

1 **Predicting low birth weight risks in pregnant women in Brazil using machine**
2 **learning algorithms: Data from the Araraquara Cohort Study**

3
4
5
6 Audêncio Victor, MPH^{1*}, Francielly Almeida, PhD², Sancho Pedro Xavier³, Patrícia H.C.
7 Rondó MD, MPH, PhD ¹

8
9
10 ¹School of Public Health, University of São Paulo (USP). São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

11 ²Faculdade de Economia, Administração e Contabilidade de Ribeirão Preto, FEA-RP/USP., Ribeirão
12 Preto, São Paulo.

13 ³Institute of Collective Health, Federal University of Mato Grosso. Cuiabá, Mato Grosso, Brazil
14
15
16

17 ***Corresponding author:** Audêncio Victor

18 Address: Faculdade de Saúde Pública- USP

19 Avenida Doutor Arnaldo, 715 – São Paulo – São Paulo

20 Postcode: 01246904

21 E-mail: audenciovictor@gmail.com

22 Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8161-3639>
23

24 **Word count: 2907**
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

40 **Abstract**

41

42 **Background:** Low birth weight (LBW) is a critical factor linked to neonatal morbidity
43 and mortality. Early prediction is essential for timely interventions. This study aimed to
44 develop and evaluate predictive models for LBW using machine learning algorithms,
45 including Random Forest, XGBoost, Catboost, and LightGBM.

46 **Methods:** Machine learning algorithms (Random Forest, XGBoost, Catboost, and
47 LightGBM) were trained and evaluated using cross-validation and the SMOTE technique
48 to correct class imbalance. Model performance was measured using the AUROC metric,
49 and variable importance was analyzed with Shapley values to ensure model
50 interpretability.

51 **Results:** The XGBoost model achieved the best performance with an AUROC of 0.94.
52 Catboost and Random Forest also showed excellent results, confirming the effectiveness
53 of these models in predicting LBW.

54 **Conclusion:** Machine learning, combined with SMOTE, proved to be an effective
55 approach for predicting LBW. XGBoost stood out as the most accurate model, but
56 Catboost and Random Forest also provided solid results. These models can be applied to
57 identify high-risk pregnancies, improving perinatal outcomes through early interventions.

58

59 **Keywords:** Low birth weight, machine learning, XGBoost, Random Forest, Araraquara
60 cohort.

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80 **Introduction**

81 Birth weight is one of the primary determinants of newborn survival chances [1,2]. Low
82 birth weight (LBW), defined as the birth of a baby weighing less than 2,500 grams, is a
83 significant public health challenge associated with increased risk of infant mortality,
84 neonatal morbidity, and chronic diseases in childhood and adulthood [3]. Several factors
85 are considered in evaluating birth quality, including maternal nutritional status, prenatal
86 care, and sociodemographic characteristics (BACCARAT DE GODOY MARTINS et al.,
87 2016).

88 Recently, there has been an increase in LBW prevalence, predisposing children to
89 respiratory diseases, growth retardation, heart conditions, and diabetes mellitus
90 (MOREIRA; SOUSA; SARNO, 2018). LBW can result from preterm birth or inadequate
91 fetal growth, often described as "small for gestational age" (SGA) to distinguish between
92 immature infants and those with insufficient prenatal growth [6]. Intrauterine growth
93 composition can influence the risk of cardiometabolic diseases in newborns, affecting
94 both small and large for gestational age infants. The compensation of intrauterine growth
95 through postnatal recovery or reduction may result in adverse outcomes (GÄTJENS et
96 al., 2022). Various factors are identified as predictors of fetal growth, including
97 intrauterine growth retardation, unfavorable socioeconomic conditions, inadequate
98 prenatal care, low maternal education, maternal nutritional status, marital status,
99 ethnicity/race, maternal weight, adolescent or advanced maternal age, urinary infections,
100 and complications such as preeclampsia and bleeding during pregnancy (CHRISTINE et
101 al., 2016; MOREIRA; SOUSA; SARNO, 2018).

