

1 **Full title: Influence of parental anthropometry and gestational weight gain on intrauterine**
2 **growth and neonatal outcomes: Findings from the MAI cohort study in rural India**

3

4 **Short title: Influence of parental anthropometry on foetal-intrauterine and neonatal**
5 **growth**

6 Mugdha Deshpande (msdeshpande96@gmail.com)^{1,2}, Demi Miriam
7 (demimiriam09@gmail.com)¹, Nikhil Shah (nikhilshah1507@gmail.com)¹, Neha Kajale
8 (kajaleneha71@gmail.com)^{1,2}, Jyotsna Angom (angomjyotsna@gmail.com)^{3,4}, Jasmin Bhawra
9 (jasmin.bhawra@torontomu.ca)^{1,5}, Ketan Gondhalekar(ketangondhalekar.hcjmri@gmail.com)¹,
10 Anuradha Khadilkar (anuradhavkhadilkar@gmail.com)^{1,2}, Tarun Katapally
11 (tarun.katapally@uwo.ca)^{1,6,7,8}

12 ¹ Hirabai Cowasji Jehangir Medical Research Institute (HCJMRI), Lower Ground Floor, Block
13 V, Jehangir Hospital, 32 Sassoon Road, Pune-411001, Maharashtra, India.

14

15 ²Interdisciplinary School of Health Sciences, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune-411007,
16 Maharashtra, India

17 ³Jehangir Hospital, 32 Sassoon Road, Pune-411001, Maharashtra, India.

18 ⁴Jupiter Hospital, Baner-Balewadi Road, Pune-411045, Maharashtra, India.

19 ⁵School of Occupational and Public Health, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, ON,
20 M5B 2K3

21 ⁶DEPtH Lab, School of Health Studies, Faculty of Health Sciences, Western University, London,
22 Ontario, N6A 3K7, Canada; Phone: 5196612111

23 ⁷Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry,
24 Western University, London, Ontario, N6A 3K7, Canada

25 ⁸Children's Health Research Institute, Lawson Health Research Institute, London, Ontario, N6A
26 4V2, Canada

27 **Corresponding author:**

28 Dr. Tarun Katapally

29 DEPtH Lab, School of Health Studies, Faculty of Health Sciences, Western University, London,
30 Ontario, N6A 3K7, Canada; Phone: 5196612111

31 Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry,
32 Western University, London, Ontario, N6A 3K7, Canada

33 Children's Health Research Institute, Lawson Health Research Institute, London, Ontario, N6A
34 4V2, Canada

35 Email: tarun.katapally@uwo.ca

36

37

38

39

40

Abstract

41 **Background:** Poor foetal growth and subsequent low birth weight are associated with an increased
42 risk for disease later in life. Identifying parental factors that determine foetal growth are important
43 to curbing intergenerational malnutrition, especially among disadvantaged populations in the
44 global south where undernutrition rates are high. The objective of this study was to assess the
45 relationships between parental biometry, intrauterine growth and neonatal outcomes, while
46 factoring in socioeconomic status of historically disadvantaged households in rural India

47 **Material and Methods:** Using data from the prospective longitudinal cohort, pregnant women
48 from rural Pune, India (n = 134) were assessed between August 2020 and November 2022. Data
49 on socio-demography, ultrasound measurements, parental and foetal anthropometry were
50 collected. Multiple linear regression models were run to predict determinants of foetal intrauterine
51 and neonatal growth (p value<0.05). The dependent variables were ultrasound measurements and
52 neonatal biometry, and independent variables were gestational weight gain, parental and mid-
53 parental height.

54 **Results:** Mean(\pm SD) maternal age, maternal height, paternal height and mid-parental height were
55 22.8 \pm 3.7 years, 153.6 \pm 5.5cm, 165.9 \pm 6.5cm and 159.1 \pm 8.7cm, respectively. Pre-pregnancy body
56 mass index and gestational weight gain was 20.5 \pm 4.0 kg/m² and 9.8 \pm 3.7kg respectively. Mid-
57 parental height and gestational weight gain were strongly correlated with neonatal growth and
58 foetal intrauterine growth (p <0.05); however, the correlation peaked at 28 weeks of
59 gestation(p <0.05). Gestational weight gain (B=28.7, p =0.00) and mid-parental height (B=14.3,
60 p =0.00) were identified as strong determinants of foetal-intrauterine growth and neonatal

61 anthropometry at birth. Maternal height was found to influence length of male neonate ($B=0.18$,
62 $p=0.00$), whereas, paternal height influenced length of the female neonate ($B=0.11$, $p=0.01$).

63 **Conclusion:** Parental socio-economic status, biometry and maternal gestational weight gain
64 influence growth of the child starting from the intrauterine period. Our study underlines the need
65 for interventions during pre-pregnancy, as well as during pregnancy, for optimal weight gain and
66 improved foetal and neonatal outcomes.

67 **Key words:** Birth weight, Foetus, GWG, mid-parental height, Neonate

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79 **Introduction**

80 Poor foetal growth and subsequent low birth weight are associated with an increased risk for
81 disease later in life(1). Foetal development is a reflection of the prenatal environment, which
82 constitutes shared maternal and paternal genetic, environmental and nutritional factors(2). It has
83 been inferred from past studies that environmental and genetic factors influence neonatal outcomes
84 at birth(3). Nutritional and socioeconomic status of parents, and maternal age are amongst the few
85 factors that impact foetal and neonatal growth(4). This implies that physiological adaptations
86 brought on by genetic exposures during the prenatal stage affect the long-term growth and health
87 of a child(5). Therefore, identifying the factors impacting foetal growth will help to understand
88 factors affecting neonatal size and survival(6).

89 Maternal anthropometry (height, pre-pregnancy weight, and gestational weight gain (GWG)) has
90 a strong impact on foetal growth as well as birth weight and body composition of the
91 neonate(7,8). It has been documented that maternal pre-pregnancy weight and gestational weight
92 gain are positively correlated with neonatal size(7,8). Pre-pregnancy body mass index (BMI)
93 represents chronic maternal nutritional status; however, gestational weight gain reflects both acute
94 nutritional status and the growth of tissues(9).

95 Paternal anthropometry influences foetal-neonatal growth; however, studies on the impact of
96 father's height on the longitudinal pattern of foetal growth are lacking. Research shows that
97 parental heights affect the growth of their offspring(10) which was first described by Galton (11)
98 as mid-parental height (MPH). However, studies assessing the relationship of MPH with foetal and
99 neonatal growth are scarce.

