

1 Title Page

2 Influence of Body Position on the Motor Development of Preterm Infants: A
3 Randomized Clinical Trial

4 Vitória Regina de Moraes Cardoso Rodrigues, PHD, Departamento de Promoção de
5 Saúde, Universidade de Franca, Av. Dr. Armando de Sáles Oliveira, 201, Parque
6 Universitário, Franca – SP, Brazil, e-mail: vitoriafisio@gmail.com

7 Rita Cordovil, PHD, Faculdade de Motricidade Humana, Estrada da Costa MB, 1495-
8 687 Cruz Quebrada, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal, e-mail: cordovil.rita@gmail.com

9 Marisa Afonso de Andrade Brunherotti, PHD, Departamento de Promoção de Saúde,
10 Universidade de Franca, Av. Dr. Armando de Sáles Oliveira, 201, Parque Universitário,
11 Franca – SP, Brazil, e-mail: marisa.brunherotti@unifran.edu.br

12 Marisa Afonso Andrade Brunherotti

13 Departamento de Promoção de Saúde, Universidade de Franca, Av. Dr. Armando de
14 Sáles Oliveira, 201, Parque Universitário, Cep 14404-600 - Franca – SP, Brazil. [e-mail:marisa.brunherotti@unifran.edu.br](mailto:marisa.brunherotti@unifran.edu.br) -Telephone: +55 (16) 98112.7768

16 Keywords: Preterm infant; Prone position; Supine position; Psychomotor performance;
17 Child development.

18 Running title: Body Position on the Motor Development of Preterm Infants

19 Abstract: 220

20 Words: 2.690

21 Funding: This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de
22 Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brasil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001.

23 Author contributions: All authors contributed to the study. V.R.M.C.R contributed to
24 the acquisition and interpretation of data, R.C. contributed to the interpretation of data
25 and analysis of data and M.B contributed to the design, analysis and interpretation of
26 data. All authors revised and approved the manuscript.

27 **Ethical approval:** The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Franca
28 University (Approval No. 2.407.182) and is registered with the Brazilian Clinical Trials
29 Registry (RBR-6q6ck3).

30

31 **There is no conflict of interest**

32

33 **Influence of Body Position on the Motor Development of Preterm Infants: A**

34 **Randomized Clinical Trial**

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background:** To analyze the influence of body position on the motor development of
37 preterm infants in the first year of life corrected for prematurity.

38 **Methods:** This controlled, randomized, open trial included 30 preterm infants randomly
39 assigned to one of the following three groups: prone group (n = 9), supine group (n = 10),
40 and control group (n = 11). Intervention: Motor development was assessed at four time
41 points using the Alberta Infant Motor Scale: first outpatient visit and at 4, 8 and 12 months
42 corrected age.

43 **Results:** In the third assessment at 8 months corrected age, the supine group exhibited
44 better motor development than the other groups (p = 0.02). In the control group, the
45 number of infants with normal development decreased from 11 (100%) in the first
46 assessment to 5 (45.45%) in the last assessment. Most infants of mothers who received
47 guidance on body positioning achieved normal motor development in the first year of life
48 (63.1%). Greater dispersion from normal Alberta Infant Motor Scale scores was observed
49 in infants at 8 and 12 months of age.

50 **Conclusions:** Guidance on body positioning of preterm infants at home appears to have
51 a positive influence in the first year of life. Child care strategies after hospitalization
52 should be supported to permit full development of the child.

53 **KeyWords:** preterm infant, psychomotor performance, child development.

54 **What's New:** This study reinforces home care programs with specialized orientation for
55 motor development of preterm newborns. By the end of the first year of life most infants
56 in the experimental groups (supine and prone positions) achieved a normal motor
57 development, which did not happen in the control group.