102 In maternal and child health, artificial intelligence (AI), including machine learning (ML)
103 algorithms, has been applied for outcome prediction and monitoring in perinatal health,
104 offering new approaches for predictive modeling, diagnosis, early detection, and
105 monitoring in perinatal health [8]. Machine learning is a subfield of AI aimed at extracting
106 knowledge from large amounts of data, where algorithms are trained from previous
107 examples [9]. This field has been on the rise in recent years due to the exponential increase
108 in structured and unstructured data, also known as Big Data (BD), making ML approaches
109 increasingly important in data analysis as traditional methods often rely on unrealistic
110 assumptions [10,11].

111 In the context of maternal and child health, mobile health (mHealth) emerges as a
112 promising AI application, particularly useful in prenatal care in low-resource settings
113 [12]. The application of these algorithms can enhance the precision and reliability of

114 predictions, contributing to early prevention and intervention strategies for fetal growth
115 issues.

116 The goal of this study is to develop a predictive model for low birth weight (LBW) in
117 pregnant women using machine learning algorithms. By applying these algorithms, we
118 aim to improve the accuracy of predictions, thus enabling more effective strategies to
119 address fetal growth problems early.

120

121 **Methods**

122 This study is based on an empirical and quantitative application. Secondary data were
123 analyzed from a longitudinal population-based cohort study conducted in Araraquara, São
124 Paulo, Brazil, titled "Araraquara Cohort" [13]. The sample included women with a
125 gestational age of ≤ 19 weeks who received prenatal care at Basic Health Units in
126 Araraquara, São Paulo, Brazil. The pregnant women were followed quarterly throughout
127 their pregnancy until the birth of their children between 2017 and 2022. Women with twin
128 pregnancies and those who experienced miscarriage were excluded. In cases of fetal and
129 stillbirth, only data from the pregnancy were considered.

130 The outcome of low birth weight was analyzed based on the dichotomous classification
131 of birth weight, defined as low birth weight: < 2500 g and normal weight: ≥ 2500 g. The
132 predictor variables are illustrated in Table 1.

133 The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee with Human Subjects at the
134 School of Public Health, University of São Paulo, prior to data collection, under protocol
135 number CAEE: 59787216.2.0000.5421, opinion number 1.885.874. All participants
136 signed the Informed Consent Form before participating. The participants were informed
137 about the objectives of the study, the associated risks, and benefits, ensuring that their
138 participation was entirely voluntary.

139

140 **Table 1. Description of model variables**

Variable	Description	Category
Maternal Age	Age of the mother at the time of pregnancy.	In years
Marital Status	Mother's marital status.	Married; Stable union; Single, widow, or separated
Maternal Education (in years)	Mother's completed years of education.	None; 1-7; 8-11; 12 or more
Race/Color	Mother's ethnicity or color.	White; Black; Asian; Mixed; Indigenous

Nutritional Status	Physical evaluation of the pregnant woman.	Anthropometry: BMI (kg/m ²): Underweight, Normal, Overweight, Obesity; Arm circumference (cm): Underweight (< 23 cm), Normal (25-28 cm), Overweight or Obese (≥ 28 cm); Body fat percentage
Household Data	Information about the gestational home.	Number of household members per room (terciles)
Previous Pregnancies	Number of previous pregnancies.	0; 1; ≥ 2
Lifestyle	Pregnant woman's lifestyle habits.	Physical activity; Smoking; Alcohol consumption
Morbidity	Pre-existing medical conditions.	Diabetes; Hypertension; Urinary tract infection; Cervicitis/Vaginitis
Other Relevant Predictors	Other relevant information.	Gestational age at birth; Glycemic profile: Fasting glucose (mg/dL), Insulin (μIU/mL), HOMA (μIU/mL), Glycated hemoglobin (%); C-reactive protein (ng/mL); Hemoglobin (g/dL); Lipid profile: Total cholesterol, LDL-c, HDL-c, and triglycerides (mg/dL)