100 To differentiate between fetuses that are at the extreme ends of the growth spectrum (e.g., small
101 for gestational age vs. large for gestational age), MPH along with individual anthropometric
102 characteristics of the mother and father could be studied together with foetal growth parameters
103 such as: crown-rump length, femur length, biparietal diameter, head circumference, abdominal
104 circumference and estimated foetal weight. These measures reflect foetal growth(12) as evidenced
105 in ultrasound measurements and neonatal growth parameters by neonatal anthropometry including
106 neonatal birth weight, recumbent length, chest circumference, mid upper arm circumference and
107 head circumference at birth(4).

108 From a public health perspective, identifying factors which impact foetal and neonatal growth is
109 particularly crucial in historically disadvantaged households in rural India-an low-middle income
110 setting, where 12.0% to 78.4% of neonates are born small for their gestational age(13). In India,
111 25% of women in the reproductive age in rural areas are underweight (National Family Health
112 Survey-5, India (2019-20)), thus, identifying parental factors that determine foetal growth are
113 important in order to curb intergenerational malnutrition. This longitudinal study aimed to assess
114 the relationship between parental biometry, intrauterine growth and neonatal outcomes, as well as
115 the determinants of foetal and neonatal growth among a rural Indian population of pregnant
116 mothers near Pune, India .

117

118

119

120

121 **Methods**

1221. Study design and subjects

123 This study was a part of the Mother and Infant cohort (MAI: Mother in Marathi-a native language
124 of Maharashtra), a single-centre, prospective, observational, longitudinal community-based cohort
125 study conducted in rural areas near Pune city in Maharashtra, India.

126 Sample size calculation: A-priori sample size was calculated to 175 after accounting for 20%
127 attrition rate, 0.8 power with an effect size f of 0.1 and alpha 0.05 using linear multiple regression
128 fixed model (F test family) G power software (Version 3.1.9.7). After enrolling 175 participants,
129 complete data on 134 was obtained for which post-hoc power was re-calculated (proportions:
130 difference from constant (G power software), effect size f of 0.1 and alpha 0.05). The power of the
131 study remained unchanged at 0.8 with 134 final samples.

132 Based on the study inclusion criteria, healthy pregnant women attending antenatal health camps in
133 primary healthcare centres and Anganwadi centres (i.e., rural childcare centres) in their first
134 trimester, who planned to deliver within a 150km radius (to ensure the feasibility of post-delivery
135 measurement) were enrolled after obtaining consent. Women with comorbidities such as diabetes
136 mellitus, and hypertension, with a gestational age of more than 12 weeks, those bearing twins,
137 women who planned to deliver beyond pre-decided distance limits, and those who did not consent
138 were excluded from the study.

139 A total of 553 pregnant women were screened, after which 175 participants were being enrolled.
140 After accounting for drop-outs, abortions, still-births, and intrauterine deaths, 41 records were

141 excluded. Thus, the final study included 134 triads (mother, father, and child). Details of
142 recruitment are explained in figure 1.

143 Figure 1: Recruitment flowchart for MAI cohort

1442. Data collection

145 Data collection was performed between August 2020 and November 2022. All participants gave
146 written informed consent before any study procedures were performed. Ethics approval was
147 obtained from the Institutional ethics committee (EC registration no.: ECR/352/Inst/MH/2013/RR-
148 19). Data were collected at five time points during clinic visits (Visit (V)1-V5): V1 - first trimester
149 (8-12 weeks Gestational Age (GA)), V2 - second trimester (18-22 weeks GA), V3 - third trimester
150 (28-32 weeks GA), V4 - before delivery and post-delivery (within 24 hours to 10 days). Follow-
151 up was conducted via phone calls and messages every month until 34 weeks of gestation, and then
152 once a week from 34 weeks until after delivery to ensure study compliance.

153 2.1 Parental data

Time frame	Data collected
I trimester (8-12 weeks)	Parental socio-economic data, maternal and paternal height, maternal weight at baseline, data from ultrasonography (USG) viability scan)
II trimester (18-22 weeks)	Maternal weight, data from USG (nuchal translucency scan to rule out genetic abnormalities and anomaly scan: growth parameters)

III trimester (28-32 weeks)	Maternal weight, data from USG (growth scan at 28 and 36 weeks of gestation: growth parameters)
Before delivery	Weight
Post-delivery (within 24 hours to 10 days)	Maternal and neonatal outcomes (birth weight, recumbent length, mid-upper arm circumference, head circumference and chest circumference)
Table 1: Data collected at different time periods from MAI cohort	

154 Family socioeconomic status was recorded using the New Socioeconomic Classification (SEC)
 155 system according to socioeconomic classification 2011(14). The New SEC system scores families
 156 based on the number of owned material possessions, which include consumer assets ranging from
 157 electricity connection to owning agricultural land and education of the chief earner of the
 158 family(14). The SEC scores were recoded as a binary variable in statistical analysis for multivariate
 159 models as high and low socioeconomic status. Maternal and paternal height was recorded to the
 160 nearest 0.5cm using a SECA stadiometer. Maternal weight was recorded using an electronic
 161 weighing scale to the nearest 0.5kg. For calculating maternal pre-pregnancy BMI, weight was self-
 162 reported by participants. The World Health Organization guidelines for BMI were used, where
 163 underweight status was defined as BMI less than 18.5kg/m², normal weight status as 18.5-24.9
 164 kg/m², and overweight and obese statuses were between 25-29.9 kg/m² and >30 kg/m²
 165 respectively(15).

166 The Institute of Medicine (IOM) provided guidelines for GWG based on pre-pregnancy BMI in
 167 2009(15). A weight gain of 12.5-18kg is recommended for underweight women, 11.5-16kg for

168 normal weight status women, and 7-11.5kg and 5-9 kg for , overweight and obese BMI category
169 women, respectively(15).

170 BMI was computed using the formula:

$$171 \text{ BMI (kg/m}^2\text{)} = \text{weight (kg)} / \text{height (m)}^2$$

172 GWG was computed by the formula:

$$173 \text{ GWG (kg)} = \text{Weight at V4 (kg)} - \text{Weight at V1 (kg)}$$

174 V1: weight at first-trimester visit and V4: Weight just before delivery

175 Mid-parental height was computed using the formula:

$$176 (\text{Paternal height (cm)} + \text{maternal height (cm)}) / 2 + 6.5 \text{ for boys and;}$$

$$177 (\text{Paternal height (cm)} + \text{maternal height (cm)}) / 2 - 6.5 \text{ for girls}$$

178 2.2 Foetal data

179 Foetal ultrasound examinations were conducted at four time points during the course of pregnancy:

180 once in early (GA:8 ± 2 weeks) and mid-pregnancy (GA:20 ± 2 weeks) and twice in late pregnancy

181 (GA: 30 ± 2 weeks and 36 ± 2 weeks). The first ultrasound examination was not included in the

182 final analysis since it did not include growth characteristics. Foetal growth parameters of interest

183 were head circumference, abdominal circumference, bi-parietal diameter, femur length in

184 centimetres and estimated foetal weight in grams which were uniformly reported at GA of 18

185 weeks and onwards. Bi-parietal diameter was measured in an axial view with foetal positioning in

186 direct occiput transverse. Measurement was taken from the inner margin of the opposite skull table

187 to the outer surface of the skull table. Head circumference was measured along the outer perimeter
188 of the calvarium at the same level as that of bi-parietal diameter. Femur length measurement was
189 made along the axis of diaphysis from later epicondyle to the tip of greater trochanter in a straight
190 line. Abdominal circumference was measured at the level of the foetal liver, taking into view the
191 umbilical part of the left portal vein in the liver. Measurement was made from the outer edge of
192 one side of the foetal abdomen to the other side edge(16).

