Born Large for Gestational Age: Bigger Is Not Always Better

Valentina Chiavaroli, MD, José G. B. Derraik, PhD, Paul L. Hofman, MD, and Wayne S. Cutfield, MD

During the past 60-90 years, there has been a change in the growth trajectories of large for gestational age (LGA) babies and the associated health effects later in life. Subjects classified as large at birth in the 1920s were found to have reduced morbidity and mortality in their seventh decade compared with those born of lower birth weight.[1,2] Indeed, across the birth weight range there was a progressive increase in cardiovascular and metabolic risk with a decrease in birth weight, even among those in the normal range.[1,2] These findings suggested that, historically, larger size at birth provided metabolic advantages that contributed to improved health and possibly longevity.

Long-term outcomes in those born LGA have dramatically changed in the last 30 years, with LGA being now associated with early obesity and increased cardiovascular and metabolic risk.[3,4] The association between birth weight and the risk of later adult diseases currently seems to be U-shaped.[5] It is likely that this relatively recent increased risk of adult disease in those born large is related to the underlying factors influencing fetal growth as well as changes in postnatal environmental conditions. For instance, from 1910 to the late 1940s, events including the World Wars and the Great Depression were characterized by limited available nutrition to the wider population.[6,7] Thus, in the past, babies were much less likely to be overnourished in utero, as shown by lower maternal weight gain and overweight/obesity rates during pregnancy,[8,9] so that LGA babies were more likely to have been long and lean. Much greater rates of postterm births and increased sibship may represent risk factors for lean LGA babies.[10,11] Before active obstetric intervention to avoid prolonged pregnancies, the postterm birth rate was 10%[12] compared with approximately 3% currently.[13] Conversely, there has been a nutritional excess in utero in recent decades,[14] leading to LGA neonates that are long and fat,[15] with postnatal exposure to an "obesogenic" environment responsible for a further acceleration in growth.[16]

Why Are Babies Being Born Larger?

There has been a progressive increase in the prevalence of large babies during the last 3 decades[17] that is now approximately 10% of all newborns[18]; however, the literature is conflicting regarding the definition of "large" at birth, which would indirectly estimate the severity of adiposity. Birth weight appears to be the most widely adopted variable to define large babies, because weight represents a crude measure of fetal growth, involving length, head circumference, and fatness.[19] The terms LGA and macrosomia have been used somewhat interchangeably, although different criteria have been adopted for both, leading to conflicting classifications. LGA babies usually are defined as having a birth weight >90th percentile according to gestational age and sex,[20] and macrosomia tends to refer to babies with a birth weight >4000 g.[21] Because LGA is a more precise term, it is more commonly used to identify larger babies.

Greater birth weight and greater neonatal adiposity represent the expression of a complex fetal–maternal interaction, which is driven by fetal genetic factors and the intrauterine environment.[22] Although the factors that have led to large birth weight in previous generations are unclear, the current underlying causes of LGA appear to be mainly attributable to nutritional excess in utero, which either directly or via epigenetic mechanisms results in increasing obesity postnatally.[23-25] This increased in utero nutrition most likely reflects maternal nutrition, in particular obesity and maternal diabetes mellitus. Greater rates of maternal obesity and gestational diabetes represent some of the main components of a proposed "obesity cycle," responsible for in utero programming of later adiposity and transgenerational amplification of obesity.[14,26] This theory was first proposed by Pedersen,[27] who hypothesized that mothers who were obese and/or with diabetes provided increased nutrition to the fetuses, who then became larger with greater adiposity. Increasing fetal adiposity/overnutrition "programs" the fetuses to grow more rapidly postnatally and develop early obesity. As obesity tracks with age, these children are more likely to become obese adults.

