephaly in  
444 Brazil. *The Lancet.* 2016;388(10047):846-847. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30931-X
- 445 49. Ho ZJM, Hapuarachchi HC, Barkham T, et al. Outbreak of Zika virus infection in  
446 Singapore: an epidemiological, entomological, virological, and clinical analysis. *Lancet*  
447 *Infect Dis.* 2017;17(8):813-821. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30249-9
- 448 50. Harville EW, Tong VT, Gilboa SM, et al. Measurement of Head Circumference:  
449 Implications for Microcephaly Surveillance in Zika-Affected Areas. *Trop Med Infect Dis.*  
450 2020;6(1):5. doi:10.3390/tropicalmed6010005
- 451 51. Latal-Hajnal B, von Siebenthal K, Kovari H, Bucher HU, Largo RH. Postnatal growth  
452 in VLBW infants: significant association with neurodevelopmental outcome. *J Pediatr.*  
453 2003;143(2):163-170. doi:10.1067/S0022-3476(03)00243-9
- 454 52. Peila C, Spada E, Giuliani F, et al. Extrauterine Growth Restriction: Definitions and  
455 Predictability of Outcomes in a Cohort of Very Low Birth Weight Infants or Preterm  
456 Neonates. *Nutrients.* 2020;12(5):1224. doi:10.3390/nu12051224
- 457 53. Cole TJ, Statnikov Y, Santhakumaran S, Pan H, Modi N, on behalf of the Neonatal  
458 Data Analysis Unit and the Preterm Growth Investigator Group. Birth weight and  
459 longitudinal growth in infants born below 32 weeks' gestation: a UK population study. *Arch*  
460 *Dis Child - Fetal Neonatal Ed.* 2014;99(1):F34-F40. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2012-303536
- 461 54. Andrews ET, Ashton JJ, Pearson F, Beattie RM, Johnson MJ. Early postnatal growth  
462 failure in preterm infants is not inevitable. *Arch Dis Child - Fetal Neonatal Ed.*  
463 2019;104(3):F235-F241. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2018-315082
- 464 55. Lee LY, Lee J, Niduvaje K, Seah SS, Atmawidjaja RW, Cheah F. Nutritional  
465 therapies in the neonatal intensive care unit and postnatal growth outcomes of preterm very  
466 low birthweight Asian infants. *J Paediatr Child Health.* 2020;56(3):400-407.

467 doi:10.1111/jpc.14634

468 56. Power C. National trends in birth weight: implications for future adult disease. *BMJ*.  
469 1994;308(6939):1270-1271. doi:10.1136/bmj.308.6939.1270

470 57. Ananth CV, Wen SW. Trends in fetal growth among singleton gestations in the  
471 United States and Canada, 1985 through 1998. *Semin Perinatol*. 2002;26(4):260-267.

472 58. Fok TF, So HK, Wong E, et al. Updated gestational age specific birth weight, crown-  
473 heel length, and head circumference of Chinese newborns. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed*.  
474 2003;88(3):F229-236.

475 59. Donahue SMA, Kleinman KP, Gillman MW, Oken E. Trends in birth weight and  
476 gestational length among singleton term births in the United States: 1990-2005. *Obstet*  
477 *Gynecol*. 2010;115(2 Pt 1):357-364. doi:10.1097/AOG.0b013e3181cbd5f5

478 60. Oken E. Secular trends in birthweight. *Nestle Nutr Inst Workshop Ser*. 2013;71:103-  
479 114. doi:10.1159/000342576

480 61. Catov JM, Lee M, Roberts JM, Xu J, Simhan HN. Race Disparities and Decreasing  
481 Birth Weight: Are All Babies Getting Smaller? *Am J Epidemiol*. 2016;183(1):15-23.

482 doi:10.1093/aje/kwv194

483

484

485 **Table 1: Basic characteristics of the study population (1991-1997 cohort n = 21 897, combined cohort n =**  
 486 **52 220).** Gestational age is defined as follows: Extremely preterm: to 27<sup>6</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks, Very preterm: 28<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub> to 31<sup>6</sup>/<sub>7</sub>  
 487 weeks, Moderately preterm: 32<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub> to 33<sup>6</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks, Late preterm: 34<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub> to 36<sup>6</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks, Early term: 37<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks to  
 488 38<sup>6</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks, Full term: 39<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks to 40<sup>6</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks, Late term: 41<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks to 41<sup>6</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks, Post term: 42<sup>0</sup>/<sub>7</sub> weeks  
 489 and beyond.

