1 2 3 4 5	Predicting low birth weight risks in pregnant women in Brazil using machine learning algorithms: Data from the Araraquara Cohort Study			
6	Audêncio Victor, MPH1*, Francielly Almeida, PhD2, Sancho Pedro Xavier3, Patrícia H.C.			
7	Rondó MD, MPH, PhD <sup>1</sup>			
8				
9				
10	<sup>1</sup> School of Public Health, University of São Paulo (USP). São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil			
11	<sup>2</sup> Faculdade de Economia, Administração e Contabilidade de Ribeirão Preto, FEA-RP/USP., Ribeirão			
12	Preto, São Paulo.			
13	<sup>3</sup> Institute 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				
21				
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39	NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.			

### Abstract

Background: Low birth weight (LBW) is a critical factor linked to neonatal morbidity and mortality. Early prediction is essential for timely interventions. This study aimed to develop and evaluate predictive models for LBW using machine learning algorithms, including Random Forest, XGBoost, Catboost, and LightGBM. Methods: Machine learning algorithms (Random Forest, XGBoost, Catboost, and LightGBM) were trained and evaluated using cross-validation and the SMOTE technique to correct class imbalance. Model performance was measured using the AUROC metric, and variable importance was analyzed with Shapley values to ensure model interpretability. **Results:** The XGBoost model achieved the best performance with an AUROC of 0.94. Catboost and Random Forest also showed excellent results, confirming the effectiveness of these models in predicting LBW. **Conclusion:** Machine learning, combined with SMOTE, proved to be an effective approach for predicting LBW. XGBoost stood out as the most accurate model, but Catboost and Random Forest also provided solid results. These models can be applied to identify high-risk pregnancies, improving perinatal outcomes through early interventions. **Keywords:** Low birth weight, machine learning, XGBoost, Random Forest, Araraquara cohort. 

## 80 Introduction

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

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

predictions, contributing to early prevention and intervention strategies for fetal growthissues.

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
- aim to improve the accuracy of predictions, thus enabling more effective strategies to
- 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  $\leq 19$  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
- 126 pregnancies and mose who experienced iniscarriage were excluded. In eases of re
- 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:  $\ge 2500$  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
- 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
- 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 <sup>2</sup> ): 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.	$0; 1; \ge 2$
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 145 specifications were tested to evaluate whether changes in strategy improved model 146 performance. Models for the outcome were estimated independently, without information 147 sharing between them. Before discussing the models, quantitative variables were 148 normalized using the z-score separately for the training and test sets. All qualitative 149 variables were treated through one-hot encoding, where each category was separately 150 considered for this procedure. Additionally, pregnant women were excluded due to 151 missing information, and variables with missing data below 20% were imputed by the 152 mean.

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 161 optimization strategy and RandomSearch to evaluate the performance of a machine

162 learning model efficiently (BERGSTRA 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, false positive, precision, and recall. All analyses followed the Transparent Reporting of a 172 173 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-Laerning-.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.





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/m<sup>2</sup>, 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.

in the Araraquara Cohort, Brazil

200	
201	Table 2. Maternal characteristics of pregnant women
202	(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/m <sup>2</sup> )	
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)	393(385-403)
Maternal Education (vears)	59.5 (50.5 40.5)
	184 (11.6)
> 8	1 395 (88 4)
Number of needle per room	1,373 (00.7)
	526 (22.0)
$\geq 1$	530 (53.9) 1 042 (66 1)
	1,043 (00.1)
Family income (KS)	211 (22.5)
< 937	311 (32.5)
93/-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)
	- • • • (,)

No	1,378 (88.7)
Yes	175 (11.3)
<b>Candidiasis/Vaginitis</b>	
No	1,445 (91.9)
Yes	108 (6.8)
Number of previous births	
0	764 (53.7)
$\geq 1$	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)

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

204 205 206

### 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

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

In addition to AUROC, other performance metrics were considered. Random Forest exhibited the highest overall accuracy (0.94), while Catboost provided the best balance between precision (0.80) and recall (0.78), resulting in an F1-score of 0.79 (Table 3). The ROC curves in Figure 3 visually illustrate the similar performance between the models,

- with all curves approaching the top-left corner, indicating high discriminatory capacity.
- 227

228 <u>Table 3. Test Set Performance comparison for LBW Weight Classification Models</u>

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.12.24315370; this version posted October 13, 2024. 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 .





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 weight gain, standing out as the factor with the most influence on predicting low birth 238 weight. Following this, maternal marital status and the absence of regular physical 239 activity during pregnancy were significant predictors. Other factors contributing 240 241 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.





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

250 XGBoost.

251

248

#### 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 approaches in predicting LBW (NAIMI; PLATT e LARKIN, 2018a; SCHMIDT et al., 258 2022; WŁODARCZYK et al., 2021). The use of ML in LBW prediction is gaining 259

traction, as these models demonstrate significant potential across various clinical andpublic 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].

