

1 **Title page**

2 **Fetal macrosomia and its associated factors among pregnant women delivered at national referral**
3 **hospital in Uganda, a case-control study.**

4 **Short title:** Associated factors for fetal macrosomia

5 **Article type:** Research

6 Authors: Peter Wanyera^{1,2*}, Eve Nakabembe¹, Mike Nantamu Kagawa^{1*}

7 ¹Department of obstetrics and gynaecology, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Makerere
8 University. P.O. Box 7072, Kampala, Uganda

9 ²Busiu Health Centre IV, Mbale District Local Government, Uganda

10

11 *These authors contributed equally to the writing of this manuscript and are both first authors.

12 Email addresses:

13 WP : dr.wanyerapeter@gmail.com

14 NE: evebembe@gmail.com

15 KNM: kagawanm@gmail.com

16 *Corresponding author: Mike N. Kagawa, Department of obstetrics and gynaecology, School of
17 Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Makerere University

18

19 **Abstract**

20 **Background:** The delivery of macrosomic newborns (newborns>4000gm) is associated with many
21 complications, yet the number macrosomic newborns is increasing steadily worldwide. Studies suggest
22 the risk factors for fetal macrosomia include weight at first antenatal visit, previous delivery of a large
23 newborn, newly diagnosed diabetes in pregnancy, increasing number of deliveries, a male fetus, and many
24 others. The objective of this study was to determine the risk factors for fetal macrosomia among women
25 who delivered at a National Referral Hospital in Kampala, Uganda in order to address a gap in knowledge
26 in this area.

27 **Methods:** An unmatched case-control study was conducted among 177 cases and 354 controls at
28 Kawempe National Referral Hospital. Data was collected using interviewer-administered questionnaires.
29 Bivariate and multivariate analysis was done using STATA version 16.0.

30 **Results:** Risk factors for fetal macrosomia included maternal age ≥ 40 years (aOR = 7.4, [95%CI 1.37 -
31 39.44], p value = 0.020), maternal weight ≥ 80 kg (aOR = 4.0, [95%CI 2.15 - 7.40], p value <0.001), maternal
32 height ≥ 160 cm (aOR = 1.6, [95%CI 1.02 - 2.51], p value = 0.040), being married (aOR = 2.55, [95%CI 1.08 -
33 6.06], P value = 0.038), gestation age ≥ 40 weeks (aOR = 1.8, [95%CI 1.16 – 2.82], p value = 0.009), previous
34 macrosomia (aOR = 2.2, [95%CI 1.26 - 3.81], p value = 0.006) and male babies (aOR = 1.78, [95%CI 1.14 -
35 2.77], p value = 0.011)

36 **Conclusions:** Maternal demographic factors at the time of birth such as weight, height as well as advanced
37 age significantly contribute to giving birth to large newborns. Other factors such as post-datism, previous
38 delivery of a large newborn, male fetus and being in a marital relationship, were also noted. A well-
39 designed protocol to identify women with risk factors for fetal macrosomia may help to provided targeted
40 interventions in this group.

41 **Keywords;** *Fetal macrosomia, maternal weight, risk factors*

42

43 **Plain English Summary**

44 The delivery of large newborns (greater than 4000gm) is associated with many complications for both
45 the mother and the newborn, and yet the number large newborns is increasing steadily worldwide.

46 Documented factors shown to increase the likelihood of delivering a large newborn include weight at
47 first antenatal visit, previous delivery of a large newborn, increased weight gain during pregnancy,
48 maternal obesity, newly diagnosed diabetes in pregnancy, pregnancies going beyond the due date, a
49 male fetus, and advanced maternal age.

50 There is paucity of information regarding delivery of delivery of large newborns in Uganda. We therefore
51 set out to determine the factors that increase the likelihood of delivering large newborns among women
52 who delivered at the National Referral Hospital in Kampala, Uganda.

53 In this study we retrospectively compared 177 women with large newborns and 354 women who had
54 average-sized newborns.

55 Our findings indicate an increased likelihood of delivering a large newborn among mothers who were
56 greater than 80kg, more than 40 years and taller than 160cm, as well as those who were married,
57 carrying a male infant, where the pregnancy went beyond 40 weeks, and those with a previous delivery
58 of a large newborn.