193 Estimated foetal weight was calculated using Hadlock's formula:

$$\begin{aligned} 194 \quad & (\log_{10} \text{ estimated foetal weight} = 1.5662) 0.0108 (\text{Head circumference}) + 0.0468 (\text{Abdominal} \\ 195 \quad & \text{circumference}) + 0.171 (\text{Femur length}) + 0.00034 (\text{Head circumference})^2) 0.003685 (\text{Abdominal} \\ 196 \quad & \text{circumference} * \text{Femur length})(17) \end{aligned}$$

1972.3 Neonatal data

198 Neonatal anthropometry as per world health organization protocol(18) and delivery details (e.g.
199 Type of delivery, membrane rupture, APGAR score, etc.) were collected within 10 days of delivery
200 by researchers who were trained in measuring anthropometry. All the equipment was calibrated
201 regularly using industry standards(19). Neonatal birth weight was recorded using an electronic
202 weighing scale that had tarring capacity, and the weight was measured with a high precision
203 (within 0.1kg) by placing the baby on the weighing scale and after adjusting for neonate's minimal
204 clothing.

205 Recumbent length was recorded using the SECA infantometer, where the neonate's diapers were
206 removed since it made it difficult to hold the neonate's legs together. Two researchers sat on either
207 side of the infantometer, where one held the baby's feet together and the other adjusted the head

208 of the neonate and moved the headboard. The position of the neonate was such that the crown
209 touched the headboard and the distance between the ear canal to lower border of eye socket formed
210 a vertical line which was perpendicular to horizontal board (vertical Frankfurt plane). After
211 adjusting for neonate's legs and hips, gentle pressure was applied to straighten the neonate's knees
212 and the footboard was positioned against soles of the feet and toes pointing outward to measure
213 length to the nearest 0.1cm.

214 For measuring head circumference, a non-bendable, non-stretchable measuring tape was used to
215 cover the fullest protuberance of skull and eyebrows after carefully positing the tape sideways and
216 then the tape was snugly pulled to compress hair and skin and the reading was recorded to the
217 nearest 0.1cm. For measuring the mid-upper arm circumference, a mid-point was placed between
218 the acromion and the olecranon process of the elbow by bending the neonate's forearm to 90° at
219 elbow with palm facing up so that olecranon stood out from the elbow. Then circumference was
220 measured by relaxing the neonate's elbow in an extended position, carefully observing that the
221 muscles didn't tighten, by snugly measuring the mid-point using a non-bendable, non-stretchable
222 SECA measuring tape to the nearest 0.1cm. Chest Circumference was recorded after removing
223 neonate's top clothing and marking a horizontal line at xiphisternum where ribs meet sternum and
224 placing a non-bendable, non-stretchable SECA measuring tape such that the upper part of tape
225 touched the marking to measure chest circumference to the nearest 0.1cm. Small for gestational
226 age was defined as birth length and birth weight of less than 10th percentile of the average weight
227 and length for gestational age in neonates of same gender(20). Low birth weight was considered
228 to be birth weight of less than 2.5kg(21). Preterm birth was defined as birth of the foetus before
229 37 weeks of gestation(22).

230

2313. Statistical analysis

232 Statistical analysis was performed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 25.
233 Continuous variables were expressed as mean and standard deviation and categorical variables
234 were expressed in percentages. All outcome variables were tested for normality before performing
235 analysis. T-Tests were performed to assess differences in means of parental anthropometry and
236 foetal-neonatal biometry. Test of proportions was used to assess significance in differences
237 between two groups. Median values of parental anthropometry were considered since the
238 participants who were under -2SD ranged from 3-4.5% which was inadequate for them to be
239 compared to their counterparts. Linear association of variables was tested using Pearson's
240 correlation for normal data and Spearman's correlation for non-normal data. Multiple linear
241 regression models were run to predict determinants of foetal intrauterine growth and neonatal
242 growth. The dependent variables were ultrasound measurements i.e., growth characteristics (femur
243 length and estimated foetal weight) and neonatal biometry (birth weight and recumbent length)
244 and the primary independent variables were GWG, MPH, maternal and paternal height. *p* value of
245 <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

246 **Results**

247 The overall sample included 134 triads of mothers, fathers and children (44% (59) male and 56%
248 (75) female). Maternal age at marriage and at pregnancy was 20.2±3.1 years and 23.4±3.7 years,
249 respectively, with minimum and maximum maternal age being 16 years and 35.4 years,
250 respectively. In terms of education, 4.5% mothers had no official literacy (i.e., never attended
251 school), 65.6% obtained 10th/12th grade qualifications, and 29.6% reported education of higher than
252 12th grade. In terms of employment, 16.4% mothers reported that they were employed until 28

253 weeks of gestation, while 83.6% mothers were home-makers (i.e., reported no formal
254 employment). One-third of mothers (32.1%) belonged to families of low socio-economic status.

255 Based on pre-pregnancy BMI, it was observed that 36.6% of mothers were underweight
256 (BMI<18.5kg/m²), 50.7% were of normal weight (18.5-24.9 kg/m²), 9% were classified with
257 overweight status (25-29.9 kg/m²), and 3.7% were categorized to obese weight status (>30 kg/m²).

258 Overall, 59.7% of mothers had inadequate GWG, with 33.6% gaining appropriate weight, and
259 6.7% gaining excess GWG, according to IOM guidelines. Of mothers who belonged to the
260 underweight pre-pregnancy BMI category, 61.2% did not gain adequate weight during pregnancy
261 as is shown in figure 2.