58

59 **Introduction**

60 Preterm infants are a vulnerable group that is an increased risk of physical, neurological
61 and cognitive problems whose severity is inversely proportional to gestational age and
62 the quality of perinatal care.^{1,2,3} Most of the outcomes in this group have psychosocial,
63 emotional and economic impacts on the families, on society, and on the health system.^{4,5}
64 Within this context, prematurity and low birth weight are biological risk factors for
65 alterations in motor development, especially when the child is born at a gestational age
66 less than 32 weeks and birth weight less than 1,500 g.⁶

67 For the acquisition of motor developmental milestones, it is important to stimulate
68 newborns in body positions that require greater muscle strength against the action of
69 gravity, such as the prone position.⁷ However, prone positioning after the newborn infant
70 has been discharged home is avoided because it is associated with death from
71 suffocation.⁸

72 The lack of attention to stimulating different body positions in newborn infants
73 can compromise child development. Studies have shown an association between prone
74 positioning only for short periods and delayed motor development.^{9,10} It is known that
75 Brazilian mothers seldom stimulate prone positioning and offer their lap a lot to their
76 babies, giving them few opportunities to sit on the floor.^{11,12} Thus, studies are needed to
77 better understand this topic within the context of parental habits and practices.¹³

78 Attention to the development of children in the first years of life is essential since
79 this period is characterized by major modifications and the acquisition of motor skills.
80 The longitudinal follow-up of children using assessment scales allows the early
81 identification of motor disorders and delays and enables early interventions. However,

82 intervention and longitudinal studies of preterm infants in the outpatient setting are still
83 sparse in Brazil.¹⁴

84 Therefore, the objective of this study was to analyze the influence of body position
85 on the motor development of preterm infants in the first year of corrected age under home
86 follow-up.

87

88 **Method**

89 This was a controlled, randomized, open trial. The study was approved by the
90 Ethics Committee of the University and is registered with the Clinical Trials Registry.

91 **Participants**

92 Preterm infants (gestational age < 37 weeks) in their first outpatient visit were
93 eligible. Infants with evident neurological and/or orthopedic alterations, malformations,
94 syndromes, confirmed congenital infections, sensory deficits (vision or hearing),
95 chromosome abnormalities, CNS malformations, polymalformative syndromes,
96 congenital heart diseases, severe intraperiventricular hemorrhage, and parenchymal
97 hemorrhagic infarction were excluded.

98 The minimum sample size was calculated assuming a desired level of confidence
99 of 95% and maximum error of 2.0 for a standard deviation of 5.0 for the percentile score
100 of the Alberta Infant Motor Scale (AIMS). Thus, a minimum number of 25 preterm infants
101 was estimated for this study.

102 The infants were randomized into the following groups using sealed and opaque
103 envelopes: control group consisting of 11 infants, supine group consisting of 10 infants,
104 and prone group consisting of 10. The infants were evaluated considering the corrected
105 age¹⁵ in the first outpatient visit (mean age of 39.27 ± 2.64 weeks), at 4 and 8 months,

106 and when they had completed one year. The assessments were performed by a single
107 evaluator.

108

109 **Assessment Instruments**

110 Demographic, clinical and prenatal data of the mothers were collected. In the infants,
111 anthropometric measurements were obtained and motor development was evaluated using
112 the AIMS. The mean time of application of the scale was 20 minutes.

113 The AIMS measures functional skills and movement quality from birth to 18
114 months of age.¹⁶ This scale consists of 58 items divided into four subscales: prone (21
115 items), supine (9 items), sitting (12 items), and standing (16 items). Each motor skill item
116 is scored as 1 (observed) or 0 (not observed). The total raw score is obtained by summing
117 the scores of each item of the four subscales. The total score and corrected age determine
118 the position of the infant on the norm-referenced percentage curves and motor
119 development is categorized into percentiles: normal/expected ($> 25^{\text{th}}$), suspicious (25^{th} to
120 5^{th}), and abnormal ($< 5^{\text{th}}$).¹⁷

121

122 **Procedures and Intervention**

123 In the first assessment after randomization, the parents were asked to implement the
124 instructions on body positioning at home during the waking hours of the infant from the
125 first assessment until the infant began to crawl. The intervention positions (prone and
126 supine) should be applied for 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours in the afternoon in a
127 playful and supervised manner, while at night the position could be chosen freely. The
128 control group received no type of guidance.