59 Maternal demographic factors at the time of birth such as weight, height as well as advance in age could
60 significantly contribute to giving birth to a large newborn. Other factors such as a pregnancy going
61 beyond its due date, having previously delivered a large newborn, a male fetus and being in a marital
62 relationship, were also noted.

63

64

65

66

67 **Introduction**

68 The worldwide prevalence of birth of infants greater or equal to 4000gm is approximately 9 percent and
69 0.1 percent for weight greater or equal to 5000g, with wide variations among countries [1]. Globally,
70 macrosomia affects 3 to 15% of all pregnancies [2] and in high income countries, the magnitude of
71 macrosomia ranges from 5 to 20% of all births [3]. In the United States, approximately 7 percent of live
72 born infants weigh greater than or equal to 4000 g and 1 percent weigh greater than 4500g [4]. The
73 prevalence of birth weight greater than or equal to 4000 g in low-income countries is typically 1 to 5
74 percent but ranges from 0.5 to 14.9 percent [5]. For example, findings from a recent study showed a
75 prevalence of macrosomia of 6.7% in Ethiopia [6].

76 Management of fetal macrosomia has for long been an obstetric challenge and is becoming an increasingly
77 important problem because of the rising incidence of macrosomia and the associated risks to the mother
78 and infant. Recent evidence suggests that the incidence of macrosomia is increasing. This is attributed to
79 the increase in maternal anthropometry, reduced cigarette smoking, and changes in socio -demographic
80 factors [7].

81 Documented risk factors for macrosomia are weight at first visit, previous macrosomic infant, excessive
82 weight gain in pregnancy, obesity, gestational diabetes, multiparity, post-datism, male fetus, and
83 advanced maternal age [8, 9]. Other factors associated with fetal macrosomia include genetics, duration
84 of gestation, presence of gestational diabetes, and diabetes mellitus types I and II. Genetic, racial, and
85 ethnic factors influence birth weight and the risk of macrosomia [10]. Fetal macrosomia complicates
86 delivery process for both mothers and neonates and macrosomic babies have higher rates of developing
87 both short- and long-term adverse health outcomes [2]. Fetal and neonatal outcomes of fetal macrosomia
88 include shoulder dystocia, birth trauma like brachial plexus injury and skeletal injury, chorioamnionitis
89 because of prolonged labour, meconium aspiration, low APGAR score, neonatal hypoglycemia and
90 intrauterine fetal death (8).

91 Since prior diagnosis / antenatal prediction of fetal macrosomia is challenging both by sonography and
92 usual estimation by palpation, paying attention to detail in terms of risk assessment and tests like blood
93 sugar levels, maternal weight, height, previous history in terms of birth outcome and birth weights could
94 help identify more of these mothers. [11]. The aim of this study was to determine the risk factors for fetal
95 macrosomia among women who delivered at Kawempe National Referral Hospital (KNRH) in Kampala,
96 Uganda. It is hoped that with this information, it will be possible to suggest ways in which prediction of
97 macrosomia can be improved in order to institute interventions to minimise the adverse maternal and
98 fetal complications associated with macrosomia.

99 **Materials and Methods**

100 This was an unmatched case-control study conducted among postpartum women on the labour and post-
101 natal wards at KNRH in Kampala. KNRH is one of the largest and public national referral hospitals in
102 Uganda. It is a teaching hospital for the department of Obstetrics and Gynecology of Makerere University
103 College of Health Sciences. The hospital is located approximately 12 kilometers from the capital city centre
104 and has a bed capacity of 170. The population of Kampala City where the hospital is located is about 2
105 million people during the night, but this rises to about 4.5 million during the day. About 60-80 mothers
106 are delivered daily at the hospital with 40-60 spontaneous vaginal deliveries and 15-20 caesarian
107 deliveries with 2-3 macrosomic babies daily. Most patients received are from within the city and the
108 surrounding districts as well as referrals from lower health units all over the country.

109 **Characteristics of participants**

110 Participants were women who delivered at KNRH during the study period. Women with babies of birth
111 weight greater or equal to 4000gm were taken as cases and those with babies weighing 2500kg – 3990kg
112 were considered as controls.