The classification of infants as LGA based on customized percentiles for birth weight has been proposed,[18,28,29] which have strengths and limitations. Customized percentiles incorporate maternal and infant factors, such as maternal weight, height, parity, gestational age, and infant sex, resulting in some LGA infants being recategorized as appropriate for gestational age (AGA).[18] Ethnicity also could be taken into account, because, for example, American Indian and Pacific Islander mothers are at increased risk of having LGA infants.[28,30] Adjusting for maternal height is reasonable, because a longer baby would be proportionally heavier but not necessarily fatter. In a large prospective cohort study, newborns defined LGA by customized percentiles had a 4-fold increase in risk of severe neonatal morbidity/mortality

AGA	Appropriate for gestational age
BMI	Body mass index
LGA	Large for gestational age

From the Liggins Institute, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2015.11.043

compared with those born macrosomic or defined as LGA by population percentiles.[18]

There are issues, however, with customized percentiles. In the aforementioned study,[18] mothers of large babies who were defined as AGA by customized percentiles had a 1.6-fold increase in the overall rate of cesarean delivery. Further, it is important to consider that prepregnancy maternal body mass index (BMI) is likely to be the main predictor of birth weight. Maternal obesity represents the main factor leading to fetal obesity at any maternal height,[31] and the increasing prevalence of LGA infants mirrors increasing maternal adiposity. As a result, the use of percentiles adjusting for maternal weight may be misguided; if the mother is obese, the adjustment of the baby's weight would be inappropriate because it would likely normalize obesity-driven fetal growth and adiposity. In addition, certain ethnic groups have increased incidences of adult obesity that may contribute to increased size of their babies, and adjustment for ethnicity may lead to the inappropriate classification of newborns. Therefore, moving an LGA infant to an AGA category should not diminish birth-size related pathology, and recent reviews have criticized the substantive support for clinical use of customized percentiles in classifying babies as LGA.[32]

Measurement of Adiposity in Babies

Birth weight does not define body composition, an issue critically important in LGA newborns. For more than 3 decades, ponderal index (g/cm^3) has been considered a practical approach to characterize neonatal adiposity,[33] which differs from BMI (kg/m^2) for providing greater adjustment for length and, thus, is a more reliable measure of neonatal adiposity.[34] In infants born LGA, ponderal index score was significantly greater than in those born AGA,[35-37] and a greater ponderal index at birth also has been associated with increased adiposity in childhood.[38] Although this index appears easy to perform and inexpensive, its accuracy is limited by the variability in length measurement,[39,40] and birth length still is not measured routinely in many centers.[40,41] In addition, ponderal index does not distinguish between fat mass and lean mass and does not clarify which body compartment is overrepresented in LGA babies; indeed, a poor correlation has been shown between ponderal index and fat mass estimated by direct assessments of neonatal body composition.[34,42,43]

Therefore, in recent years, direct techniques have been proposed to measure neonatal adiposity, such as dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry and air displacement plethysmography.[43-45] These methods consistently have shown increased fat mass in LGA babies compared with AGA babies.[45,46] Nevertheless, these studies have not estimated body fat distribution, which would help clarify whether greater birth weight is associated with increased central adiposity. Lean and fat mass have been reported differently (as total or percentage mass), which may have created confusion regarding the body composition of LGA infants. Greater adiposity in LGA infants has been found in combination with an increased lean mass (as absolute values) measured by dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry, consistent with an increased muscularity compared with AGA infants.[46,47] Specifically, breastfed LGA infants born to mothers without diabetes were found to have greater adiposity at birth and increased muscularity by age 4 months.[47] Similarly, an increase in lean mass in children born LGA through age 47 months also has been shown.[48] In other studies, the proportion of lean body mass as a percentage of body weight was lower in LGA babies with greater absolute values of lean mass.[45,49]

Collectively, these studies of LGA infants suggest an increase in fat mass and often a smaller increase in lean mass, so that percentage body fat is increased, notably in those born to mothers who are obese and or with diabetes[45]; however, more robust studies are needed to clarify the pattern of fat distribution and levels of adiposity in these babies, ideally by using direct methods for assessment of neonatal body composition.

Will a Large Baby Become a Fat Adult with an Increased Cardiometabolic Risk?