129 In the interval between assessments, the mothers were contacted by telephone or
130 personally in the waiting room of the clinic, providing feedback on the instructions
131 established at the beginning of the study. The mothers also received a booklet to record
132 the days when they followed the instructions of the intervention.

133

134 **Statistical Analysis**

135 Statistical analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
136 (SPSS) 23.0 for Windows. The maternal characteristics and profile of the preterm infants
137 are reported descriptively using percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Significant
138 differences between the groups were investigated using ANOVAs and Fisher exact tests.
139 Motor gain in the first year of life for each group of the preterm infants was investigated
140 using Friedman's test and the Wilcoxon post-hoc test. Stepwise multiple linear
141 regressions were performed to identify the best predictors of performance in the AIMS in
142 each assessment. The level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

143

144 **Results**

145 During the study period, 45 preterm infants started longitudinal outpatient follow-up and
146 31 were eligible for the study. One infant was excluded during the intervention because
147 of a diagnosis of Dandy-Walker syndrome. Thus, 30 preterm infants participated in this
148 study.

149 The maternal characteristics are shown in Table 1. Antenatal corticosteroid use
150 was the only variable that differed significantly between the groups studied, with 90.9%
151 of mothers of the control group using corticosteroids ($p = 0.05$). There was no significant
152 difference in the other maternal variables between the three groups.

153 Table 2 shows the main birth characteristics of the infants studied. No significant
154 difference was observed between the three groups in any of the variables and the groups
155 were therefore considered homogeneous. The mean gestational age of the preterm infants
156 was 30.6 ± 59 weeks and the mean birth weight was $1,367.5 \pm 413$ kg.

157 Classification of the groups studied by the AIMS in the four assessments (Table
158 3) showed a significant difference in the third assessment ($p = 0.02$). In this assessment
159 (8 months of age), the supine group exhibited the best motor development, with 80% of
160 the infants being classified as normal. In the first assessment, all infants were classified
161 as normal. The percentage of infants classified as suspicious and abnormal tended to
162 increase over the phase of motor development Friedman's test revealed that this increase
163 was only significant in the control group ($\chi^2=12.91, p<0.01$). The Wilcoxon signed-ranks
164 test indicated that, in the control group, there were significantly less infants classified as
165 normal in the third AIMS assessment than in the first ($Z=-2.71, p=0.01$).

166 Figure 1 the trajectories of development of the different infants, displaying the
167 changes of the final score in Alberta scale, in absolute values, along the four evaluations.
168 The variability of the AIMS scores increases as infants grow older. In the first two
169 evaluations, that all the preterm infants showed a motor development closer to the normal
170 average than in the third and fourth evaluations, where AIMS values became much more
171 disperse.

172 The results of the stepwise multiple linear regressions identified different predictors of
173 performance in the AIMS, depending on the moment of the motor assessment. Variables
174 entered as possible predictors were: maternal age, gestational age, birth weight, birth
175 length, head circumference, chest circumference, APGAR (first and fifth minutes), days
176 with mechanical ventilation, days with breathing support (O₂), days with continuous

177 positive airway pressure, length of hospital stay, weight when the infant left the ICU, and
178 weight when the infant left the hospital. No predictors were found for the first assessment.
179 For the other three assessments the following predictors were found: second assessment
180 - length of hospital stay (Beta=-0.52, p=0.02; R²=0.27); third assessment - birth weight
181 (Beta=0.51, p=0.02; R²=0.26); fourth assessment - maternal age (Beta=0.54, p=0.01;
182 R²=0.29).