141

142

143

Model Design

144

As shown in Figure 1, regarding the fetal growth outcome (LBW), different model specifications were tested to evaluate whether changes in strategy improved model performance. Models for the outcome were estimated independently, without information sharing between them. Before discussing the models, quantitative variables were normalized using the z-score separately for the training and test sets. All qualitative variables were treated through one-hot encoding, where each category was separately considered for this procedure. Additionally, pregnant women were excluded due to missing information, and variables with missing data below 20% were imputed by the mean.

153


In this study, four different machine learning algorithms were tested: Catboost [14], Xgboost (CHEN e GUESTRIN, 2016), Lightgbm [16] and Random Forest. For Catboost, XGBoost, and LightGBM, the Python packages were used. For the remaining algorithms, the scikit-learn library was employed [17]. Recent studies indicate that boosting algorithms represent the state-of-the-art for tabular data. They have shown high performance across a wide range of tasks, including classification (BORISOV et al., 2022; SHWARTZ-ZIV e ARMON, 2022).

160

The training set was conducted through 10-fold cross-validation using the Bayesian optimization strategy and RandomSearch to evaluate the performance of a machine

161

162 learning model efficiently (BERGSTRÄ e YAMINS; COX, 2013). In cases of significant
163 class imbalance, where the minority class represents less than 25% of the total outcomes,
164 the Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE) was applied. Additionally,
165 the Boruta method was employed for feature selection (KURSA e RUDNICKI, 2010).
166 The best-performing models in the training set (80% of the data) were selected for
167 evaluation in the test set (20%). The evaluation of ML algorithms was conducted in the
168 test set using metrics such as area under the ROC curve (AUC-ROC), Matthews
169 correlation coefficient (MCC), precision, recall, positive predictive value, negative
170 predictive value, and F1-score. Additionally, the performance of the algorithms in the top
171 20% of high-risk patients (20% k-tops) was assessed using metrics such as true positive,
172 false positive, precision, and recall. All analyses followed the Transparent Reporting of a
173 multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD)
174 guidelines [22]. The code developed for constructing the algorithms along with the
175 original dataset, is available on Github [https://github.com/Audency/Predictors-of-Low-
176 Birth-Weight-using-Machine-Learning-.git](https://github.com/Audency/Predictors-of-Low-Birth-Weight-using-Machine-Learning-.git). This study was approved by the Research
177 Ethics Committee of the School of Public Health, University of São Paulo (USP), prior
178 to data collection, under CAEE number 59787216.2.0000.5421, opinion number
179 1.885.874. All participants provided informed consent, consistent with the principles
180 outlined in the Helsinki Declaration.
181



182
183 Figure 1. An example of the workflow diagram for classifying birth weight adequacy.

184

185

186 Results

187 Maternal Characteristics

188 According to Table 2, the maternal characteristics of 1,579 pregnant women from the
189 Araraquara cohort were evaluated. The women had an average age of 28.4 years, a height
190 of 162 cm, a pre-pregnancy body mass index (BMI) of 24.7 kg/m², and a gestational age
191 of 39.3 weeks. Most women (88.4%) had an education level equal to or greater than 8
192 years, 53.7% were non-white, and 87.7% were married or in a stable relationship, with
193 most having a family income of R\$563 and being non-smokers. Only 5.0% of the women
194 had diabetes, and 7.0% had hypertension. A total of 11.3% of the women had a urinary
195 tract infection during pregnancy. CRP (C-reactive protein) levels were 3.3 mg/L
196 (interquartile range: 1.4–7.8), and HOMA (homeostasis model assessment) values were
197 2.9 units (interquartile range: 1.3–6.1). Figure 2 shows the distribution of low birth weight
198 in the Araraquara cohort, where 1,309 (91.2%) had normal birth weight, and 126 (8.8%)
199 had low birth weight.