262 Figure 2: GWG according to IOM Guidelines in rural Indian pregnant women from MAI cohort

263 In terms of numbers of historical pregnancies per woman, approximately 30% were nulliparous
264 (first pregnancy), and almost 70% were primiparous (had previously given birth at least once). Of
265 the total deliveries recorded within the sample, 20.1% were pre-term (deliveries of gestational
266 age<37 weeks). The prevalence of small-for-gestational age computed at birth was found to be
267 42.5%, with a higher percentage noted among male neonates. Prevalence of low birth weight was
268 found to be 23.9% with a larger proportion of female neonates weighing below 2.5kg. Maternal,
269 paternal, and neonatal characteristics of the study population are summarized in table 2.

270 **Table 2: Parental and neonatal characteristics of study population from MAI cohort**

Parameter	Mean±S.D.
Maternal age (years)	23.4±3.7
Maternal height (cm)	153.6±5.6

Paternal height (cm)	166.0±6.4
Mid-parental height (cm)	159.1±8.7
Maternal body mass index (kg/m ²)	20.5±4.0
Gestational age (weeks)	38.3±1.8
Gestational weight gain (kg)	9.9±3.7
Neonatal birth weight (kg)	2.6±0.4
Neonatal Recumbent length (cm)	48.7±2.6
Neonatal Head circumference (cm)	33.3±3.4
Neonatal Chest circumference (cm)	31.8±3.3
Neonatal Mid-upper arm circumference (cm)	9.3±1.1

271 Foetal growth parameters as assessed through foetal ultrasonography over the course of gestation
 272 at 20 weeks, 28 weeks and 36 weeks respectively are described in table 3. Foetal growth parameters
 273 showed a significant increase over the duration of pregnancy (p<0.05).

274 **Table 3: Foetal growth parameters in rural Indian pregnancies from MAI cohort**

Variable	1 st trimester	2 nd trimester	3 rd trimester	
			7 th month	9 th month
Foetal crown rump length (cm)	5.3±2.0	-	-	-
Foetal head circumference (cm)	-	17.7±2.5*	26.4±1.7*	31.0±1.3*
Foetal abdominal circumference (cm)	-	14.8±2.6*	23.6±1.8*	29.6±2.1*
Foetal bi-parietal diameter (cm)	-	4.7±0.6*	7.8±0.5*	8.4±0.5*
Foetal femur length (cm)	-	3.2±0.5*	5.3±0.4*	6.7±0.4*
Estimated foetal weight (g)	-	361±138*	1241±250*	2373±422*

275 Note: foetal crown rump length has significance in 1st trimester only, the rest have significance
 276 18 weeks of gestation onwards

277 *Level of significance at p value <0.05

278

279 Foetal and neonatal growth was significantly different between mothers who gained adequate
 280 versus inadequate weight, with an exception of no difference observed between the two groups
 281 with respect to femur length, abdominal circumference, and neonatal head circumference (table
 282 4). A large number of significant differences were seen between medians of paternal height as
 283 compared to the medians of maternal height ($p < 0.05$) as demonstrated in table 4. On comparison
 284 of medians of MPH, significant foetal and neonatal growth differences were also observed ($p <$
 285 0.05).

286

287

288 **Table 4: Difference in means of parental parameters and foetal-neonatal growth**

289 **characteristics from MAI cohort**

Parameters	GWG		Paternal height		Maternal height		Mid-parental height	
	Inadequat e	Adequate	<Median	>Median	<Media n	>Media n	<Median	>Median
Foetal	6.6±0.3	6.8±0.4	6.6±0.4*	6.8±0.3*	6.5±0.3	6.8±0.4	6.6±0.4*	6.7±0.4*

290

femur length (cm)					*	*		
Foetal biparietal diameter (cm)	8.3±0.6*	8.5±0.4*	8.3±0.6*	8.5±0.4*	8.3±0.6	8.5±0.4	8.3±0.6*	8.5±0.4*
					*	*		
Foetal abdominal circumference (cm)	29.3±2.2	30.1±1.8	28.9±2.2*	30.3±1.8*	29.3±2.3	30.0±1.8	29.3±2.5*	30.0±1.5*
Foetal head circumference (cm)	30.8±1.3*	31.4±1.2*	30.7±1.4*	31.4±1.1*	30.8±1.4*	31.3±1.1*	30.7±1.4*	31.4±1.1*
Estimated foetal weight (g)	2292±429*	2491±386*	2222.8±433.0*	2510.7±364.8*	2263.1±455.5*	2477.5±362.5*	2270.1±469.6*	2474.5±345.5*
Neonatal birth weight (kg)	2.5±0.4*	2.8±0.4*	2.6±0.4*	2.7±0.3*	2.6±0.4	2.7±0.4	2.5±0.4*	2.7±0.3*
Neonatal recumbent length (cm)	48.2±2.6*	49.5±2.3*	48.1±2.6*	49.3±2.4*	48.2±2.4*	49.3±2.6*	48.1±2.7*	49.4±2.2*
Neonatal	33.2±2.0	33.5±4.8	32.9±4.2*	33.8±2.3*	33.0±4.1	33.7±2.1	32.6±4.2*	34.1±2.2*

head circumference (cm)					2	3		
Neonatal mid-upper arm circumference (cm)	9.2±1.2*	9.6±1.4*	9.3±1.2*	9.4±1.1*	9.3±1.2	9.4±1.2	31.3±3.8	32.3±2.5
Neonatal chest circumference (cm)	31.0±3.3*	33.0±2.9*	31.4±3.7*	32.2±2.7*	31.8±2.4	31.8±3.9	9.2±1.2	9.4±1.1

291

292 *GWG categories have been formed on the basis of guidelines recommended by IOM, 2009

293 Level of significance at p value <0.05

294

295

296 Significant correlations were observed between parental anthropometry and foetal-neonatal
 297 growth (Table 5); however, the correlation was significant only after 28 weeks of gestation with
 298 strongest correlation observed at 36 weeks of gestation. Maternal pre-pregnancy BMI significantly
 299 correlated with only femur length at 20 weeks of gestation and birth weight (p < 0.05). The

300 relationship between the foetal and neonatal growth parameters with maternal height was
 301 significant only from 36 weeks of gestation ($p < 0.05$). Similarly, foetal and neonatal growth
 302 parameters were significantly correlated with paternal height from 36 weeks of gestation ($p <$
 303 0.05).