There are contradictory long-term outcomes reported in those born LGA for adiposity and cardiometabolic disorders.[3,50-53] As discussed previously, this contradiction probably reflects subjects from different eras with different environmental factors affecting intrauterine nutrition, neonatal anthropometry, postnatal nutritional exposure, and growth trajectories during infancy and childhood.

Nutrition before conception and during pregnancy plays a fundamental role in influencing maternal weight gain, fetal growth, and neonatal outcomes,[54-56] but the evidence is limited in the case of LGA births. A lower prevalence of LGA infants was observed among healthy mothers who followed a low-glycemic diet compared with those assigned to a high-glycemic diet (3.1% vs 33.3%).[57] Conversely, a randomized controlled trial involving women who had previously delivered a large infant showed that a low-glycemic diet did not reduce incidence of LGA babies,[58] although there was an associated reduction in gestational weight gain and in the prevalence of gestational diabetes.[58] Further, a recent meta-analysis showed that dietary interventions in pregnancy were associated with increased birth size (by both weight and length) and reduced incidence of low birth weight, but there was no significant effect on the prevalence of infants born LGA or small for gestational age.[55] Overall, it is difficult to differentiate the effects of maternal obesity from those of an obesogenic diet on the prevalence of LGA births because both tend to be closely intertwined.[56]

The early postnatal nutritional environment, particularly breastfeeding, also has been suggested to be a modulator of long-term risks of obesity,[59] which may affect outcomes among those born LGA. Unfortunately, many epidemiologic studies do not report information on feeding practices in infants born LGA, such as data on early infant feeding and age at weaning into solid foods. Breastfeeding is associated with a

small but consistent reduction in later childhood obesity (OR 0.78 compared with formula-fed infants).[59] A similar or longer breastfeeding duration has been observed in LGA infants compared with those born AGA,[60] except for large babies of obese women with diabetes or extremely obese women without diabetes, who are more likely to experience breastfeeding failure and/or breastfeed for a shorter period of time.[61] Macrosomic infants also were more likely to be introduced earlier to solid food (before the age of 6 months) than AGA infants, with a synergistic effect of macrosomia and early introduction to solids on the development of high weight-for-length between 1 and 3 years of age in boys.[62] Notably, being born LGA remains a risk factor for greater BMI status during early childhood independently of early feeding practices.[63] Similarly, the association between birth weight and adolescent obesity remains after adjustment for breastfeeding.[64]

Growth patterns in infancy and childhood also are associated with the long-term risks of obesity in those born LGA.[65-67] The majority of LGA infants display a growth deceleration for weight and length ("catch-down growth") early in life, with some studies reporting similar growth variables at 12 months compared with AGA infants.[36,37,65] Thus, after escaping maternal influence on intrauterine growth, it has been speculated that LGA infants physiologically return to their genetically determined growth trajectories.[36] Conversely, other studies have reported that, despite the catch-down growth, LGA infants tend to remain heavier and longer in infancy and early childhood,[67] which ultimately leads to a greater risk of being overweight.[66] LGA infants born of mothers with diabetes are particularly likely to remain heavier with greater abdominal adiposity.[15] Furthermore, in approximately 20% of LGA infants there is a lack of catch-down growth, with weight gain continuing in the upper percentiles during the first year.[36] Indeed, LGA children without catch-down growth represent a high-risk subgroup, because they have increased fat mass in early childhood.[65] Two systematic reviews have shown that infants who are larger on the basis of weight or BMI or who have an acceleration in postnatal growth are at greater risk of later obesity.[68,69]