200
201
202
203

Table 2. Maternal characteristics of pregnant women in the Araraquara Cohort, Brazil (2021-2023)


Variable	N (%)
Age (years)	
< 20	154 (9.7)
20 to 35	1,185 (74.9)
> 35	244 (15.4)
Height (cm)	
< 153	534 (33.7)
153-165	566 (35.8)
> 165	483 (30.5)
Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m²)	
Underweight	64 (4.0)
Normal weight	1,084 (68.5)
Overweight	450 (28.4)
Obesity	48 (3.2)
Arm circumference (cm)	
< 23	674 (42.6)
≥ 23	919 (57.4)
Gestational age (weeks)	39.3 (38.5–40.3)
Maternal Education (years)	
≤ 8	184 (11.6)
> 8	1,395 (88.4)
Number of people per room	
≤ 1	536 (33.9)
> 1	1,043 (66.1)
Family income (R\$)	
< 937	311 (32.5)
937–1,866	563 (34.6)
> 1,866	666 (33.0)
Race	
Non-white	724 (46.3)
White	833 (53.7)
Marital Status	
Single	135 (9.3)
Married or in a stable relationship	1,359 (87.7)
Separated, divorced, or widowed	198 (12.7)
Smoking	
No	1,434 (91.7)
Yes	123 (7.9)
Alcohol Consumption	
No	1,235 (79.5)
Yes	319 (20.5)
Diabetes	
No	1,479 (95.0)
Yes	78 (5.0)
Hypertension	
No	1,445 (93.7)
Yes	108 (7.0)
Urinary Tract Infection	

No	1,378 (88.7)
Yes	175 (11.3)
Candidiasis/Vaginitis	
No	1,445 (91.9)
Yes	108 (6.8)
Number of previous births	
0	764 (53.7)
≥ 1	655 (43.9)
CRP (mg/L)	3.3 (1.4–7.8)
HOMA (units)	2.9 (1.3–6.1)
Glycated Hemoglobin (%)	5.1 (4.7–5.6)
Fasting Glucose (mg/dL)	74.3 (67.3–81.6)
Cholesterol (mg/dL)	195 (168–224)
LDL (mg/dL)	104 (86–123)
HDL (mg/dL)	57 (47–68)
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	94 (65–143)

204
205
206

Note: Data are presented as mean and interquartile range (25th percentile - 75th percentile) or number (percentage). Abbreviations: BMI, Body Mass Index; LDL, Low-Density Lipoprotein; HDL, High-Density Lipoprotein; CRP, C-reactive Protein; HOMA, Homeostasis Model Assessment of Insulin Resistance.

Distribution of Low Birth Weight



207
208

Figure 2. Distribution of LBW

209 Results

210 Performance of Machine Learning Models

211 In this study, we evaluated the predictive capacity of various machine learning models,
212 including Random Forest, XGBoost, LightGBM, and Catboost, to predict LBW in
213 neonates. The analysis focused on multiple performance metrics such as AUROC,

214 accuracy, precision, recall, F1-score, and the MCC to provide a comprehensive evaluation
215 of the ability of these models to classify cases of low birth weight.

216 The results of the machine learning models' evaluation for LBW prediction are
217 summarized in Table 3 and Figure 3. The XGBoost model showed the best performance
218 with an AUROC of 0.941, demonstrating excellent discrimination between neonates with
219 normal and low birth weight. Catboost followed closely with an AUROC of 0.939, while
220 Random Forest and LightGBM achieved AUROCs of 0.938 and 0.937, respectively.

221

222 In addition to AUROC, other performance metrics were considered. Random Forest
223 exhibited the highest overall accuracy (0.94), while Catboost provided the best balance
224 between precision (0.80) and recall (0.78), resulting in an F1-score of 0.79 (Table 3). The
225 ROC curves in Figure 3 visually illustrate the similar performance between the models,
226 with all curves approaching the top-left corner, indicating high discriminatory capacity.