113 **Sample Size Determination**

114 The sample size was estimated using an online formula for case control studies by Glaziou Phillipe [12].

115 This was based on a study done in Ethiopia by Wondie et al to determine factors associated with
116 macrosomia among neonates delivered at Debre Markos Referral Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia in 2014
117 [13] . In this study, 70.7% of multiparous mothers had macrosomic babies, compared to 60.1% of the
118 controls. Using the following assumptions: Odds ratio 1.9, Exposed controls 60.1%, Alpha risk 5%, and a
119 Control / Case ratio 2:1, the number of cases required was determined to be 177, and the number of
120 controls 354; giving an overall sample size of 531 participants.

121 **Sampling Method**

122 Consecutive sampling was used to recruit cases. A case was any mother in the postnatal ward with a baby
123 birth weight of 4000gm or more as documented in the delivery register. For each case, two controls were
124 selected and these included mothers who had delivered a baby weighing between 2500 – 3999gm, just
125 before and after the case as indicated in the delivery register giving a ratio of cases: controls = 1:2. In case
126 any of the selected controls as per the register was found to be a case, then four controls were selected,
127 that is two before and two after the two cases.

128 During sampling, mothers who were identified as cases or controls were approached and given a full
129 explanation about the study. Following acceptance to participate in the study, written informed consent
130 was obtained. For minors (emancipated or non-emancipated), consent was sought from a legal guardian
131 or parent present at time of recruitment. Data collection was done within 24hours of delivery using a pre-
132 tested interviewer administered questionnaire. Additional Information was obtained from the mother's
133 clinical chart/delivery report where such information was documented.

134 **Data collection and analysis**

135 Data was collected using pre-tested interviewer administered structured questionnaires for three months
136 from 8th February 2021 to 25th May 2021 when the expected sample size was achieved. A database was
137 designed using the computer software EPI-DATA version 4.6 for data. The raw data was securely stored
138 to maintain confidentiality. The data was then exported to STATA version 16.0 software for analysis. For

139 continuous data that was normally distributed, comparison between the cases and the controls was done
140 using the student t-test. For data that was not normally distributed, comparison between the cases and
141 the controls was done using the Mann Whitney U Test (Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test). Binary logistic regression
142 was used in multivariate analysis for factors associated with fetal macrosomia. All variables with a P value
143 <0.05 using the chi-square test were included in the multivariable model. Backward stepwise selection (or
144 backward elimination) method was used in analysis for the associated factors. Odds ratios were used as
145 the measure of association and reported along with their 95% confidence intervals.

146 **Ethics approval and consent to participate;** approval was obtained from the Makerere University School
147 of Medicine Research and Ethics Committee (#REC REF 2021-002). Voluntary written informed consent
148 was sought from each participant before enrolment into the study. If the participant was a minor, the
149 parent or legal guardian was requested to provide an informed consent in writing before the subject was
150 enrolled into the study. The study participants were informed of their right to refuse participation or
151 withdraw from the study at any time if they so wished, and that refusal to participate or withdrawal of
152 consent from the study would not result in any penalties or have any impact on their care in the hospital.

153 **Consent for publication;** the participants were informed during the consent process that the findings,
154 without disclosing their names may be published, and they had no objection. All authors consent to be a
155 part of this publication by taking full responsibility and accountability for the contents of the article. All
156 the work, figures and tables in this publication were prepared by the authors and where other work is
157 used, it has been appropriately cited.