In those LGA infants who display accelerated weight gain, epigenetics has been proposed as a possible mechanism leading to greater birth weight and altered body composition and metabolism. Potential epigenetic changes in utero associated with the LGA phenotype have been examined recently. Hypermethylation of a specific gene locus (fibroblast growth factor receptor 2, *FGFR2*, involved in modulation of cell growth regulation and maturation) was associated with high birth weight.[23] Further, recent studies have highlighted the importance of considering the potential effects of DNA methylation in determining the development of adipose tissue.[70,71] Specifically, prenatal development of adipose tissue is characterized by the appearance of fat lobules at 14 weeks of gestation, which intensely proliferate through to 23 weeks followed by an increase in size from 24 to 29 weeks.[70] Exposure to excessive nutrition and adverse environments in utero were hypothesized to result in epigenetic modifications affecting adipocyte development, with lasting effects during postnatal life (eg, greater ability to store energy, or to generate new cells in fat tissue).[71] This finding contrasts with previous views that fat cell number was set at birth with increased adipocyte size the only mechanism to increase postnatal fat mass.[72] Thus, it has been speculated that LGA babies born to mothers who are obese and/or with diabetes are prone to become obese in adulthood because they are born with more and larger adipocytes.[25] In an animal model of diet-induced obesity, greater body weight has been observed in early life in offspring together with adipocyte hypertrophy and greater fat depots.[73] In rat offspring, maternal low-protein and postnatal high-fat diets induce increased *IGF2* gene expression and DNA methylation within adipocytes, leading to rapid adipose tissue growth[74]; however, it is also possible that these changes may simply represent epigenetic signatures of the phenotype, and their influence on birth size still remains speculative.

Later in life, the association between heavier birth weight and increased adiposity has been found to persist.[75] During childhood, there is a progressive increase in the risk of overweight with greater birth weight.[76] A meta-analysis reported that adults of greater birth weight had a 2-fold increase in the long-term risk of overweight,[50] with greater abdominal adiposity.[51,77]

The long-term cardiovascular and metabolic outcomes in adults born LGA are conflicting. An increased risk of cardiovascular and metabolic disease has been reported in adolescents born LGA to healthy mothers,[78] and a greater risk of coronary heart disease also has been found during adulthood.[79] Furthermore, a number of studies have found adults born LGA to be at increased risk of diabetes.[3,80] Conversely, greater birth weight has been associated with lower incidence of coronary heart disease and stroke in adulthood,[53] although it has been speculated that some of these data might be from subjects born in the 1950s, when environmental circumstances were likely different (as previously discussed) for pregnant women and their children.[53] Still, another study revealed no increased risk of cardiovascular events after being born LGA to mothers without diabetes.[52] It is tempting to speculate that these results reflect LGA cohorts from previous generations who were long and lean at birth and, thus, with favourable long-term outcomes. The different underlying causes of LGA birth have probably led to the conflicting outcomes observed.

Conclusions

The balance of evidence indicates that being born LGA is now associated with an increased risk of later obesity, particularly in those born of mothers who are obese and/or with diabetes; however, the data on long-term cardiometabolic outcomes are conflicting, probably reflecting LGA subjects of contrasting phenotypes, with different nutritional environments in utero and in postnatal life. In addition, the group of LGA babies who remain fatter at the end of infancy are likely to have

differences in adipocyte numbers/size together with epigenetic changes to metabolic genes. Birth weight alone is inadequate to assess infant body composition and size. More detailed anthropometric data at birth are necessary to better define body composition and the underlying etiology of increased birth size, as well as the long-term health risks. ■

Submitted for publication Aug 17, 2015; last revision received Oct 27, 2015; accepted Nov 13, 2015.

Reprint requests: Wayne S. Cutfield, MD, Liggins Institute, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand. E-mail: w.cutfield@auckland.ac.nz