227

228 Table 3. Test Set Performance comparison for LBW Weight Classification Models

Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-Score	MCC	AUC
XGBoost	0.92	0.76	0.77	0.77	0.54	0.94
LightGBM	0.92	0.76	0.77	0.77	0.54	0.94
CatBoost	0.93	0.80	0.78	0.79	0.58	0.94
RandomForest	0.94	0.87	0.72	0.77	0.57	0.94

229

230




231

232 Figure 3. Performance by ROC Curve of ML (Random Forest, XGBoost, LightGBM,
233 and Catboost) for LBW Prediction.

234

235 Variable importance for LBW Prediction

236 Figure 4 shows the importance of the predictors for LBW using Shapley values for the
237 best-performing model, XGBoost. The most important variable identified was gestational
238 weight gain, standing out as the factor with the most influence on predicting low birth
239 weight. Following this, maternal marital status and the absence of regular physical
240 activity during pregnancy were significant predictors. Other factors contributing
241 substantially included maternal race, parity, and fewer prenatal visits, underscoring the
242 importance of socioeconomic and behavioral variables. Variables such as smoking and
243 alcohol consumption during pregnancy, although important predictors, appeared with less
244 relevance compared to the previously mentioned factors. S.1, illustrates the strength of
245 variable contributions to the prediction of LBW using Shapley values in the XGBoost
246 model. The most influential variables, shown in the graphs, provide a detailed view of
247 how each factor contributes to increasing or reducing the risk of LBW.



248

249 Figure 4. Predictors of LBW (Shapley Variable Importance) for the Best Model -
250 XGBoost.

251

252 Discussion

253 The findings from this study confirm and expand the evidence that machine learning (ML)
254 models, such as Random Forest, XGBoost, LightGBM, and Catboost, are effective for
255 predicting low birth weight (LBW) in neonates. Among the models tested, XGBoost
256 exhibited the best performance with an AUROC of 0.941, which places it as the most
257 effective algorithm. This outcome aligns with previous studies that have explored ML
258 approaches in predicting LBW (NAIMI; PLATT e LARKIN, 2018a; SCHMIDT et al.,
259 2022; WŁODARCZYK et al., 2021). The use of ML in LBW prediction is gaining

260 traction, as these models demonstrate significant potential across various clinical and
261 public health applications.

262 In agreement with the current literature, our study corroborates the efficacy of ML
263 algorithms in maternal-fetal health. Previous studies have underscored the importance of
264 selecting the most suitable ML algorithm, given the variations in performance and
265 reliability among different models [26]. For example, a study published in BMC
266 Pregnancy and Childbirth evaluated the performance of eight different ML algorithms for
267 predicting LBW. It found that deep learning (AUROC: 0.86), random forest classification
268 (AUROC: 0.79), and extreme gradient boost classification (AUROC: 0.79) performed
269 best in distinguishing LBW from normal birth weight across a cohort of 8,853 births,
270 where 1,280 resulted in LBW [27].

271 Our study further supports the finding that boosting algorithms such as XGBoost and
272 Catboost are particularly powerful for tabular datasets, as seen in our cohort. These
273 models outperform more traditional methods like logistic regression and are
274 advantageous in dealing with complex non-linear relationships among
275 predictors[18,19,28]. Studies like that of Pollob et al. (2022), which used ML to predict
276 LBW in Bangladesh, similarly demonstrated that ensemble and boosting models provide
277 more accurate predictions than classical statistical models, with LBW rates around 16.2%
278 in their study population. Key risk factors included region, education, wealth index, and
279 height, consistent with our findings on the importance of gestational weight gain, race,
280 and socioeconomic status in predicting LBW.