304 **Table 5: Correlation between parental and foetal- neonatal growth parameters from MAI**
 305 **cohort**

Parameter	Pre- pregnancy BMI	Maternal height	Paternal height	MPH	GWG
Foetal femur length (20 weeks)	.221	NS	NS	NS	NS
Foetal femur length (32 weeks)	NS	.259	.200	.255	.214
Foetal bi-parietal diameter (32 weeks)	NS	.208	.249	.350	.212
Foetal head circumference (32 weeks)	NS	.238	.216	.327	.221
Foetal abdominal circumference (32 weeks)	NS	NS	.329	.284	.243
Estimated foetal weight (32 weeks)	NS	.234	.346	.333	.295
Neonatal birth weight	.298	.188	.291	.274	.271
Neonatal recumbent length	NS	.325	.294	.355	.277
Neonatal chest circumference	NS	NS	NS	NS	.263
Neonatal head circumference	NS	NS	NS	.269	NS

306 Level of significance at $p < 0.05$

307

308 Multiple linear regression models were run to determine foetal-neonatal growth after adjusting for
309 socioeconomic status (table 6). Socioeconomic status was added in layer one to observe the
310 independent effect of low family socioeconomic status on the dependent variable with the control
311 as high family socioeconomic status and again in layer two to observe its additional impact on the
312 dependent variable in combination with other independent variables. GWG and MPH were
313 significant predictors of foetal length and weight ($p < 0.05$). With every 1cm increase in paternal
314 height, foetal weight increased by 19g. Similarly, with every 1 kg increase in GWG, foetal weight
315 increased by 21g. Neonatal birth weight was significantly associated with GWG and MPH,
316 whereas, neonatal recumbent length was significantly associated with parental anthropometry
317 overall ($p < 0.05$). On further analysis, paternal height was significantly associated with recumbent
318 length of female neonates (B: 0.110, $p < 0.05$) whereas, the recumbent length of male neonates
319 was significantly determined by maternal height (B: 0.151, $p < 0.05$).

320

321

322

323

324 **Table 6: Determinants of foetal-neonatal growth parameters from MAI cohort**

Dependent parameters	Layer	Parameter	B	S.E.	<i>p</i> value	Adjusted R²
-----------------------------	--------------	------------------	----------	-------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------

Model 1 (Foetal Femur length)	One	Lower SES	-0.103	0.088	0.243	0.003
	Two	Lower SES	-0.56	0.086	0.512	0.076
		GWG	0.020	0.011	0.068	
		MPH	0.011	0.005	0.018	
Model 2a (Estimated foetal weight)	One	Lower SES	-217.96	83.79	0.01	0.050
	Two	Lower SES	-159.32	79.04	0.04	0.181
		GWG	25.91	10.05	0.01	
		MPH	13.61	4.24	0.00	
Model 2b (Estimated foetal weight)	One	Lower SES	-217.96	83.79	0.011	0.050
	Two	Lower SES	-180.95	78.65	0.023	.182
		GWG	21.68	10.28	0.037	
		Paternal height	19.02	5.86	.002	
Model 3 (Neonatal birth weight)	One	Lower SES	-0.245	0.082	0.003	0.057
	Two	Lower SES	-0.190	0.079	0.01	0.148
		GWG	0.026	0.010	0.01	
		MPH	0.012	0.004	0.00	
Model 4a (Neonatal recumbent length)	One	Lower SES	-1.085	0.270		0.031
	Two	Lower SES	-0.718	0.447	0.111	0.175
		GWG	.150	0.057	0.010	
		MPH	0.093	0.024	0.000	
Model 4b (Neonatal recumbent length)	One	Lower SES	-1.085	0.477	0.025	0.031
	Two	Lower SES	-0.866	0.456	0.060	0.134
		GWG	0.135	0.060	0.025	

		Paternal height	0.097	0.034	0.005	
Model 4c	One	Lower SES	-1.085	0.477	0.025	0.031
(Neonatal recumbent length)	Two	Lower SES	-0.815	0.452	0.074	0.151
		GWG	0.136	0.059	0.022	
		Maternal height	0.126	0.038	0.001	

325 GWG: Gestational weight gain, MPH: Mid-parental height

326 Level of significance at $p < 0.05$

327

328 Discussion

329 Parental influence on child growth has been a longstanding subject of interest in the field of
 330 maternal-new born and child health. This is one of the few studies conducted that highlights the
 331 importance of not only maternal, but also paternal anthropometry on foetal and neonatal growth.
 332 Our study has established gender-dependent relationships with parental anthropometry and
 333 neonatal growth, and further emphasized the influence of maternal gestational gains on foetal and
 334 neonatal growth.

335 Our study corroborates findings from multiple studies that highlight the influence of maternal
 336 weight gain on a neonate's birth weight(8,23,24). Maternal nutritional status was found to be an
 337 important factor for determining neonatal growth in several studies however, data on findings from
 338 a socially disadvantaged population are scarce. Zilko et al from a developed country setting found
 339 that the odds of an small-for-gestational age neonate decreased with improvement in gestation
 340 weight gain(23). Occurrence of adverse outcomes (small-for-gestational age, preterm birth, large-

341 for-gestational age) was noted at the extreme ends of the spectrum (underweight and obese BMI
342 mothers who did not gain adequate weight). Our study analysed the difference in foetal and
343 neonatal growth between socially disadvantaged mothers who gained adequate and inadequate
344 gestational weight. Mothers belonging to the inadequate gestational weight gain category had a
345 higher risk of having neonates with low birth weight. Similar findings were reported by Perumal
346 *et al*, wherein they reported that mothers who gained inadequate weight gave birth to low birth
347 weight neonates and small for gestational age neonates(25).

348 Consistent with previous literature(26,27), we also observed a significant correlation between
349 maternal pre-pregnancy BMI with foetal femur length from 20 weeks of gestation, unlike other
350 foetal parameters which were significant since the 28 weeks of gestation. A study conducted in
351 Vienna revealed that maternal height and BMI both strongly correlated with foetal size and
352 neonatal size at birth(28). The associations were prominent from the first trimester onwards which
353 was also observed in our study. These results highlight the influence of maternal nutritional
354 characteristics on the length of the child since the foetal period. In the current study based in global
355 south, an association was noted between maternal height and birth length, and birth weight and
356 our results are thus in line with the narrative that tall mothers give birth to taller and heavier
357 neonates, a result confirmed by Patra *et al* in a similar setting (29).

358 Our study highlighted a strong influence of maternal height on neonatal anthropometry, we also
359 found that underweight mothers or those with shorter stature delivered low birth weight neonates
360 as compared to their counterparts. A study by Witter *et al* and Britto *et al* corroborated these
361 findings too, thus explaining the influence of maternal height on a neonate's weight and not just
362 length(30). It is generally hypothesized that maternal height is a strong predictor of gestational age
363 and thereby neonatal outcomes viz. foetal weight and length at birth i.e., shorter mothers give birth

364 early to neonates who have relatively shorter length and lower birth weight. Zhang *et al* aimed to
365 study this hypothesis and they concluded that maternal height and foetal growth measures are in
366 fact significantly associated, however, they attributed the association to foetal genetics(31).