References

1. Hales CN, Barker DJ, Clark PM, Cox LJ, Fall C, Osmond C, et al. Fetal and infant growth and impaired glucose tolerance at age 64. BMJ 1991;303:1019-22.
2. Barker DJ, Hales CN, Fall CH, Osmond C, Phipps K, Clark PM. Type 2 (non-insulin-dependent) diabetes mellitus, hypertension and hyperlipidaemia (syndrome X): relation to reduced fetal growth. Diabetologia 1993;36:62-7.
3. Johnsson IW, Haglund B, Ahlsson F, Gustafsson J. A high birth weight is associated with increased risk of type 2 diabetes and obesity. Pediatr Obes 2015;10:77-83.
4. Yu ZB, Han SP, Zhu GZ, Zhu C, Wang XJ, Cao XG, et al. Birth weight and subsequent risk of obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Obes Rev 2011;12:525-42.
5. Wei JN, Sung FC, Li CY, Chang CH, Lin RS, Lin CC, et al. Low birth weight and high birth weight infants are both at an increased risk to have type 2 diabetes among schoolchildren in Taiwan. Diabetes Care 2003;26:343-8.
6. Tapia Granados JA, Diez Roux AV. Life and death during the Great Depression. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2009;106:17290-5.
7. Roseboom T, de Rooij S, Painter R. The Dutch famine and its long-term consequences for adult health. Early Hum Dev 2006;82:485-91.
8. Gunderson EP, Abrams B. Epidemiology of gestational weight gain and body weight changes after pregnancy. Epidemiol Rev 1999;21:261-75.
9. Gunderson EP. Childbearing and obesity in women: weight before, during, and after pregnancy. Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am 2009;36:317-32.
10. Walsh JM, McAuliffe FM. Prediction and prevention of the macrosomic fetus. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 2012;162:125-30.
11. Langer O. Fetal macrosomia: etiologic factors. Clin Obstet Gynecol 2000;43:283-97.
12. Hauth JC, Goodman MT, Gilstrap LC III, Gilstrap JE. Post-term pregnancy. I. Obstet Gynecol 1980;56:467-70.
13. Savitz DA, Terry JW Jr, Dole N, Thorp JM Jr, Siega-Riz AM, Herring AH. Comparison of pregnancy dating by last menstrual period, ultrasound scanning, and their combination. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2002;187:1660-6.
14. Dabelea D, Crume T. Maternal environment and the transgenerational cycle of obesity and diabetes. Diabetes 2011;60:1849-55.
15. Vohr BR, McGarvey ST. Growth patterns of large-for-gestational-age and appropriate-for-gestational-age infants of gestational diabetic mothers and control mothers at age 1 year. Diabetes Care 1997;20:1066-72.
16. Cetin C, Ucar A, Bas F, Poyrazoglu S, Bundak R, Saka N, et al. Are metabolic syndrome antecedents in prepubertal children associated with being born idiopathic large for gestational age? Pediatr Diabetes 2013;14:585-92.
17. Weissmann-Brenner A, Simchen MJ, Zilberberg E, Kalter A, Weisz B, Achiron R, et al. Maternal and neonatal outcomes of macrosomic pregnancies. Med Sci Monit 2012;18:PH77-81.
18. Pasupathy D, McCowan LM, Poston L, Kenny LC, Dekker GA, North RA. Perinatal outcomes in large infants using customised birthweight centiles and conventional measures of high birthweight. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol 2012;26:543-52.
19. Barker DJ, Osmond C, Simmonds SJ, Wield GA. The relation of small head circumference and thinness at birth to death from cardiovascular disease in adult life. BMJ 1993;306:422-6.
20. Bocca-Tjeertes IF, Kerstjens JM, Reijneveld SA, Veldman K, Bos AF, de Winter AF. Growth patterns of large for gestational age children up to age 4 years. Pediatrics 2014;133:e643-9.