	1991-1997 cohort		Combined cohort	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Sex of child</b>				
Female	10319	47%	25017	48%
Male	11578	53%	27203	52%
<b>Maternal race</b>				
Chinese	10485	48%	22248	43%
Indian	2811	13%	8543	16%
Malay	7621	35%	16006	31%
Others	980	4%	5423	10%
<b>Gestational term</b>				
Extremely preterm	31	0%	122	0%
Very preterm	166	1%	428	1%
Moderately preterm	214	1%	475	1%
Late preterm	1368	6%	3506	7%
Early term	6523	30%	18593	36%
Full term	10931	50%	25040	48%
Late term	2128	10%	3393	6%
Post-term	536	2%	663	1%
<b>Maternal age group</b>				
<26	4216	19%		
26~30	8486	39%		
31~35	6729	31%		
>35	2466	11%		
<b>Maternal height group</b>				
<151	3555	16%		
151~155	6606	30%		
156~160	7395	34%		
>160	4341	20%		
<b>Household income</b>				
<\$1500	6092	28%		
\$1500~\$3000	7170	33%		
>\$3000	8635	39%		

490

491

492 **Table 2: Multivariate analysis of the association between birth anthropometry and determinant factors in**  
 493 **Singapore (1991-1997 cohort n = 21 897 in the upper part of table and marked with \*, combined cohort n**  
 494 **= 52 220 in the lower part of table).** Adjusted models account for gestational age using multivariate general  
 495 additive model. In 1991-1997 cohort, model is adjusted for sex of child, number of births, birth order, maternal  
 496 race, and diabetes, the effects of which are omitted. CI: confidential interval. Differences significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$   
 497 are highlighted in bold.

	BW difference (g) (95% CI)	Adjusted BW difference (g) (95% CI)	Birth length difference (cm) (95% CI)	Adjusted Birth length difference (cm) (95% CI)	Head circumference difference (cm) (95% CI)	Adjusted Head circumference difference (cm) (95% CI)
<b>Hypertension*</b>						
No	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	<b>-89 (-107, -72)</b>	-13 (-27, 1)	<b>-0.4 (-0.5, -0.3)</b>	-0.1 (-0.1, 0.0)	<b>-0.2 (-0.2, -0.1)</b>	0.0 (-0.1, 0.0)
<b>Haemoglobin*</b>						
Non-anemia	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Anemia	<b>-37 (-51, -23)</b>	-10 (-21, 1)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.1, 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.1, 0.0)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.0)
<b>Household income in Singapore dollar* (1SGD <math>\approx</math> 0.74USD)</b>						
>\$3000	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
<\$1500	<b>-91(-108, -74)</b>	<b>-27 (-45, -9)</b>	<b>-0.6 (-0.7, -0.5)</b>	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.0)	<b>-0.3 (-0.4, -0.3)</b>	<b>-0.1 (-0.2, -0.1)</b>
\$1500~\$3000	<b>-53 (-69, -37)</b>	<b>-16 (-31, -1)</b>	<b>-0.4 (-0.4, -0.3)</b>	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.0)	<b>-0.2 (-0.2, -0.1)</b>	-0.1 (-0.1, 0.0)
<b>Maternal education*</b>						
Primary school	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
O Level (1/2 subjects)	<b>34 (7, 60)</b>	-5 (-25, 16)	<b>0.2 (0.1, 0.3)</b>	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)	<b>0.1 (0.0, 0.2)</b>	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)
O Level (>3 subjects)	<b>42 (25, 59)</b>	12 (-3, 27)	<b>0.2 (0.1, 0.3)</b>	0.1 (0.0, 0.1)	<b>0.2 (0.1, 0.2)</b>	<b>0.1 (0.0, 0.1)</b>
A Level	<b>72 (47, 96)</b>	14 (-7, 36)	<b>0.5 (0.3, 0.6)</b>	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	<b>0.2 (0.1, 0.3)</b>	0.1 (0.0, 0.1)
Polytechnic/ Teachers' College	<b>79 (46, 111)</b>	<b>29 (1, 57)</b>	<b>0.5 (0.3, 0.7)</b>	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	<b>0.2 (0.1, 0.3)</b>	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)
Tertiary education	<b>109 (89, 130)</b>	<b>33 (12, 54)</b>	<b>0.7 (0.6, 0.8)</b>	<b>0.1 (0.0, 0.2)</b>	<b>0.4 (0.3, 0.4)</b>	<b>0.1 (0.1, 0.2)</b>
<b>Smoking*</b>						
No	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Ex-smoker	-51 (-141, 39)	-66 (-141, 9)	-0.3 (-0.7, 0.2)	<b>-0.5 (-0.9, -0.1)</b>	-0.1 (-0.4, 0.2)	-0.2 (-0.4, 0.1)
Yes	<b>-163 (-237, -89)</b>	<b>-116 (-180, -51)</b>	<b>-0.8 (-1.2, -0.5)</b>	<b>-0.5 (-0.8, -0.2)</b>	<b>-0.4 (-0.6, -0.2)</b>	<b>-0.3 (-0.5, -0.1)</b>
<b>Alcohol*</b>						
No	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Social	<b>81 (24, 138)</b>	36 (-10, 83)	<b>0.5 (0.2, 0.8)</b>	0.2 (0.0, 0.4)	<b>0.3 (0.1, 0.5)</b>	0.2 (0.0, 0.4)
Regular	18 (-161, 197)	-8 (-153, 137)	-0.2 (-1.1, 0.7)	-0.2 (-0.9, 0.5)	0.1 (-0.5, 0.6)	0.1 (-0.4, 0.6)
<b>Coffee /day*</b>						