183 The analysis of the phone call records made during follow-up of the mothers
184 showed that only two mothers (22.2%) of the prone group reported to have followed the
185 instructions correctly at all times. The remaining mothers reported not to have followed
186 the instructions because of fear of leaving the child in prone, because the child did not
187 stay in the prone position or cried, because of lack of time since they had to care for the
188 other children, and because they forgot to follow the instructions. Thus, most mothers did
189 not follow the instructions on prone positioning. On the other hand, most of the mothers
190 of the supine group (70%) correctly followed the instructions.

191

192 **Discussion**

193 The results showed that preterm infants achieved the motor developmental milestones
194 within the first year of life. However, a larger number of infants were classified as
195 suspicious or abnormal by the AIMS between 8 months and one year of corrected age.
196 The strategy of providing guidance for caregivers was used so that preterm infants would
197 receive motor stimulation at home. The number of infants with abnormal and suspicious
198 motor development was higher in the group whose caregiver did not receive any guidance
199 on motor stimulation compared to infants whose mothers received instructions.

200 Maternal guidance and training on the stimulation of motor development in
201 preterm infants have been shown to result in positive outcomes for children. According
202 to these authors, the results suggest that the support given to mothers may have
203 contributed to their self-confidence, improving their ability to care for their children, and
204 that the effective participation of mothers based on the instructions offered may have
205 influenced the affective relationship with the infant, providing a greater stimulus for
206 neurosensorimotor acquisition of the infant.¹⁸

207 In the present study, the 30 infants were classified as extremely preterm and very
208 low birth weight, a fact explaining the mean length of hospital stay of 43.9 days for special
209 care. In this respect, prolonged hospitalization is known to limit closer involvement of
210 the parents with their infants. Another study involving very low birth weight preterm
211 infants reported a mean length of stay of 60 days. According to the authors, the need for
212 hospitalization of the infant alters family dynamics in an unexpected way since the parents
213 have to deal with the emotions of hospitalization of the debilitated child. Possible
214 complications may arise with the organization of daily routines to accompany the infant
215 during hospitalization and with the preparation for discharge when the care will become
216 the full responsibility of the parents.¹⁹

217 In an attempt to identify strategies designed to improve the development of
218 preterm infants during longitudinal and home follow-up, the stimulation of body
219 positioning has gained the attention of professionals as a protective practice for children.
220 Prone positioning has shown some advantages for the cardiorespiratory system²⁰ and for
221 the child's motor development. A recent study demonstrated that children who cannot
222 maintain the prone position on extended arms have a disadvantage, exhibiting delayed
223 development.²¹

224 Placing the infant in the prone position during waking hours is an uncommon
225 practice among Brazilian mothers.^{8,22} However, further studies are necessary to
226 understand the reason for this parental practice. The present findings agree with previous
227 studies reporting that many patients avoid placing their children in the prone position for
228 play because the child is intolerant to this position, as demonstrated by crying.
229 Consequently, the child is rarely exposed to this position.^{10,23} These findings corroborate
230 another study showing that 44% of the infants were intolerant to the prone position and
231 spent less than 15 minutes in this position for play during their waking hours.²⁴

232 We understand that the time in the prone position is an important part of the daily
233 routine of an infant and can be performed at different times over the day. Professionals
234 must explain caregivers that the child may not tolerate the prone position on the first
235 occasion and that the time can be gradually increased with increasing tolerance. To
236 encourage the use of this position, the parents may talk and sing to the infant, use toys
237 and mirrors, and maintain visual contact,²⁵ reinforcing a playful way as instructed in this
238 study.

239 Although the mothers of this study did not follow the prescription correctly, the
240 importance of guidance on body positioning for the child's motor development should be
241 reinforced in public child care programs so that it can be better understood and applied
242 by caregivers. The present results showed no significant difference between all
243 associations of the positions. However, from a clinical point of view, we emphasize that
244 63.1% of the children whose mothers received guidance on body positioning achieved
245 normal motor development according to the AIMS in the first year of life. The percentage
246 was only 45.4% in the group that did not receive any guidance, with a difference of 17.7%
247 between the intervention and control groups.