21. Koyanagi A, Zhang J, Dagvadorj A, Hirayama F, Shibuya K, Souza JP, et al. Macrosomia in 23 developing countries: an analysis of a multicountry, facility-based, cross-sectional survey. Lancet 2013;381:476-83.
22. Chawla R, Badon S, Rangarajan J, Reisetter A, Armstrong LL, Lowe LP, et al. A genetic risk score for prediction of newborn adiposity and large for gestational age birth. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2014;99:E2377-86.
23. Haworth KE, Farrell WE, Emes RD, Ismail KM, Carroll WD, Hubball E, et al. Methylation of the FGFR2 gene is associated with high birth weight centile in humans. Epigenomics 2014;6:477-91.
24. Fraser A, Lawlor DA. Long-term health outcomes in offspring born to women with diabetes in pregnancy. Curr Diab Rep 2014;14:489.
25. Lawlor DA. The Society for Social Medicine John Pemberton Lecture 2011. Developmental overnutrition—an old hypothesis with new importance? Int J Epidemiol 2013;42:7-29.
26. Catalano PM. Obesity and pregnancy–the propagation of a viscous cycle? J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2003;88:3505-6.
27. Pedersen J. The pregnant diabetic and her newborn. Baltimore (MD): William & Wilkins; 1967.
28. McCowan L, Stewart AW, Francis A, Gardosi J. A customised birthweight centile calculator developed for a New Zealand population. Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol 2004;44:428-31.
29. Larkin JC, Speer PD, Simhan HN. A customized standard of large size for gestational age to predict intrapartum morbidity. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2011;204:499.e1-10.
30. Boulet SL, Alexander GR, Salihu HM, Pass M. Macrosomic births in the United States: determinants, outcomes, and proposed grades of risk. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2003;188:1372-8.
31. Ay L, Kruithof CJ, Bakker R, Steegers EA, Witteman JC, Moll HA, et al. Maternal anthropometrics are associated with fetal size in different periods of pregnancy and at birth. The Generation R Study. BJOG 2009;116:953-63.
32. Sjaarda LA, Albert PS, Mumford SL, Hinkle SN, Mendola P, Laughon SK. Customized large-for-gestational-age birthweight at term and the association with adverse perinatal outcomes. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2014;210:63.e1-11.
33. Holston A, Stokes T, Olsen C, Choi YS, Curtis J, Higginson J, et al. Novel noninvasive anthropometric measure in preterm and full-term infants: normative values for waist circumference:length ratio at birth. Pediatr Res 2013;74:299-306.
34. Demerath EW, Fields DA. Body composition assessment in the infant. Am J Hum Biol 2014;26:291-304.
35. Lepercq J, Lahlou N, Timsit J, Girard J, Mouzon SH. Macrosomia revisited: ponderal index and leptin delineate subtypes of fetal overgrowth. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1999;181:621-5.
36. Davies DP. Size at birth and growth in the first year of life of babies who are overweight and underweight at birth. Proc Nutr Soc 1980;39:25-33.
37. Chiavaroli V, Cutfield WS, Derraik JG, Pan Z, Ngo S, Sheppard A, et al. Infants born large-for-gestational-age display slower growth in early infancy, but no epigenetic changes at birth. Sci Rep 2015;5:14540.
38. Rogers IS, Ness AR, Steer CD, Wells JC, Emmett PM, Reilly JR, et al. Associations of size at birth and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry measures of lean and fat mass at 9 to 10 y of age. Am J Clin Nutr 2006;84:739-47.
39. Pereira da Silva L, Bergmans KI, van Kerkhoven LA, Leal F, Virella D, Videira-Amaral JM. Reducing discomfort while measuring crown-heel length in neonates. Acta Paediatr 2006;95:742-6.