367 In our study, we found that maternal family socio-economic status influences gestational weight
368 and foetal-neonatal anthropometry and that the relationship between socio-economic status and
369 these outcomes may be mediated by factors such as access to healthcare, dietary quality, and
370 physical activity levels, etc. A few studies from different parts of the world highlight a similar
371 phenomenon (32–34). We also observed that women with lower socio-economic status gave birth
372 to neonates with lower birth weight than women with higher socio-economic status and Papazian
373 *et al.* in their study highlighted this key finding(35). They also reported that maternal height and
374 weight were important predictors of gestational weight gain, and that maternal education was
375 associated with neonatal length and head circumference, which is yet another corroborating factor
376 between their and our study. Another study conducted in India by Motwani *et al.* also reported
377 similar results suggesting that maternal education was associated with gestational weight gain and
378 neonatal anthropometry, and that the effect of maternal education on neonatal anthropometry was
379 partially mediated by gestational weight gain, highlighting how socio-economic status is a strong
380 determinant of foetal-neonatal growth. Data driven finding is chiefly highlighted in our study that
381 women with lower socio-economic status are at higher risk of inadequate gestational weight gain,
382 thus leading to a foetus of smaller size and consequently, it is hypothesized that they possibly give
383 birth to neonates with lower birth weight.

384 Unlike the impact of maternal height and weight gains on foetal-neonatal growth, data on impact
385 of paternal height on foetal-neonatal growth are scarce. Takagi *et al* reported the influence of
386 paternal height on birth weight of the neonate wherein a gender dependant relationship was

387 observed between paternal height and birth weight of the female neonate(36). An Indian study
388 conducted with the aim of assessing the relationship between paternal and maternal height on
389 foetal growth by Wills *et al*(2) concluded that paternal height was significantly correlated with
390 foetal head circumference and femur length from 17 weeks of gestation onwards. In our study,
391 paternal height significantly correlated with foetal femur length, abdominal circumference, head
392 circumference, bi-parietal diameter and foetal weight from 28 weeks of gestation onwards where
393 the correlation was much stronger at 36 weeks of gestation. Additionally, correlations between
394 paternal height and neonatal birth weight and recumbent length were also found. We also observed
395 that paternal height determined birth weight and recumbent length of the neonates unlike Morrison
396 *et al* who concluded that father's height significantly impacted only birth weight of the
397 neonate(37). They found that up to 152 g variance in the neonatal weight can be attributed to
398 paternal height with a larger effect when the mother was taller. However, in the current study we
399 found that paternal height, independent of the maternal height influenced neonatal weight. Nahum
400 *et al* corroborated findings of paternal height being an important factor in determining birth weight
401 of the neonate. They concluded that only 250g of variance in birth weight can be explained by
402 paternal height independently(38). They also found that with every 1cm increase in paternal height,
403 birth weight increased by 10g. In the current study, an independent significant association was
404 observed between paternal height and birth weight and length of the neonate. Similar findings have
405 been reported by To *et al* and they concluded that paternal height could be a strong determinant of
406 neonatal birth weight(39).

407 Our study demonstrated a relationship between fathers' height and female offspring's length and
408 mother's height and male neonate's length, indicating a gender-dependent relationship. We cannot
409 exclude the possibility of epigenetic factors, as a previous study in Japan indicated that paternal

410 height may have a gender-dependent impact on the growth of the neonate(36). A study was
411 conducted in a Norwegian population where they evaluated the association between parental
412 height and weight with child's height and weight at birth and until 2 years of age(40). They found
413 that maternal weight significantly influenced femur length at 20 and 30 weeks of gestation whereas
414 the current study found that maternal weight showed significant association from 28 weeks of
415 gestation onwards. They also found a gender dependent relationship between parental height and
416 neonate's length at birth where paternal height influenced the female neonate's length and maternal
417 height influenced the male neonate's length. Future studies can address the use of MPH for
418 assessing combined effect of parental anthropometry on foetal and neonatal growth in different
419 genders for a more comprehensive analysis.

420 We found that the mean gestational weight gain in our study participants was 9.9 ± 3.7 kg. In a
421 study by Zilko *et al*, gestational weight gain was around 14.2 ± 6.9 kg(23). The discrepancy noted
422 in the GWG could be, as in the cohort studied by Zilko *et al*, a fairly large number of mothers
423 belonged to a normal pre-pregnancy BMI category and very few women were underweight (in the
424 present study 36.6% of women were underweight). Also, the mothers in that cohort complied with
425 IOM weight gain guidelines leading to a greater GWG compared to ours where mothers largely
426 belonged to an underweight pre-pregnancy BMI category and did not gain adequate weight during
427 pregnancy. They also report a relationship between maternal gestational gains and neonatal size at
428 birth, as also evidenced by our study.

429 To the best of our knowledge, this is one of the few studies being conducted in the global south
430 among socially disadvantaged rural Indian population (low-middle income setting) in a
431 longitudinal study design to assess the effects of parental anthropometry on intrauterine growth
432 and neonatal outcomes. We have taken into account paternal as well as follow-up data on maternal

433 nutritional status (thus considering maternal acute and chronic nutritional status), accounting for
434 gestation-dependent growth of tissues. We have also assessed the influence of short maternal and
435 paternal stature, and inadequate gestational weight gain on the growth of the child from rural
436 settings which has not been well documented in rural India enough. One of the cornerstones of the
437 current study is the gender-dependent relationship of parental nutritional status and growth of the
438 neonate, which has been documented in Caucasian populations, but to date, data on Indian
439 populations have been scarce.

440 Our study is not without limitations. A larger sample size would have made our model more
441 generalizable, however, the power of our study was good enough. For calculating pre-pregnancy
442 BMI, we relied upon participant recall for weight before pregnancy, which could have generated
443 recall bias; however, we cross-checked weight in the medical record books as well as measured
444 actual first trimester weight to omit potential discrepancies. Moreover, sonographies were
445 conducted by multiple ultrasonologists, given the vast distances between data collection centres
446 and participants' residences which could have resulted in variations in readings; however, the
447 sonographies were eventually examined by one examiner to nullify potential error-based variation.
448 Due to the unavailability of paternal weight, associations between acute paternal nutritional status
449 and growth of the child could not be made. Future recommendation should highlight on conducting
450 longitudinal prospective cohort studies with a larger sample size whilst examining the impact of
451 parental birth anthropometry and socio-economic status on the growth of their child in-utero and
452 at birth, this should help researchers identify and understand the phenomenon of inter-generational
453 malnutrition which would in-turn reduce the incidence of adverse parental-foetal-neonatal growth
454 outcomes.