158

159

160

161

162

163 **Results**

164 **Table 1. Maternal characteristics**

	Cases n=177	Controls n=354	
Maternal age in years (mean ± SD)	28.5 ± 5.9	25.9 ± 5.4	
Maternal weight (kgs) (mean ± SD)	78.4 ± 12.4	68.2 ± 11.7	
Maternal height (cm) (mean ± SD)	163.0 ± 6.9	159.5 ± 7.6	
MUAC (cm) (mean ± SD)	30.6 ± 3.3	28.3 ± 3.4	
BMI (kg/m ²) (mean ± SD)	29.5 ± 4.5	26.8 ± 4.2	
Maternal age, year categories	n=177 (%)	n=354 (%)	P value
<30	109 (61.6)	264 (74.6)	0.002
30 – 39	59 (33.3)	88 (24.9)	0.040
≥40	9 (5.1)	2 (0.5)	0.001
Weight categories (kg)			
<80	98 (55.4)	299 (84.5)	<0.001
80 – 89	42 (23.7)	28 (7.9)	<0.001
≥90	37 (20.9)	27 (7.6)	<0.001
Height categories (cm)			
<160	68 (38.4)	201 (56.8)	<0.001
≥160	109 (61.6)	153 (43.2)	
Maternal education level			
None	0 (0.0)	6 (1.7)	0.082
Primary	63 (35.6)	124 (35.0)	0.899
Secondary	89 (50.3)	183 (51.7)	0.759
Tertiary	25 (14.1)	41 (11.6)	0.403
Residence type			
Urban	152 (85.9)	319 (90.1)	0.147
Rural	25 (14.1)	35 (9.9)	
Marital status			
Single	11 (6.2)	48 (13.6)	0.011
Married/ partnered	166 (93.8)	306 (86.4)	
Religion			
Catholic	53 (29.9)	104 (29.4)	0.894
Pentecostal/ Born Again	36 (20.3)	77 (21.7)	0.708
Muslim	43 (24.3)	91 (25.7)	0.723
Anglican	39 (22.0)	63 (17.8)	0.243
Others (SDA, orthodox)	6 (3.4)	19 (5.4)	0.310

Working status

Employed/ salaried	31 (17.5)	63 (17.8)	0.934
Business	92 (52.0)	144 (40.7)	0.014
Housewife/ Not working	54 (30.5)	147 (41.53)	0.014

165

166 A total of 531 participants were recruited into the study with 177 (33.3%) as cases and 354 (66.7%) as
 167 controls making up a ratio of 1:2. The maternal age, weight and height was significantly higher among
 168 the cases compared to the controls across all the categories (Table 1).

169 **Table 2. Pregnancy and birth related characteristics**

	Cases n=177 (%)	Controls n=354 (%)	P value
Gestation age in weeks (mean ± SD), n = 478	39.5 ± 1.1	39.0 ± 1.3	<0.001
Gestation age categories (weeks) n = 478			
37 – 39	83 (52.9)	213 (66.4)	0.004
40 – 42	74 (47.1)	108 (33.6)	
Parity (carried above 28 weeks)			
1	38 (21.5)	123 (34.8)	0.002
2 – 4	107 (60.4)	192 (54.2)	0.257
≥5	32 (18.1)	39 (11.0)	0.054
Ever delivered a baby >4kg			
No	123 (69.5)	310 (87.6)	<0.001
Yes	54 (30.5)	44 (12.4)	
Number of deliveries >4kg (n=98)			
1	36 (66.7)	30 (68.2)	0.874
2	13 (24.1)	10 (22.7)	0.876
3	4 (7.4)	3 (6.8)	0.910
4	1 (1.9)	1 (2.3)	0.884
Ever had a still birth			
No	171 (96.6)	345 (97.5)	0.557
Yes	6 (3.4)	9 (2.5)	
Number of still births (n=15)			
1	4 (66.7)	8 (88.9)	0.143
2	2 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	
3	0 (0.0)	1 (11.1)	
Early neonatal death			

No	176 (99.4)	348 (98.3)	0.281
Yes	1 (0.6)	6 (1.7)	
Use of herbal medicine during pregnancy			
No	117 (66.1)	277 (78.3)	0.003
Yes	60 (33.9)	77 (21.7)	

170

171 The following characteristics were significantly higher among the cases than in the controls; gestation age
 172 (39.5 ± 1.1 vs 39.0 ± 1.3, P value <0.001), ever delivered a baby greater than 4kg (30.5% vs 12.4%, P value
 173 <0.001) and use of herbal medicine during pregnancy (33.9% versus 21.7%, P value = 0.003) (Table 2).