281 The use of Shapley values in our study provided additional insights into the
282 interpretability of the models, allowing for a more granular understanding of how each
283 variable contributes to the prediction of LBW. This aspect is particularly important in
284 clinical applications where transparency and explainability of the models are crucial for
285 their adoption by healthcare professionals. For example, the Shapley analysis in our study
286 indicated that gestational weight gain had the strongest influence on LBW predictions,
287 followed by maternal race and prenatal care visits. These findings mirror global trends in
288 LBW prediction, where maternal health, nutrition, and prenatal care are recognized as
289 key determinants of birth outcomes.

290 Our findings also align with the work of Patterson et al. (2023), who developed a
291 predictive model for LBW in low- and middle-income countries. Their study found that

292 socioeconomic factors, including maternal education and access to prenatal care,
293 significantly contributed to the risk of LBW, similar to our results from the Araraquara
294 cohort. Both studies emphasize the importance of early identification of high-risk
295 pregnancies through predictive models, especially in resource-limited settings where
296 timely interventions can significantly improve neonatal outcomes.

297 The clinical implications of our findings are significant. By accurately identifying
298 pregnancies at high risk for LBW, these ML models could enable healthcare providers to
299 implement early interventions, such as nutritional supplementation, increased prenatal
300 visits, or targeted counseling on lifestyle modifications. Such interventions could mitigate
301 the risks associated with LBW, including neonatal mortality, morbidity, and long-term
302 health consequences like developmental delays and chronic conditions. This is
303 particularly relevant in low- and middle-income countries, where LBW rates are higher,
304 and healthcare resources are often limited[29]

305

306 **Limitations and future directions**

307 While the results of this study are promising, there are several limitations to consider.
308 First, the cohort used in this study was from a specific region in Brazil, which may limit
309 the generalizability of the findings to other populations. Future research should aim to
310 validate these models across different regions and populations to ensure their broader
311 applicability. Additionally, while our models demonstrated high predictive accuracy,
312 further research is needed to assess their integration into clinical workflows and their
313 potential impact on perinatal care. For example, future studies could explore the use of
314 these models in combination with mobile health (mHealth) technologies to improve
315 prenatal care in low-resource settings.

316 Moreover, although we employed robust techniques such as SMOTE to handle class
317 imbalance and Shapley values to interpret model predictions, the models still require
318 validation in real-world clinical environments. The practical deployment of ML models
319 in healthcare settings involves challenges related to data privacy, model fairness, and bias
320 mitigation, which should be thoroughly addressed before these models can be widely
321 adopted.

322

323 **Conclusion**

324 This study successfully developed and evaluated machine learning models, including
325 XGBoost, Catboost, LightGBM, and Random Forest, for predicting low birth weight in

326 neonates. The XGBoost model demonstrated the highest predictive performance, with
327 excellent discrimination between neonates at risk of LBW and those with normal birth
328 weight. The application of these models in clinical practice has the potential to improve
329 early detection of high-risk pregnancies, enabling timely and personalized interventions
330 that could significantly improve neonatal outcomes.
331 Given the increasing global focus on maternal and neonatal health, these findings hold
332 important implications for both clinical practice and public health policy. The integration
333 of machine learning models into prenatal care systems could offer a transformative
334 approach to preventing adverse birth outcomes, particularly in low-resource settings
335 where LBW remains a critical challenge.

336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355

356 **Acknowledgments**

357 The authors gratefully acknowledge the professionals, undergraduate, and graduate
358 students who collaborated in the data collection for the Araraquara cohort. We also thank
359 the editors and reviewers for their valuable suggestions and comments to improve our
360 manuscript. Additionally, we acknowledge the São Paulo Research Foundation
361 (FAPESP) for financial support (grant number 2015/03333-6) and the principal author's
362 scholarship (grant number 2023/07936-3).

363

364 **Author Contributions**

365 **Conceptualization:** Audêncio Victor and Francielly Almeida.

366 **Data curation:** Audêncio Victor.

367 **Formal analysis:** Audêncio Victor.

368 **Investigation:** Audêncio Victor, Sancho Pedro Xavier.