248 At 12 months of chronological age, an association was observed between AIMS
249 scores and the environmental variable in the group of preterm infants studied. The older
250 the mother, the better was the motor development of the infant. Our findings agree with
251 a study showing that older parents have greater knowledge of infant development,
252 favoring the development of their child.²⁶ Another study following up 561 infants until
253 18 months of age demonstrated an association of environmental factors with motor
254 development, especially in the second half of the first year of life.²⁷ The evidence
255 reinforces the need for professional guidance on child development. On the other hand,
256 the association of birth weight and length of hospital stay with AIMS scores was no longer
257 observed at 12 months corrected age of the infants.

258 **Limitations**

259 This study has some limitations. The prescription of body positioning was not
260 completely followed by the caregiver, a fact that can negatively influence the outcome.
261 However, empowering caregivers is extremely important for the achievement of motor
262 skills. In addition, the number of infants was lower than that estimated at the beginning
263 of the study. The main reason was the difficulty in recruiting infants that met the inclusion
264 criteria over the period studied. Obtaining a larger number of infants than those reported
265 in this study is not simple since the study involved preterm newborns with exclusion
266 factors and one-year follow-up by the same professional.

267

268 **Implications for Occupational Therapy Practice**

269 The literature suggests an effect of body positioning on motor development. Evidence of
270 the influence of body positioning after discharge of preterm infants is limited.

- 271 • Considering the increasing survival of preterm infants, guidance on body
272 positioning could be a protective strategy for motor development to help mothers
273 care.
- 274 • By the end of the first year of life most infants in the experimental groups (supine
275 and prone positions) achieved a normal motor development, which did not happen
276 in the control group (without position orientation).
- 277 • This study findings show evidences that mother orientation about child body
278 position can help in preterm infants motor development.

279

280 **Conclusion**

281 The present results show that prone positioning of preterm infants is little used at
282 home and suggest that achieving motor developmental milestones involves body
283 positioning in the first year of life. Home strategies for the care of this vulnerable
284 population must be designed to achieve the best development as a protective factor.

285

286 **Acknowledgments**

287 We thank the employees and families of the High-Risk Children Outpatient Clinic for
288 their collaboration with this study.

289

290

291

292

293

294

295 **References**

296

297 1. Glass HC, Costarino AT, Stayer SA, et al. Outcomes for extremely premature
298 infants. *Anesthesia and analgesia*, 2015; 120(6), 1337-1351.
299 <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000000705>

300 2. Blencowe, H., Cousens, S., Chou, D., Oestergaard, M., Say, L., Moller, A. B.,
301 Kinney, M., & Lawn, J. (2013). Born too soon: the global epidemiology of 15
302 million preterm births. *Reproductive health*, 10(1), S2.
303 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-4755-10-S1-S2>

304 3. Blencowe, H., Lee, A. C., Cousens, S., Bahalim, A., Narwal, R., Zhong, N., Chou,
305 D, Say, L, Modi, N, Katz, J, Vos, T, Marlow, N, &., Lawn, J. E. (2013). Preterm
306 birth–associated neurodevelopmental impairment estimates at regional and global
307 levels for 2010. *Pediatric research*, 74(S1), 17-34.
308 <https://doi.org/10.1038/pr.2013.204>

309 4. Behrman, R. E. & Butler, A. S.(Eds.). (2007). Preterm birth: causes,
310 consequences, and prevention. National Academies Press. Retrieved from
311 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK11362/>.