0	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
1	<b>24 (8, 40)</b>	2 (-17, 20)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)	0.1 (0.0, 0.1)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)
2	<b>39 (14, 64)</b>	5 (-19, 28)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.2)	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.00 (-0.1, 0.1)
>=3	26 (-8, 60)	-7 (-36, 22)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.2)	0.0 (-0.2, 0.1)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)
Coffee in pregnancy*						
No	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	<b>25 (10, 40)</b>	-5 (-24, 13)	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.0)	0.1 (0.0, 0.1)	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)
Duration married*						
/10y increase	<b>96 (79, 112)</b>	-5 (-24, 14)	<b>0.2 (0.1, 0.3)</b>	0.0 (-0.1, 0.1)	<b>0.4 (0.3, 0.4)</b>	0.0 (0.0, 0.1)
Maternal age*						
/10y increase	<b>60 (47, 74)</b>	<b>39 (24, 53)</b>	<b>0.3 (0.2, 0.3)</b>	<b>0.2 (0.1, 0.3)</b>	<b>0.3 (0.2, 0.3)</b>	<b>0.2 (0.1, 0.2)</b>
Maternal height*						
/10cm increase	<b>129 (118, 141)</b>	<b>135 (125, 145)</b>	<b>0.7 (0.7, 0.8)</b>	<b>0.7 (0.6, 0.7)</b>	<b>0.3 (0.3, 0.4)</b>	<b>0.3 (0.3, 0.4)</b>
Sex of child						
Female	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Male	<b>88 (79, 96)</b>	<b>107 (100, 113)</b>	<b>0.53 (0.48, 0.58)</b>	<b>0.63 (0.59, 0.66)</b>	<b>0.39 (0.36, 0.42)</b>	<b>0.44 (0.41, 0.46)</b>
Number of births						
1	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
>1	<b>-791 (-818, -764)</b>	<b>-320 (-343, -298)</b>	<b>-3.91 (-4.06, -3.77)</b>	<b>-1.54 (-1.65, -1.42)</b>	<b>-1.38 (-1.47, -1.29)</b>	<b>-0.28 (-0.36, -0.20)</b>
Birth order						
1	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
2	<b>58 (48, 68)</b>	<b>79 (71, 87)</b>	<b>0.07 (0.01, 0.12)</b>	<b>0.20 (0.16, 0.24)</b>	<b>0.22 (0.18, 0.25)</b>	<b>0.29 (0.26, 0.32)</b>
3	<b>86 (73, 98)</b>	<b>109 (99, 119)</b>	-0.05 (-0.12, 0.02)	<b>0.26 (0.20, 0.31)</b>	<b>0.22 (0.17, 0.26)</b>	<b>0.39 (0.35, 0.42)</b>
>3	<b>54 (35, 72)</b>	<b>123 (108, 137)</b>	<b>-0.22 (-0.32, -0.12)</b>	<b>0.34 (0.26, 0.42)</b>	<b>0.17 (0.11, 0.23)</b>	<b>0.44 (0.38, 0.49)</b>
Maternal race						
Chinese	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Indian	<b>-51 (-64, -38)</b>	<b>-33 (-42, -23)</b>	-0.01 (-0.08, 0.05)	<b>-0.07 (-0.12, -0.02)</b>	-0.03 (-0.07, 0.01)	<b>-0.10 (-0.14, -0.07)</b>
Malay	<b>-28 (-38, -17)</b>	<b>-22 (-30, -14)</b>	<b>-0.46 (-0.52, -0.41)</b>	<b>-0.40 (-0.45, -0.36)</b>	<b>-0.15 (-0.18, -0.11)</b>	<b>-0.15 (-0.18, -0.12)</b>
Others	<b>66 (51, 81)</b>	<b>77 (66, 89)</b>	<b>0.48 (0.40, 0.56)</b>	<b>0.27 (0.21, 0.33)</b>	<b>0.37 (0.32, 0.42)</b>	<b>0.19 (0.15, 0.24)</b>
Diabetes						
No	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	<b>41 (27, 54)</b>	<b>97 (86, 107)</b>	<b>0.17 (0.09, 0.24)</b>	<b>0.29 (0.24, 0.34)</b>	<b>0.22 (0.18, 0.26)</b>	<b>0.25 (0.22, 0.29)</b>
Cohort						
1990	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
2010	<b>-36 (-45, -28)</b>	<b>12 (5, 19)</b>	<b>0.67 (0.63, 0.72)</b>	<b>0.84 (0.80, 0.87)</b>	<b>0.51 (0.48, 0.54)</b>	<b>0.61 (0.59, 0.64)</b>