455 **Conclusion**

456 Our study reveals the impact of parental socioeconomic status, anthropometry as well as maternal
457 pregnancy weight gain on foetal-neonatal weight and length. Given that the majority of mothers
458 who were underweight during pre-pregnancy had inadequate gestational weight gain, this study
459 underlines the need for interventions pre-pregnancy and during pregnancy to ensure optimal
460 weight gain as this has long-term implications for foetal and neonatal outcomes. In addition,
461 interventions aimed at improving socioeconomic status and maternal education, in particular, may
462 also contribute to improvements in gestational weight gain and foetal-neonatal outcomes.

463 **Acknowledgements and disclosures**

464 We are grateful to all our study participants for their active and voluntary participation,
465 ultrasonologists and primary health care centre heads of study centres for their support and
466 encouragement. Mugdha Deshpande was funded by a fellowship grant from University Grants
467 Commission, Government of India. NTA Ref. no.: 220510107214 (NET JRF Dec 2021 and June
468 2022).

469 **Conflict of interest**

470 All the authors express no conflict of interest.

471 **Author contributions**

472 Mugdha Deshpande: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Data curation, Writing-
473 Original draft preparation, Visualization, Investigation

474 Demi Miriam: Conceptualization, Writing- Original draft preparation, Reviewing and Editing

475 Nikhil Shah: Conceptualization, Writing- Original draft preparation, Visualization, Investigation,
476 Validation, Reviewing and Editing

477 Neha Kajale: Writing- Original draft preparation, Supervision, Validation, Reviewing and
478 Editing

479 Jyotsna Angom: Supervision, Validation, Reviewing and Editing

480 Jasmin Bhawra: Investigation, Validation, Writing- Reviewing and Editing

481 Ketan Gondhalekar: Investigation, Validation, Data curation, Software

482 Anuradha Khadilkar: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing- Original draft preparation,
483 Visualization, Investigation, Supervision, Validation, Reviewing and Editing

484 Tarun Katapally: Writing- Investigation, Validation, Supervision, Reviewing and Editing

485 **Supporting information**

486 Ethics approval letter has been obtained from the institutional ethics committee which has been
487 uploaded on the editorial manager.

488

489

490

491 **References:**

- 492 1. Belbasis L, Savvidou MD, Kanu C, Evangelou E, Tzoulaki I. Birth weight in relation to
493 health and disease in later life: an umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
494 BMC Med. 2016 Dec;14(1):147.

- 495 2. Wills AK, Chinchwadkar MC, Joglekar CV, Natekar AS, Yajnik CS, Fall CHD, et al.
496 Maternal and paternal height and BMI and patterns of fetal growth: The Pune Maternal
497 Nutrition Study. *Early Human Development*. 2010 Sep;86(9):535–40.
- 498 3. Brooks AA, Johnson MR, Steer PJ, Pawson ME, Abdalla HI. Birth weight: nature or
499 nurture? *Early Human Development*. 1995 May;42(1):29–35.
- 500 4. Albouy-Llaty M, Thiebaugeorges O, Goua V, Magnin G, Schweitzer M, Forhan A, et al.
501 Influence of fetal and parental factors on intrauterine growth measurements: results of the
502 EDEN mother-child cohort. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2011 Dec;38(6):673–80.
- 503 5. Colella M, Frérot A, Novais ARB, Baud O. Neonatal and Long-Term Consequences of Fetal
504 Growth Restriction. *CPR*. 2018 Dec 21;14(4):212–8.
- 505 6. Zhang J, Merialdi M, Platt LD, Kramer MS. Defining normal and abnormal fetal growth:
506 promises and challenges. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2010
507 Jun;202(6):522–8.
- 508 7. Mitra S, Nayak P, Misra S, Sahoo J. Effect of maternal anthropometry and metabolic
509 parameters on fetal growth. *Indian Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*.
510 2012;16(5):754.
- 511 8. Mamidi RS, Banjara SK, Manchala S, Babu CK, Geddam JJB, Boiroju NK, et al. Maternal
512 Nutrition, Body Composition and Gestational Weight Gain on Low Birth Weight and Small
513 for Gestational Age—A Cohort Study in an Indian Urban Slum. *Children*. 2022 Sep
514 23;9(10):1460.

- 515 9. Soltani H, Lipoeto NI, Fair FJ, Kilner K, Yusrawati Y. Pre-pregnancy body mass index and
516 gestational weight gain and their effects on pregnancy and birth outcomes: a cohort study in
517 West Sumatra, Indonesia. *BMC Women's Health*. 2017 Dec;17(1):102.
- 518 10. Wu H, Ma C, Yang L, Xi B. Association of Parental Height With Offspring Stunting in 14
519 Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Front Nutr*. 2021 Aug 11;8:650976.
- 520 11. Cole TJ. Galton's midparent height revisited. *Annals of Human Biology*. 2000
521 Jan;27(4):401–5.
- 522 12. Aggarwal N, Sharma GL. Fetal ultrasound parameters: Reference values for a local
523 perspective. *Indian Journal of Radiology and Imaging*. 2020 Apr;30(02):149–55.
- 524 13. Katz J, Wu LA, Mullany LC, Coles CL, Lee ACC, Kozuki N, et al. Prevalence of Small-for-
525 Gestational-Age and Its Mortality Risk Varies by Choice of Birth-Weight-for-Gestation
526 Reference Population. Wright L, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2014 Mar 18;9(3):e92074.
- 527 14. Media research users council. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASSIFICATION-2011 The New
528 SEC system [Internet]. The Market Research Society of India; 2011 [cited 2022 Nov 23].
529 Available from:
530 <https://www.mruc.net/uploads/posts/b17695616c422ec8d9dadafc1c3eec26.pdf>
- 531 15. Gilmore LA, Redman LM. Weight gain in pregnancy and application of the 2009 IOM
532 guidelines: Toward a uniform approach: Approaches Estimating GWG. *Obesity*. 2015
533 Mar;23(3):507–11.