312 5. Liu, L., Oza, S., Hogan, D., Perin, J., Rudan, I., Lawn, J. E., Cousens S2, Mathers
313 C & Black, R. E. (2015). Global, regional, and national causes of child mortality
314 in 2000–13, with projections to inform post-2015 priorities: an updated systematic
315 analysis. *The Lancet*, 385(9966), 430-440. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61698-6)
316 [6736\(14\)61698-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61698-6)

- 317 6. World Health Organization. (2012). Born too soon: the global action report on preterm
318 birth. Retrieved from
319 http://www.who.int/pmnch/media/news/2012/201204_borntoosoon-report.pdf.
- 320 7. Darrah, J., Hodge, M., Magill-Evans, J., & Kembhavi, G. (2003). Stability of serial
321 assessments of motor and communication abilities in typically developing infants—
322 implications for screening. *Early human development*, 72(2), 97-110.
323 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3782\(03\)00027-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3782(03)00027-6)
- 324 8. Gontijo, A. P. B., de Castro Magalhães, L., & Guerra, M. Q. F. (2014). Assessing
325 gross motor development of Brazilian infants. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*, 26(1),
326 48-55. <https://doi:10.1097/PEP.0000000000000014>
- 327 9. Salls, J. S., Silverman, L. N., & Gatty, C. M. (2002). The relationship of infant
328 sleep and play positioning to motor milestone achievement. *American Journal of*
329 *Occupational Therapy*, 56(5), 577-580. <https://doi:10.5014/ajot.56.5.577>
- 330 10. Dudek-Shriber, L., & Zelazny, S. (2007). The effects of prone positioning on the quality
331 and acquisition of developmental milestones in four-month-old infants. *Pediatric*
332 *Physical Therapy*, 19(1), 48-55. <https://doi:10.1097/01.pep.0000234963.72945.b1>
- 333 11. Santos, D. C., Gabbard, C., & Goncalves, V. M. (2000). Motor development during the
334 first 6 months: the case of Brazilian infants. *Infant and Child Development: An*
335 *International Journal of Research and Practice*, 9(3), 161-166.
336 [https://doi.org/10.1002/1522-7219\(200009\)9:3<161::AID-ICD229>3.0.CO;2-7](https://doi.org/10.1002/1522-7219(200009)9:3<161::AID-ICD229>3.0.CO;2-7)
- 337 12. Lopes, V. B., de Lima, C. D., & Tudella, E. (2009). Motor acquisition rate in Brazilian
338 infants. *Infant and Child Development: An International Journal of Research and*
339 *Practice*, 18(2), 122-132. <https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.595>
- 340 13. Pinto, P. A. F., Falci, D. M., & Morais, R. (2017). Percepção, conhecimento e
341 prática de pediatras quanto ao posicionamento do lactente e o desenvolvimento

- 342 motor. *Revista Pesquisa em Fisioterapia*, 7(2), 149-156.
343 <https://doi.org/10.17267/2238-2704rpf.v7i2.1266>
- 344 14. Sociedade Brasileira de Pediatria. (2012). Departamento Científico de
345 Neonatologia, editor. Seguimento Ambulatorial do Prematuro de Risco.
- 346 15. Rugolo, L. M. S. D. S. (2005). Growth and developmental outcomes of the extremely
347 preterm infant. *Jornal de pediatria*, 81(1), S101-S110. [https://doi.org/10.1590/S0021-](https://doi.org/10.1590/S0021-75572005000200013)
348 [75572005000200013](https://doi.org/10.1590/S0021-75572005000200013)
- 349 16. Van Haastert, I. C., De Vries, L. S., Helders, P. J. M., & Jongmans, M. J. (2006).
350 Early gross motor development of preterm infants according to the Alberta Infant
351 Motor Scale. *The Journal of pediatrics*, 149(5), 617-622.
352 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2006.07.025>
- 353 17. Piper, M. C., Pinnell, L. E., Darrah, J., Maguire, T., & Byrne, P. J. (1992).
354 Construction and validation of the Alberta Infant Motor Scale (AIMS). *Canadian*
355 *journal of public health= Revue canadienne de sante publique*, 83, S46-50
- 356 18. Kayenne Formiga, C., Silva Pedrazzani, E., Pereira dos Santos Silva, F., & de
357 Lima, C. D. (2004). Effectiveness of the early intervention program with preterm
358 infants. *Paidéia*, 14(29), 301-311. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-863x2004000300006)
359 [863x2004000300006](http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-863x2004000300006)
- 360 19. Sassá, A. H., & Silva Marcon, S. (2013). Evaluation of families of infants with very low
361 birth weight in home care. *Texto & Contexto Enfermagem*, 22(2), 442-451.
362 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0104-07072013000200021>
- 363 20. Oishi, Y., Ohta, H., Hirose, T., Nakaya, S., Tsuchiya, K., Nakagawa, M., Kusakawa, I,
364 Sato, T, Obonai, T, Nishida, H & Yoda, H. (2018). Combined effects of body position
365 and sleep status on the cardiorespiratory stability of near-term infants. *Scientific reports*,
366 8(1), 8845. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-27212-8>