499 **Figure 1: Univariate analysis of the association between BW (a), length (b) and head circumference (c)**  
500 **and determinants in Singapore.** Lines are 95% confidence intervals. (cohort 1990-1997 n=21 897 for subplots  
501 a, b and c; combined cohort n=52 220 for shaded subplots d, e and f)


502  
503 **Figure 2: Smoothened centile charts of BW, birth length and head circumference for boys and girls by**  
504 **gestational age in weeks with comparison to international standard.** Pink and blue shades for girls and boys  
505 show the 5 centiles calculated based on observed data points in grey, compared with baseline curves from  
506 Fenton 2013 (blue and red for female and male babies respectively). Differences in centile positions between  
507 Singapore cohort and Fenton 2013 are tested by binomial test in each gestational week separately, with  
508 significant differences marked in yellow.

509  
510 **Figure 3a: Singapore Birth Anthropometry Charts for boys.** The 5 centiles curves are extracted from Figure  
511 2 (b), (d), (f), presented in a similar fashion as Fenton 2013 for clinical reference.

512 **Figure 3b: Singapore Birth Anthropometry Charts for girls.** The 5 centiles curves are extracted from Figure  
513 2 (a), (c), (e), presented in a similar fashion as Fenton 2013 for clinical reference.


514





Female

Male



3, 10, 50, 90, 97 percentiles  
calculated for female newborns

3, 10, 50, 90, 97 percentiles  
calculated for male newborns


Observations

3, 10, 50, 90, 97 percentiles  
in Fenton 2013 for female newborns

3, 10, 50, 90, 97 percentiles  
in Fenton 2013 for male newborns

Significant difference between  
observations and Fenton 2013

Singapore Birth Anthropometry Chart - Boys



Singapore Birth Anthropometry Chart - Girls