174 **Table 3. Delivery and fetal characteristics**

	Cases n=177 (%)	Controls n=354 (%)	P value
Neonatal Apgar at 1 minute (mean ± SD)	7.2 ± 2.4	7.7 ± 1.9	0.004
Neonatal Apgar at 5 minutes (mean ± SD)	8.4 ± 2.6	9.0 ± 2.0	0.009
Mode of delivery			
Vaginal	80 (45.2)	159 (44.9)	0.951
Caesarean	97 (54.8)	195 (55.1)	
Labour complications			
None	131 (74.0)	264 (74.6)	0.887
Obstructed labor	24 (13.6)	39 (11.0)	0.394
Ruptured uterus	7 (4.0)	10 (2.8)	0.485
Others	15 (8.5)	41 (11.6)	0.271
Labour augmentation with oxytocin			
No	122 (70.9)	252 (72.6)	0.682
Yes	50 (29.1)	95 (27.4)	
Current delivery outcomes			
Live birth	164 (92.7)	340 (96.1)	0.094
Still birth	13 (7.3)	14 (3.9)	
Sex of the baby			
Male	113 (63.8)	195 (55.1)	0.054
Female	63 (35.6)	159 (44.9)	0.040
Sexual development disorder	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	

175

176 The mean Apgar scores at 5 minutes was significantly lower for cases as compared to controls (8.4 ± 2.6
 177 vs 9.0 ± 2.0 , P value = 0.009). In addition, the proportion of male babies born to the cases was significantly
 178 higher than that for the controls (64.6% vs 55.3%, P value = 0.041) (Table 3).

179 **Risk factors for fetal macrosomia**

180 **Table 4. Multivariate analysis of maternal risk factors for fetal macrosomia**

	Cases	Controls	Adjusted OR	P value
	n (%)	n (%)	(95%CI)	
Number of participants	177 (33.3)	354 (66.7)		
Maternal age, year categories				
<30	109 (61.6)	264 (74.6)	Ref	
30 – 39	59 (33.3)	88 (24.9)	0.8 (0.49 - 1.38)	0.456
≥40	9 (5.1)	2 (0.5)	7.4 (1.37 - 39.44)	0.020
Weight, kg categories				
<80	98 (55.4)	299 (84.5)	Ref	
80 – 89	42 (23.7)	28 (7.9)	4.0 (2.15 - 7.40)	<0.001
≥90	37 (20.9)	27 (7.6)	3.9 (1.99 - 7.49)	<0.001
Height, cm categories				
<160	68 (38.4)	201 (56.8)	Ref	
≥160	109 (61.6)	153 (43.2)	1.6 (1.02 - 2.51)	0.040
Marital status				
Single	11 (6.2)	48 (13.6)	Ref	
Married/ partnered	166 (93.8)	306 (86.4)	2.5 (1.05 - 5.95)	0.038
Gestation age, weeks categories				
37 – 39	83 (52.9)	213 (66.4)	Ref	
40 – 42	74 (47.1)	108 (33.6)	1.8 (1.16 - 2.82)	0.009
Ever delivered a baby >4kg				
No	123 (69.5)	310 (87.6)	Ref	
Yes	54 (30.5)	44 (12.4)	2.2 (1.26 - 3.81)	0.006
Use of herbal medicine during pregnancy				
No	117 (66.1)	277 (78.3)	Ref	
Yes	60 (33.9)	77 (21.7)	2.3 (1.41 - 3.82)	0.001
Sex of the baby				
Female	63 (35.6)	159 (44.9)	Ref	
Male	113 (63.8)	195 (55.1)	1.78 (1.14 - 2.77)	0.011

182 On multivariate analysis, the following factors were found to be risk factors for fetal macrosomia;
183 maternal age \geq 40 years, maternal weight \geq 80kg, maternal height \geq 160cm, being married, gestation age
184 \geq 40 weeks, history of having a prior delivery of a baby greater than 4kg, use of herbal medicine during
185 pregnancy, and having a male baby (Table 4).

186 Discussion

187 This was an unmatched hospital-based case control study to identify the risk factors for fetal macrosomia
188 among women delivering at a National Referral Hospital in Kampala, Uganda. Risk factors for fetal
189 macrosomia were- maternal age greater or equal to 40 years, maternal weight of 80kg and above, height
190 greater than 160cm, being married, gestational age greater or equal to 40 weeks, history of previous
191 macrosomic baby, use of herbal medicines during pregnancy and a male fetus.