- 534 16. Babuta S, Chauhan S, Garg R, Bagarhatta M. Assessment of fetal gestational age in different
535 trimesters from ultrasonographic measurements of various fetal biometric parameters.
536 *Journal of the Anatomical Society of India*. 2013 Jun;62(1):40–6.
- 537 17. Ay L, Kruithof C, Bakker R, Steegers E, Witteman J, Moll H, et al. Maternal
538 anthropometrics are associated with fetal size in different periods of pregnancy and at birth.
539 The Generation R Study: Maternal anthropometrics and fetal size. *BJOG: An International*
540 *Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*. 2009 Jun;116(7):953–63.
- 541 18. de Onis M, Garza C, Victora CG, Onyango AW, Frongillo EA, Martines J. The who
542 Multicentre Growth Reference Study: Planning, Study Design, and Methodology. *Food Nutr*
543 *Bull*. 2004 Jan;25(1_suppl_1):S15–26.
- 544 19. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES): Anthropometry procedure
545 manual [Internet]. CDC; 2007 [cited 2023 May 3]. Available from:
546 https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhanes/nhanes_07_08/manual_an.pdf
- 547 20. Iams JD. Small for gestational age (SGA) and fetal growth restriction (FGR). *American*
548 *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2010 Jun;202(6):513.
- 549 21. Hughes MM, Black RE, Katz J. 2500-g Low Birth Weight Cutoff: History and Implications
550 for Future Research and Policy. *Matern Child Health J*. 2017 Feb;21(2):283–9.
- 551 22. Quinn JA, Munoz FM, Gonik B, Frau L, Cutland C, Mallett-Moore T, et al. Preterm birth:
552 Case definition & guidelines for data collection, analysis, and presentation of immunisation
553 safety data. *Vaccine*. 2016 Dec;34(49):6047–56.

- 554 23. Margerison Zilko CE, Rehkopf D, Abrams B. Association of maternal gestational weight
555 gain with short- and long-term maternal and child health outcomes. *American Journal of*
556 *Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2010 Jun;202(6):574.e1-574.e8.
- 557 24. Chung JGY, Taylor RS, Thompson JMD, Anderson NH, Dekker GA, Kenny LC, et al.
558 Gestational weight gain and adverse pregnancy outcomes in a nulliparous cohort. *Eur J*
559 *Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2013 Apr;167(2):149–53.
- 560 25. Perumal N, Cole DC, Ouédraogo HZ, Sindi K, Loechl C, Low J, et al. Health and nutrition
561 knowledge, attitudes and practices of pregnant women attending and not-attending ANC
562 clinics in Western Kenya: a cross-sectional analysis. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*
563 [Internet]. 2013 Dec [cited 2020 Mar 2];13(1). Available from:
564 <https://bmcpregnancychildbirth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2393-13-146>
- 565 26. Vinturache A, Moledina N, McDonald S, Slater D, Tough S. Pre-pregnancy Body Mass
566 Index (BMI) and delivery outcomes in a Canadian population. *BMC Pregnancy and*
567 *Childbirth* [Internet]. 2014 Dec [cited 2020 Jan 16];14(1). Available from:
568 <http://bmcpregnancychildbirth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12884-014-0422-y>
- 569 27. Nucci D, Chiavarini M, Duca E. Pre-pregnancy body mass index, gestational weight gain
570 and adverse birth outcomes: some evidence from Italy. *annali di igiene medicina preventiva*
571 *e di comunità*. 2018 Apr 30;(2):140–52.
- 572 28. Pözlberger E, Hartmann B, Hafner E, Stümpflein I, Kirchengast S. MATERNAL HEIGHT
573 AND PRE-PREGNANCY WEIGHT STATUS ARE ASSOCIATED WITH FETAL
574 GROWTH PATTERNS AND NEWBORN SIZE. *J Biosoc Sci*. 2017 May;49(3):392–407.

- 575 29. Patra S, Sarangi G. Association between maternal anthropometry and birth outcome. *J*
576 *Pediatr Assoc India*. 2017 Apr 1;6(2):85–94.
- 577 30. Britto RP de A, Florêncio TMT, Benedito Silva AA, Sesso R, Cavalcante JC, Sawaya AL.
578 *Influence of Maternal Height and Weight on Low Birth Weight: A Cross-Sectional Study in*
579 *Poor Communities of Northeastern Brazil*. Alexander BT, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2013 Nov
580 11;8(11):e80159.
- 581 31. Zhang G, Bacelis J, Lengyel C, Teramo K, Hallman M, Helgeland Ø, et al. Assessing the
582 *Causal Relationship of Maternal Height on Birth Size and Gestational Age at Birth: A*
583 *Mendelian Randomization Analysis*. Myers J, editor. *PLoS Med*. 2015 Aug
584 18;12(8):e1001865.
- 585 32. Johrapurkar M, Sharma R. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF PREGANANT MOTHERS:
586 EFFECT ONNEONATAL ANTHROPOMETRY. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF*
587 *RESEARCHES IN BIOSCIENCES, AGRICULTURE AND TECHNOLOGY*. 2018
588 Jan;6(1):106–13.
- 589 33. O’Brien EC, Alberdi G, McAuliffe FM. The influence of socioeconomic status on
590 gestational weight gain: a systematic review. *Journal of Public Health*. 2018 Mar 1;40(1):41–
591 55.
- 592 34. Vanstone M, Kandasamy S, Giacomini M, DeJean D, McDonald SD. Pregnant women’s
593 perceptions of gestational weight gain: A systematic review and meta-synthesis of qualitative
594 research. *Matern Child Nutr* [Internet]. 2017 Oct [cited 2023 Mar 2];13(4). Available from:
595 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/mcn.12374>

- 596 35. Papazian T, Abi Tayeh G, Sibai D, Hout H, Melki I, Rabbaa Khabbaz L. Impact of maternal
597 body mass index and gestational weight gain on neonatal outcomes among healthy Middle-
598 Eastern females. Cardoso MA, editor. PLoS ONE. 2017 Jul 17;12(7):e0181255.
- 599 36. Takagi K, Iwama N, Metoki H, Uchikura Y, Matsubara Y, Matsubara K, et al. Paternal
600 height has an impact on birth weight of their offspring in a Japanese population: the Japan
601 Environment and Children's Study. J Dev Orig Health Dis. 2019 Oct;10(5):542–54.
- 602 37. Morrison J, Williams GM, Najman JM, Andersen MJ. The Influence of Paternal Height and
603 Weight on Birth-weight. Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol. 1991 May;31(2):114–6.
- 604 38. Nahum GG, Stanislaw H. Relationship of paternal factors to birth weight. J Reprod Med.
605 2003 Dec;48(12):963–8.
- 606 39. To W, Cheung W, Kwok J. Paternal Height and Weight as Determinants of Birth Weight in a
607 Chinese Population. Amer J Perinatol. 1998;15(09):545–8.
- 608 40. Skåren L, Davies B, Bjørnerem Å. The effect of maternal and paternal height and weight on
609 antenatal, perinatal and postnatal morphology in sex-stratified analyses. Acta Obstet Gynecol
610 Scand. 2020 Jan;99(1):127–36.
- 611

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.06.23288237>; this version posted April 12, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).





Figure 1: Recruitment flowchart for MAI cohort



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.06.23288237>; this version posted April 12, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 2: GWG according to IOM Guidelines in rural Indian pregnant women from MAI cohort
 GWG: Gestational weight gain
 *Level of significance at p value <0.05