40. Johnson TS, Engstrom JL, Gelhar DK. Intra- and interexaminer reliability of anthropometric measurements of term infants. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr 1997;24:497-505.
41. Stein AD, Barros FC, Bhargava SK, Hao W, Horta BL, Lee N, et al. Birth status, child growth, and adult outcomes in low- and middle-income countries. J Pediatr 2013;163:1740-6.e4.
42. de Bruin NC, van Velthoven KA, Stijnen T, Juttmann RE, Degenhart HJ, Visser HK. Body fat and fat-free mass in infants: new and classic anthropometric indexes and prediction equations compared with total-body electrical conductivity. Am J Clin Nutr 1995;61:1195-205.
43. De Cunto A, Paviotti G, Ronfani L, Travan L, Bua J, Cont G, et al. Can body mass index accurately predict adiposity in newborns? Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed 2014;99:F238-9.
44. Ma G, Yao M, Liu Y, Lin A, Zou H, Urlando A, et al. Validation of a new pediatric air-displacement plethysmograph for assessing body composition in infants. Am J Clin Nutr 2004;79:653-60.
45. Hammami M, Walters JC, Hockman EM, Koo WW. Disproportionate alterations in body composition of large for gestational age neonates. J Pediatr 2001;138:817-21.
46. Schmelzle HR, Quang DN, Fusch G, Fusch C. Birth weight categorization according to gestational age does not reflect percentage body fat in term and preterm newborns. Eur J Pediatr 2007;166:161-7.
47. de Zegher F, Perez-Cruz M, Diaz M, Gomez-Roig MD, Lopez-Bermejo A, Ibanez L. Less myostatin and more lean mass in large-born infants from nondiabetic mothers. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2014;99:E2367-71.
48. Hediger ML, Overpeck MD, Kuczmarski RJ, McGlynn A, Maurer KR, Davis WW. Muscularity and fatness of infants and young children born small- or large-for-gestational-age. Pediatrics 1998;102:E60.
49. Akcakus M, Kurtoglu S, Koklu E, Kula M, Koklu S. The relationship between birth weight leptin and bone mineral status in newborn infants. Neonatology 2007;91:101-6.
50. Schellong K, Schulz S, Harder T, Plagemann A. Birth weight and long-term overweight risk: systematic review and a meta-analysis including 643,902 persons from 66 studies and 26 countries globally. PLoS One 2012;7:e47776.
51. Renom Espineira A, Fernandes-Rosa FL, Bueno AC, de Souza RM, Moreira AC, de Castro M, et al. Postnatal growth and cardiometabolic profile in young adults born large for gestational age. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 2011;75:335-41.
52. Stuart A, Amer-Wahlin I, Persson J, Kallen K. Long-term cardiovascular risk in relation to birth weight and exposure to maternal diabetes mellitus. Int J Cardiol 2013;168:2653-7.
53. Lawlor DA, Ronalds G, Clark H, Smith GD, Leon DA. Birth weight is inversely associated with incident coronary heart disease and stroke among individuals born in the 1950s: findings from the Aberdeen Children of the 1950s prospective cohort study. Circulation 2005;112:1414-8.
54. Imdad A, Bhutta ZA. Maternal nutrition and birth outcomes: effect of balanced protein-energy supplementation. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol 2012;26:178-90.
55. Gresham E, Byles JE, Bisquera A, Hure AJ. Effects of dietary interventions on neonatal and infant outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Clin Nutr 2014;100:1298-321.
56. Muhlhausler BS, Gugusheff JR, Ong ZY, Vithayathil MA. Nutritional approaches to breaking the intergenerational cycle of obesity. Can J Physiol Pharmacol 2013;91:421-8.
57. Moses RG, Luebcke M, Davis WS, Coleman KJ, Tapsell LC, Petocz P, et al. Effect of a low-glycemic-index diet during pregnancy on obstetric outcomes. Am J Clin Nutr 2006;84:807-12.
58. Walsh JM, McGowan CA, Mahony R, Foley ME, McAuliffe FM. Low glycaemic index diet in pregnancy to prevent macrosomia (ROLO study): randomised control trial. BMJ 2012;345:e5605.
59. Arenz S, Ruckerl R, Koletzko B, von Kries R. Breast-feeding and childhood obesity—a systematic review. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord 2004;28:1247-56.