192 The study found out that maternal age of 40 years and above had increased odds of fetal macrosomia.
193 Mothers who were aged 40 years and above were 7.4 times more likely to deliver a macrosomic baby
194 compared to those below 40 years (aOR = 7.4, 95%CI 1.37 - 39.44, P value = 0.020). These findings are
195 consistent with a study done in Nigeria where the mean age of mothers that had macrosomic babies was
196 reported to be significantly higher than that of mothers with normal birth weight babies [14]. This could
197 be related to the frequent development of medical conditions like Gestational diabetes mellitus in older
198 women. This was however in disagreement with findings of a study done in South Africa which found that
199 advanced maternal age women was associated with delivery of low birth weight babies [15].

200 Compared to women with maternal weight of 80kg or less, women with a maternal weight of 80-89kg had
201 4 times higher odds of delivering a macrosomic newborn (aOR = 4.0, 95%CI 2.15 - 7.40, P value <0.001),.
202 This could be attributed to excess fats in obese mothers being broken down into glucose which is later
203 transferred to the fetus across the placenta [16]. The findings from this study are similar to findings from
204 studies done in Tanzania and Southeast Nigeria which reported an increased risk of macrosomia with
205 increasing maternal weight [17, 18].

206 Maternal height greater or equal to 160cm was an independent risk factor for fetal macrosomia. Mothers
207 whose height was greater or equal to 160cm were 60 percent more likely to deliver macrosomic babies
208 compared to mothers whose height was less than 160cm (aOR = 1.6, 95%CI 1.02 - 2.51, P value = 0.040).
209 These findings are similar to studies done in Nigeria and Saudi Arabia where it was reported that maternal
210 height greater than 160cm was significantly associated with macrosomia compared to controls [14, 19,
211 20].

212 The odds of having a macrosomic infant were 2.5 times among the married women than in single women
213 (aOR = 2.5, 95%CI 1.05 - 5.95, P value = 0.038). These findings are similar to results of studies done in
214 Ethiopia and other low-and middle-income countries [6, 21]. This may be attributed to better social and
215 economic support to aid in nutrition and psychological wellbeing of the mother and generally good quality
216 of life [22].

217 In this study, mothers whose gestational age was greater or equal to 40 weeks were 1.8 times more likely
218 to deliver a macrosomic baby compared to those less than 40 weeks of gestation (aOR = 1.8, 95%CI 1.16
219 – 2.82, P value = 0.009). This is similar to findings by Koyanagi et al in his study entitled macrosomia in 23
220 developing countries: an analysis of a multi-country, facility-based, cross-sectional survey [5]. Aduigna
221 also found similar trends in his study done in Gondar, Ethiopia where mothers having a gestational age
222 greater or equal to 40 weeks were 4.1 times more likely to be deliver macrosomic babies than mothers
223 with less than 40 weeks [3]. This may be a consequence of continued supply of nutrients and oxygen-rich
224 blood to the developing fetus beyond 40 weeks.

225 A previous history of delivering a macrosomic infant was found to be associated with 2.2 times odds of
226 having another macrosomic infant compared to mothers with no prior history (aOR = 2.2, 95%CI 1.26 -
227 3.81, P value = 0.006). This finding has been consistent across several studies [3, 23, 24]. This may be
228 due to an inherited genetic tendency of a mother to deliver macrosomic babies. Use of herbal medicines
229 during pregnancy was also found to be associated with macrosomia with a 2.3 times risk compared to

230 mothers who never used herbal medicines herbs (aOR = 2.3, 95%CI 1.41 - 3.82, P value = 0.001). This is
231 in contrast to findings from other studies that did not report any association [25, 26]. There seems no
232 biologically plausible explanation except that these herbs may contain insulin inducing agents that may
233 interfere with glucose metabolism hence leading to fetal macrosomia.

234 Delivery of a male infant was associated with macrosomia. Male babies were nearly 80 percent more
235 likely to be macrosomic compared to their female counterparts (aOR = 1.78, 95%CI 1.14 - 2.77, P value =
236 0.011). These findings are consistent with other studies done in Africa which found that male gender was
237 significantly associated with increased risk of macrosomia [27, 28]. Daily fetal growth appears to be higher
238 in male fetuses than in females [29]. More weight gained by male babies in utero is thought to be a result
239 of androgen action [30].