- 367 21. Senju, A., Shimono, M., Tsuji, M., Suga, R., Shibata, E., Fujino, Y., Kawamoto, T., &
368 Kusuhara, K. (2018). Inability of infants to push up in the prone position and subsequent
369 development. *Pediatrics International*. <http://doi.org/10.1111/ped.13632>
- 370 22. Silva, P. L., Santos, D. C. C., & Gonçalves, V. M. G. (2006). Influence of child-rearing
371 practices on infant's motor development between the sixth and twelfth months of
372 life. *Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy*, 10(2), 225-231.
- 373 23. Valentini, N. C., & Saccani, R. (2012). Brazilian Validation of the Alberta Infant Motor
374 Scale. *Physical therapy*, 92(3), 440-447. <http://doi.org/10.2522/ptj.20110036>
- 375 24. Zachry, A. H., & Kitzmann, K. M. (2011). Caregiver awareness of prone play
376 recommendations. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 65(1), 101-105.
377 <http://doi:10.5014/ajot.2011.09100>
- 378 25. Coulter-O'Berry, C., & Lima, D. (2006). Tummy time tools: Activities to help
379 you position, carry, hold and play with your baby. Retrieved from
380 <[https://www.choa.org/~media/files/Childrens/medical-](https://www.choa.org/~media/files/Childrens/medical-services/orthopaedics/orthotics-and-prosthetics/tummy-time-tools-update-2014.pdf?la=en)
381 [services/orthopaedics/orthotics-and-prosthetics/tummy-time-tools-update-](https://www.choa.org/~media/files/Childrens/medical-services/orthopaedics/orthotics-and-prosthetics/tummy-time-tools-update-2014.pdf?la=en)
382 [2014.pdf?la=en](https://www.choa.org/~media/files/Childrens/medical-services/orthopaedics/orthotics-and-prosthetics/tummy-time-tools-update-2014.pdf?la=en)>.
- 383 26. Lima, L. N., Vale-Dias, M. D. L., & Mendes, T. F. V. (2012). Crenças parentais
384 sobre o desenvolvimento da criança e sua relação com o cuidar. *Revista INFAD*,
385 1(1), 53-62.
- 386 27. Saccani, R., Valentini, N. C., Pereira, K. R., Müller, A. B., & Gabbard, C. (2013).
387 Associations of biological factors and affordances in the home with infant motor
388 development. *Pediatrics International*, 55(2), 197-203.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ped.12042>
- 390
391

392 **Table 1** Distribution of the characteristics of mothers of the infants participating in the
 393 study