369 **Methodology:** Audêncio Victor, Francielly Almeida, Patrícia H.C. Rondó.

370 **Supervision:** Francielly Almeida and Patrícia H.C. Rondó

371 **Writing – original draft:** Audêncio Victor and Sancho Pedro Xavier.

372 **Writing – review & editing:** Audêncio Victor, MPH, Francielly Almeida, Sancho Pedro
373 Xavier, Patrícia H.C. Rondó.

374

375 **Funding**

376 Audêncio Victor has received a scholarship from São Paulo Research Foundation
377 (FAPESP) (grant number 2023/07936-3). This study was supported by the São Paulo
378 Research Foundation (FAPESP) (grant number 2015/03333-6).

379

380 **Conflicts of Interest**

381 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390 **Referências**

- 391 1. Wachamo TM, Yimer NB, Bizuneh AD. Risk factors for low birth weight in
392 hospitals of North Wello zone, Ethiopia: A case-control study. PLoS One.
393 2019;14: 1–15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0213054
- 394 2. Sangi R, Ahsan AK, Khan AT, Aziz SN, Afroze M, Jamro S, et al. Evaluating
395 Association of Maternal Nutritional Status With Neonatal Birth Weight in Term
396 Pregnancies: A Cross-Sectional Study With Unexpected Outcomes. Cureus.
397 2021;13: 1–6. doi:10.7759/cureus.17621
- 398 3. Lopes AAT, Tani G, Maia JAR. Desempenho neuromotor, prematuridade e baixo
399 peso à nascença. Revista Brasileira de Cineantropometria e Desempenho
400 Humano. 2011;13: 73–81. doi:10.5007/1980-0037.2011v13n1p73
- 401 4. Christine B de GM, Oliveira Pessoa TA, Aguiar Lima FC, Munhoz Gaíva MA. O
402 crescimento e desenvolvimento frente à prematuridade e baixo peso ao nascer.

- 403 Avances en Enfermería. 2016;33: 401–411.
404 doi:10.15446/av.enferm.v33n3.44425
- 405 5. Moreira AIM, Sousa PRM de, Sarno F. Low birth weight and its associated
406 factors. *Einstein (Sao Paulo)*. 2018;16: eAO4251.
407 doi:10.31744/einstein_journal/2018AO4251
- 408 6. Wilcox AJ, Cortese M, McConaughy DR, Moster D, Basso O. The limits of
409 small-for-gestational-age as a high-risk category. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2021;36: 985–
410 991. doi:10.1007/s10654-021-00810-z
- 411 7. Gätjens I, Fedde S, Schmidt SCE, Hasler M, Plachta-Danielzik S, Müller MJ, et
412 al. Relationship between birth weight, early growth rate and body composition in
413 5 to 7-year-old children. *Obes Facts*. 2022. doi:10.1159/000522509
- 414 8. Ramakrishnan R, Rao S, He J-R. Perinatal health predictors using artificial
415 intelligence: A review. *Womens Health (Lond)*. 2021;17: 17455065211046132.
416 doi:10.1177/17455065211046132
- 417 9. Islam MN, Islam AKMN. A systematic review of the digital interventions for
418 fighting COVID-19: the Bangladesh perspective. *Ieee Access*. 2020;8: 114078–
419 114087.
- 420 10. Jordan MI, Mitchell TM. Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects.
421 *Science (1979)*. 2015;349: 255–260.
- 422 11. Loring Z, Mehrotra S, Piccini JP. Machine learning in ‘big data’: handle with
423 care. *EP Europace*. 2019;21: 1284–1285.
- 424 12. Davidson L, Boland MR. Towards deep phenotyping pregnancy: a systematic
425 review on artificial intelligence and machine learning methods to improve
426 pregnancy outcomes. *Brief Bioinform*. 2021;22: bbaa369.
- 427 13. Victor A, de França da Silva Teles L, Aires IO, de Carvalho LF, Luzia LA, Artes
428 R, et al. The impact of gestational weight gain on fetal and neonatal outcomes:
429 the Araraquara Cohort Study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2024;24: 320.
430 doi:10.1186/s12884-024-06523-x
- 431 14. Prokhorenkova L, Gusev G, Vorobev A, Dorogush AV, Gulin A. CatBoost:
432 unbiased boosting with categorical features. *Adv Neural Inf Process Syst*.
433 2018;31.
- 434 15. Chen T, Guestrin C. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. *Proceedings of*
435 *the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data*
436 *mining*. 2016. pp. 785–794.
- 437 16. Ke G, Meng Q, Finley T, Wang T, Chen W, Ma W, et al. Lightgbm: A highly
438 efficient gradient boosting decision tree. *Adv Neural Inf Process Syst*. 2017;30.
- 439 17. Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, et al.
440 *Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python*. *the Journal of machine Learning*
441 *research*. 2011;12: 2825–2830.
- 442 18. Shwartz-Ziv R, Armon A. Tabular data: Deep learning is not all you need.
443 *Information Fusion*. 2022;81: 84–90.
444 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2021.11.011
- 445 19. Borisov V, Leemann T, Seßler K, Haug J, Pawelczyk M, Kasneci G. Deep
446 Neural Networks and Tabular Data: A Survey. *IEEE Trans Neural Netw Learn*
447 *Syst*. 2022; 1–21. doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3229161
- 448 20. Bergstra J, Yamins D, Cox D. Making a science of model search:
449 Hyperparameter optimization in hundreds of dimensions for vision architectures.
450 *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR; 2013. pp. 115–123.
- 451 21. Kursu MB, Rudnicki WR. Feature selection with the Boruta package. *J Stat*
452 *Softw*. 2010;36: 1–13.