240 **Conclusions and recommendations.**

241 The risk factors for fetal macrosomia among women delivering at Kawempe National Referral Hospital in
242 central Uganda were; maternal age greater or equal to 40 years, maternal weight of 80kg and above,
243 height greater than 160cm, gestational age greater or equal to 40 weeks, history of previous
244 macrosomic baby, being married, use of herbal medicines during pregnancy and male fetus. It therefore
245 becomes imperative to identify pregnant women at risk of fetal macrosomia during ANC, admission,
246 labour, using simple processes such measuring maternal weight and height so that effective education,
247 precautions and interventions are implemented. A well-designed protocol to guide in the management
248 of mothers at risk of macrosomia would go a long in reducing the adverse maternal and fetal outcomes
249 such as shoulder dystocia, perineal trauma, fetal distress and many others that are known to be
250 associated with fetal macrosomia.

251 **Study limitations**

252 Pregnancy weight gain could not be established since most mothers did not know their pre-pregnancy
253 weight.

254 **Declarations**

255 **Availability of data and materials;** All data regarding this manuscript is available from the corresponding
256 author upon reasonable request.

257 **Competing interests;** all the authors declare no competing interests.

258 **Funding;** funding for this work was obtained from personal savings.

259 **Authors' contributions;** All authors; WP, EN & MNK made significant contributions to this work from the
260 conception stage, study design, execution, acquisition of data, analysis, and interpretation. MNK & WP
261 drafted the initial manuscript and all authors participated in critically reviewing the article and made
262 suggestions for improvement. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

263 **Acknowledgements;** We would like to acknowledge the support obtained from the management and
264 staff of Kawempe National Referral Hospital, the work well done by the research assistants and all the
265 study participants.

266 **References**

- 267 1. Beniuk V., S.E., Lastovetskaya L., & Manzhara V *The modern view on the problem of fetal*
268 *macrosomia*. Sciences of Europe, 2018. **26**(1): p. 64-70.
- 269 2. Biratu, A.K., N. Wakgari, and B. Jikamo, *Magnitude of fetal macrosomia and its associated*
270 *factors at public health institutions of Hawassa city, southern Ethiopia*. BMC Research Notes,
271 2018. **11**(1): p. 888.
- 272 3. Adugna, D.G., E.F. Enyew, and M.T. Jemberie, *Prevalence and Associated Factors of Macrosomia*
273 *Among Newborns Delivered in University of Gondar Comprehensive Specialized Hospital, Gondar,*
274 *Ethiopia: An Institution-Based Cross-Sectional Study*. Pediatric Health, Medicine and
275 Therapeutics, 2020. **11**: p. 495-503.
- 276 4. Martin, J.A., et al., *Births: Final Data for 2017*. Natl Vital Stat Rep, 2018. **67**(8): p. 1-50.
- 277 5. Koyanagi, A., et al., *Macrosomia in 23 developing countries: an analysis of a multicountry,*
278 *facility-based, cross-sectional survey*. The Lancet, 2013. **381**(9865): p. 476-483.
- 279 6. Mengesha, H.G., et al., *Low birth weight and macrosomia in Tigray, Northern Ethiopia: who are*
280 *the mothers at risk?* BMC Pediatrics, 2017. **17**(1): p. 144.
- 281 7. Lao, T. and Y.K.-Y. Cheng, *Fetal and maternal complications in macrosomic pregnancies*.
282 *Research and Reports in Neonatology*, 2014: p. 65.
- 283 8. Mardani, M.-., et al., *Evaluation of the Prevalence of Macrosomia and the Maternal Risk Factors*.
284 *Iranian Journal of Neonatology IJN*, 2014. **5**(3): p. 5-9.
- 285 9. Richardson, C. and H. Trotman, *Risk factors for the delivery of macrosomic infants at the*
286 *University Hospital of the West Indies*. Am J Perinatol, 2014. **31**(11): p. 927-32.
- 287 10. Najafian, M. and M. Cheraghi, *Occurrence of fetal macrosomia rate and its maternal and*
288 *neonatal complications: a 5-year cohort study*. ISRN Obstet Gynecol, 2012. **2012**: p. 353791.