Variable	Total	Control	Prone	Supine	F	p
	group	group	group	group		
	(n = 30)	(n = 11)	(n = 9)	(n = 10)		
	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	(2,27)	
Maternal age (years)	27.8±5.9	30.2±6.6	25.0±4.8	27.7±5.1	2.13	0.14
Prenatal visit	06.1±2.2	06.2±1.4	07.0±2.8	05.1±2.0	1.90	0.17
	n %	n %	n %	n %	FET	p
Maternal education						
Elementary school	09 (30)	05 (45.1)	02 (22.2)	02 (20.0)		
High school	17 (56.6)	05 (45.1)	06 (66.7)	06 (60.0)	2.39	0.74
Higher education	04 (13.3)	01 (9.0)	01 (11.1)	02 (20.0)		
Type of delivery						
Cesarean	24 (80)	10 (90.9)	06 (66.7)	08 (80.0)	1.81	0.38
Normal	06 (20)	01 (9.1)	03 (33.3)	02 (20.0)		
Parity						
Primiparous	14 (46.6)	06 (54.6)	02 (22.2)	06 (60.0)	3.07	0.25
Multiparous	16 (53.3)	05 (45.4)	07 (77.8)	04 (40.0)		
Antibiotic use						
Yes	12 (40)	03 (27.3)	04 (44.4)	05 (50.0)	1.29	0.64
No	18 (60)	08 (72.7)	05 (55.6)	05 (50.0)		
Antenatal						
corticosteroid	19 (63.4)	10 (90.9)*	05 (55.6)	04 (40.0)	6.22	0.05*
Yes	11 (36.6)	01 (9.1)	04 (44.4)	06 (60.0)		
No						

394 Note. FET: Fischer's Exact Test; SD: standard deviation.

395 * Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

396

397 **Table 2** Profile of the 30 preterm infants participating in the study

Variable	Total	Control	Prone	Supine	F	p
	group	group	group	group		
	(n = 30)	(n = 11)	(n = 9)	(n = 10)		
	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	(2,27)	
Gestational age (weeks)	30.6±59	31.1±1.5	30.5±2.5	30.0±2.5	0.68	0.52
Birth weight (grams)	1.367±413	1.307±223	1.481±572	1.331±419	0.49	0.62
Birth length (centimeters)	39.1±3.6	39.0±1.5	38.8±5.3	39.4±3.6	0.05	0.95
Apgar						
1	06.5±1.6	06.7±1.4	06.4±1.4	06.2±2.0	0.24	0.79
5	08.5±1.2	08.7±0.7	08.6±1.2	08.0±1.5	1.10	0.35
Mechanical ventilation (days)	11±15	05.8±2.4	12.8±17.1	15.3±18.3	1.14	0.33
Length of hospital stay (days)	43.9±24.5	34.6±15.8	55.2±27.4	43.9±27.3	1.85	0.18
	n %	n %	n %	n %	FET	p
Male	17 (56.7)	9 (81.8)	4 (44.4)	4 (40.0)	4.46	0.11
Surfactant	21 (70)	6 (54.5)	6 (66.6)	9 (90.0)	3.16	0.22

398 Note. FET: Fischer's Exact Test; SD: standard deviation.

399 Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

400

401

402

403 **Table 3.** Classification of the preterm infants in the three groups according to the Alberta Infant

404 Motor Scale

Assessment	AIMS classification	Total	Control	Prone	Supine	FET	p
		group	group	group	group		
		(n = 30)	(n = 11)	(n = 9)	(n = 10)		
		Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	Mean±SD		
First	Normal	30	11	9	10		
	Suspicious	0	0	0	0	a)	a)
	Abnormal	0	0	0	0		
Second	Normal	21	8	6	7		
	Suspicious	8	2	3	3	2.32	0.96
	Abnormal	1	1	0	0		
Third	Normal	16	3	5	8		
	Suspicious	9	7	2	0	10.46	0.02
	Abnormal	5	1	2	2		
Fourth	Normal	17	5	5	7		
	Suspicious	5	3	1	1	20.06	0.79
	Abnormal	8	3	3	2		

405 Note. FET: Fischer's Exact Test; a) No statistics were computed because AIMS classification is constant.

406

407

408

409

410


411

412

413

414

415



416 Fig. 1 Final Alberta Infant Motor Scale (AIMS) score of the 30 preterm infants in the four
417 assessments. Friedman test. Wilcoxon post-hoc test.

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430