60. Surber CD. Breastfeeding among obese women: the role of infant size and providing additional support. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University; 2007.
61. Cordero L, Gabbe SG, Landon MB, Nankervis CA. Breastfeeding initiation in women with gestational diabetes mellitus. J Neonatal Perinatal Med 2013;6:303-10.
62. Yu Z, Sun JQ, Haas JD, Gu Y, Li Z, Lin X. Macrosomia is associated with high weight-for-height in children aged 1-3 years in Shanghai, China. Int J Obes (Lond) 2008;32:55-60.
63. Zhang J, Himes JH, Guo Y, Jiang J, Yang L, Lu Q, et al. Birth weight, growth and feeding pattern in early infancy predict overweight/obesity status at two years of age: a birth cohort study of Chinese infants. PLoS One 2013;8:e64542.
64. Wang Y, Gao E, Wu J, Zhou J, Yang Q, Walker MC, et al. Fetal macrosomia and adolescence obesity: results from a longitudinal cohort study. Int J Obes (Lond) 2009;33:923-8.
65. Taal HR, Vd Heijden AJ, Steegers EA, Hofman A, Jaddoe VW. Small and large size for gestational age at birth, infant growth, and childhood overweight. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2013;21:1261-8.
66. Moschonis G, Grammatikaki E, Manios Y. Perinatal predictors of overweight at infancy and preschool childhood: the GENESIS study. Int J Obes (Lond) 2008;32:39-47.
67. Hediger ML, Overpeck MD, Maurer KR, Kuczmarski RJ, McGlynn A, Davis WW. Growth of infants and young children born small or large for gestational age: findings from the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 1998;152:1225-31.
68. Baird J, Fisher D, Lucas P, Kleijnen J, Roberts H, Law C. Being big or growing fast: systematic review of size and growth in infancy and later obesity. BMJ 2005;331:929.
69. Monteiro PO, Victora CG. Rapid growth in infancy and childhood and obesity in later life–a systematic review. Obes Rev 2005;6:143-54.
70. Tarantal AF, Berglund L. Obesity and lifespan health—importance of the fetal environment. Nutrients 2014;6:1725-36.
71. Martin RJ, Hausman GJ, Hausman DB. Regulation of adipose cell development in utero. Proc Soc Exp Biol Med 1998;219:200-10.
72. Spalding KL, Arner E, Westermark PO, Bernard S, Buchholz BA, Bergmann O, et al. Dynamics of fat cell turnover in humans. Nature 2008;453:783-7.
73. Caluwaerts S, Lambin S, van Bree R, Peeters H, Vergote I, Verhaeghe J. Diet-induced obesity in gravid rats engenders early hyperadiposity in the offspring. Metabolism 2007;56:1431-8.
74. Claycombe KJ, Uthus EO, Roemmich JN, Johnson LK, Johnson WT. Prenatal low-protein and postnatal high-fat diets induce rapid adipose tissue growth by inducing Igf2 expression in Sprague Dawley rat offspring. J Nutr 2013;143:1533-9.
75. Skilton MR, Siitonen N, Wurtz P, Viikari JS, Juonala M, Seppala I, et al. High birth weight is associated with obesity and increased carotid wall thickness in young adults: the Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns Study. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol 2014;34:1064-8.
76. Loaiza S, Coustasse A, Urrutia-Rojas X, Atalah E. Birth weight and obesity risk at first grade in a cohort of Chilean children. Nutr Hosp 2011;26:214-9.
77. Bueno AC, Espineira AR, Fernandes-Rosa FL, de Souza RM, de Castro M, Moreira AC, et al. Adiponectin: serum levels, promoter polymorphism, and associations with birth size and cardiometabolic outcome in young adults born large for gestational age. Eur J Endocrinol 2010;162:53-60.
78. Chiavaroli V, Marcovecchio ML, de Giorgis T, Diesse L, Chiarelli F, Mohn A. Progression of cardio-metabolic risk factors in subjects born small and large for gestational age. PLoS One 2014;9:e104278.
79. Osler M, Lund R, Kriegbaum M, Andersen AM. The influence of birth weight and body mass in early adulthood on early coronary heart disease risk among Danish men born in 1953. Eur J Epidemiol 2009;24:57-61.
80. Clausen TD, Mathiesen ER, Hansen T, Pedersen O, Jensen DM, Lauenborg J, et al. High prevalence of type 2 diabetes and pre-diabetes in adult offspring of women with gestational diabetes mellitus or type 1 diabetes: the role of intrauterine hyperglycemia. Diabetes Care 2008;31:340-6.