- 289 11. Allen, K. and S.V.F. Wallace, *Fetal macrosomia*. Obstetrics, Gynaecology & Reproductive
290 Medicine, 2013. **23**(6): p. 185-188.
- 291 12. Glaziou, P., <http://sampsiz.sourceforge.net/iface/s3.html>. 2005.
- 292 13. Wondie, T., D. Jara, and M. Ayana, *Factors Associated with Macrosomia among Neonates*
293 *Delivered at Debre Markos Referral Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia, 2014: A Case Control Study*.
294 Journal of diabetes & metabolism, 2014. **5**: p. 1-5.
- 295 14. Olorok, O.E., J.U. Onakewhor, and A.K. Aderoba, *Determinants and outcome of fetal macrosomia*
296 *in a Nigerian tertiary hospital*. Niger Med J, 2015. **56**(6): p. 411-5.
- 297 15. Hoque, M.A., *Advanced maternal age and outcomes of pregnancy: A retrospective study from*
298 *South Africa*. Biomedical Research-tokyo, 2012. **23**: p. 0.
- 299 16. Gaudet, L., et al., *Maternal obesity and occurrence of fetal macrosomia: a systematic review and*
300 *meta-analysis*. Biomed Res Int, 2014. **2014**: p. 640291.
- 301 17. Kamanu, C.I., et al., *Fetal macrosomia in African women: a study of 249 cases*. Arch Gynecol
302 Obstet, 2009. **279**(6): p. 857-61.
- 303 18. Said, A.S. and K.P. Manji, *Risk factors and outcomes of fetal macrosomia in a tertiary centre in*
304 *Tanzania: a case-control study*. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 2016. **16**(1): p. 243.
- 305 19. Meshari, A.A., S. De Silva, and I. Rahman, *Fetal macrosomia--maternal risks and fetal outcome*.
306 Int J Gynaecol Obstet, 1990. **32**(3): p. 215-22.
- 307 20. Rochow, N., et al., *Maternal body height is a stronger predictor of birth weight than ethnicity:*
308 *analysis of birth weight percentile charts*. J Perinat Med, 2018. **47**(1): p. 22-29.
- 309 21. Ye, J., et al., *Searching for the definition of macrosomia through an outcome-based approach in*
310 *low- and middle-income countries: a secondary analysis of the WHO Global Survey in Africa, Asia*
311 *and Latin America*. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth, 2015. **15**(1): p. 324.
- 312 22. Calou, C.G.P., et al., *Maternal predictors related to quality of life in pregnant women in the*
313 *Northeast of Brazil*. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 2018. **16**(1).
- 314 23. Fang, F., et al., *Risk factors for recurrent macrosomia and child outcomes*. World J Pediatr, 2019.
315 **15**(3): p. 289-296.
- 316 24. Walsh, C.A., et al., *Recurrence of fetal macrosomia in non-diabetic pregnancies*. J Obstet
317 Gynaecol, 2007. **27**(4): p. 374-8.
- 318 25. Ahmed, M., et al., *Herbal medicine use by pregnant women in Bangladesh: a cross-sectional*
319 *study*. BMC Complement Altern Med, 2018. **18**(1): p. 333.
- 320 26. El Hajj, M. and L. Holst, *Herbal Medicine Use During Pregnancy: A Review of the Literature With*
321 *a Special Focus on Sub-Saharan Africa*. Front Pharmacol, 2020. **11**: p. 866.
- 322 27. Koyanagi, A., et al., *Macrosomia in 23 developing countries: an analysis of a multicountry,*
323 *facility-based, cross-sectional survey*. Lancet, 2013. **381**(9865): p. 476-83.
- 324 28. Nkwabong, E. and G.R. Nzalli Tangho, *Risk Factors for Macrosomia*. J Obstet Gynaecol India,
325 2015. **65**(4): p. 226-9.
- 326 29. De Jong, C.L.D., et al., *Fetal weight gain in a serially scanned high-risk population*. Ultrasound in
327 Obstetrics and Gynecology, 1998. **11**(1): p. 39-43.
- 328 30. de Zegher, F., H. Devlieger, and R. Eeckels, *Fetal growth: boys before girls*. Horm Res, 1999.
329 **51**(5): p. 258-9.

330