Our study further supports the finding that boosting algorithms such as XGBoost and 271 272 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 indicated that gestational weight gain had the strongest influence on LBW predictions. 286 287 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

socioeconomic factors, including maternal education and access to prenatal care, significantly contributed to the risk of LBW, similar to our results from the Araraquara cohort. Both studies emphasize the importance of early identification of high-risk pregnancies through predictive models, especially in resource-limited settings where 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 implement early interventions, such as nutritional supplementation, increased prenatal 299 300 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.

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

322

## 323 Conclusion

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

neonates. The XGBoost model demonstrated the highest predictive performance, with excellent discrimination between neonates at risk of LBW and those with normal birth weight. The application of these models in clinical practice has the potential to improve early detection of high-risk pregnancies, enabling timely and personalized interventions that could significantly improve neonatal outcomes. Given the increasing global focus on maternal and neonatal health, these findings hold important implications for both clinical practice and public health policy. The integration of machine learning models into prenatal care systems could offer a transformative approach to preventing adverse birth outcomes, particularly in low-resource settings where LBW remains a critical challenge. Acknowledgments The authors gratefully acknowledge the professionals, undergraduate, and graduate students who collaborated in the data collection for the Araraquara cohort. We also thank the editors and reviewers for their valuable suggestions and comments to improve our manuscript. Additionally, we acknowledge the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) for financial support (grant number 2015/03333-6) and the principal author's scholarship (grant number 2023/07936-3). **Author Contributions** Conceptualization: Audêncio Victor and Francielly Almeida.

perpetuit	y.
It is made available under a CC-B	Y 4.0 International license

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	Writin	g – original draft: Audêncio Victor and Sancho Pedro Xavier.			
372	Writin	g – review & editing: Audêncio Victor, MPH, Francielly Almeida, Sancho Pedro			
373	Xavier,	, Patrícia H.C. Rondó.			
374					
375	Fundir	ıg			
376	Audêno	cio Victor has received a scholarship from São Paulo Research Foundation			
377	(FAPE	SP) (grant number 2023/07936-3). This study was supported by the São Paulo			
378	Researc	ch Foundation (FAPESP) (grant number 2015/03333-6).			
379					
380	Conflie	cts of Interest			
381	The aut	thors declare that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose.			
382					
383					
384					
385					
386					
387					
388					
389					
390	Referê	ncias			
391 392	1. Y	Wachamo TM, Yimer NB, Bizuneh AD. Risk factors for low birth weight in nospitals of North Wello zone, Ethiopia: A case-control study. PLoS One.			
393 394	2.	2019;14: 1–15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0213054 Sangi R. Ahsan AK, Khan AT, Aziz SN, Afroze M, Jamro S, et al. Evaluating			
395 396 397	]	Association of Maternal Nutritional Status With Neonatal Birth Weight in Term Pregnancies: A Cross-Sectional Study With Unexpected Outcomes. Cureus. 2021:13: 1–6. doi:10.7759/cureus.17621			
398 399 400	3.	Lopes AAT, Tani G, Maia JAR. Desempenho neuromotor, prematuridade e baixo peso à nascençe. Revista Brasileira de Cineantropometria e Desempenho Humano, 2011:13: 73–81, doi:10.5007/1980-0037.2011y13p1p73			
401 402	4. 0	Christine B de GM, Oliveira Pessoa TA, Aguiar Lima FC, Munhoz Gaíva MA. O crescimento e desenvolvimento frente à prematuridade e baixo peso ao nascer.			

403		Avances en Enfermería $2016:33:401.411$
403		Avalues en Emermeria. 2010,55. 401–411. doi:10.15446/av.enferm.v23n3.44425
404	5	Moraira AIM Sousa DDM do Sarno F. Low birth weight and its associated
405	5.	factors Einstein (See Paule) 2018:16: aAO4251
400		$d_{2}$ $d_{2$
407	6	Wilson AL Contage M McConneyscher DD Master D Dages O. The limits of
408	0.	which AJ, Contese M, McConnaugney 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	7	991. doi:10.100//\$10654-021-00810-Z
411	1.	Gatjens I, Fedde S, Schmidt SCE, Hasler M, Plachta-Danielzik S, Muller MJ, et
412		al. Relationship between birth weight, early growth rate and body composition in
413	0	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 O, 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	101	Information Fusion, 2022:81: 84–90.
444		doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/i.inffus.2021.11.011
445	19	Borisov V Leemann T Seßler K Haug J Pawelczyk M Kasneci G Deen
446	17.	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 I Yamins D Cox D Making a science of model search
449	<u> </u>	Hyperparameter optimization in hundreds of dimensions for vision architectures
450		International conference on machine learning PMLR $\cdot$ 2013 nn 115–123
451	21	Kursa MB Rudnicki WR Feature selection with the Boruta nackage 1 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, Tshefu 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		
401		