- 453 22. Moons KGM, Altman DG, Reitsma JB, Ioannidis JPA, Macaskill P, Steyerberg
454 EW, et al. Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for
455 Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and elaboration. *Ann*
456 *Intern Med*. 2015;162: W1–W73.
- 457 23. Schmidt LJ, Rieger O, Neznansky M, Hackelöer M, Dröge LA, Henrich W, et al.
458 A machine-learning–based algorithm improves prediction of preeclampsia-
459 associated adverse outcomes. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;227: 77.e1-77.e30.
460 doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2022.01.026
- 461 24. Naimi AI, Platt RW, Larkin JC. Machine Learning for Fetal Growth Prediction.
462 *Epidemiology*. 2018;29: 290–298. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000788
- 463 25. Włodarczyk T, Płotka S, Szczepański T, Rokita P, Sochacki-Wójcicka N,
464 Wójcicki J, et al. Machine Learning Methods for Preterm Birth Prediction: A
465 Review. *Electronics (Basel)*. 2021;10: 586. doi:10.3390/electronics10050586
- 466 26. Islam MN, Mustafina SN, Mahmud T, Khan NI. Machine learning to predict
467 pregnancy outcomes: a systematic review, synthesizing framework and future
468 research agenda. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2022;22: 348. doi:10.1186/s12884-
469 022-04594-2
- 470 27. Ranjbar A, Montazeri F, Farashah MV, Mehrnoush V, Darsareh F, Roozbeh N.
471 Machine learning-based approach for predicting low birth weight. *BMC*
472 *Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2023;23. doi:10.1186/s12884-023-06128-w
- 473 28. McElfresh D, Khandagale S, Valverde J, Ramakrishnan G, Goldblum M, White
474 C. When Do Neural Nets Outperform Boosted Trees on Tabular Data? arXiv
475 preprint arXiv:230502997. 2023.
- 476 29. Patterson JK, Thorsten VR, Eggleston B, Nolen T, Lokangaka A, Tshetu A, et al.
477 Building a predictive model of low birth weight in low- and middle-income
478 countries: a prospective cohort study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2023;23.
479 doi:10.1186/s12884-023-05866-1
480
481