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An insight into the prevalence of low birth weight in Madhya Pradesh
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ABSTRACT

Background: The objective of the study was to find out the prevalence of low birth weight in Sanwer block in Madhya Pradesh.

Methods: The study was conducted in community health center of Sanwer Tehsil (Indore district) in the state of Madhya Pradesh in collaboration with the department of Community Medicine of Sri Aurobindo Medical College and PG Institute, Indore.

Results: Out of 136 cases observed till completion, 66 cases were of female neonates and 70 cases were of male neonates. Out of 66 females, 36 cases (54.54%) were below the standard 2,500 g. Out of 70 male neonates, 44 cases were below the standard 2,500 g. Average female weight at time of birth was 2.1 kg while the average female height at time of birth was 46.48 cm. Average male weight at time of birth was 2.15 kg and average male height at time of birth was 47.37 cm.

Conclusions: National programmes targeting to address low birth weight are the need of the hour.
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INTRODUCTION

The WHO distinguishes newborn infants with weight less than 2500 g as low birth weight (LBW) infants.1 LBW is substantially affiliated to infant morbidity, mortality, and risk of developmental disabilities and diseases amid infants.2 At the household and individual level, a wide continuum of child health occurs due to many influences. For example: demographic, social and economic conditions are known to be determinants of health in general, including birth weight. At birth, child’s weight is accepted as the single parameter of child health that is directly related to the health and nutrition of the mother, and on the other hand, is an important determinant of the chances of the newborn to survive and experience healthy growth and development.3

While birth weight is an indicator of a newborn’s chances for survival, growth, long-term health and psychosocial development- it is also an indicator of the mother’s health and nutritional status.1,3

LBW neonates are sub-grouped according to the first birth weight: (a) moderately low birth weight (MLBW): between 1500 and 2499 g; (b) very low birth weight (VLBW): less than 1500 g; (c) extremely low birth weight (ELBW): less than 1000 g.7

As per the WHO estimation about 25 million low birth weight babies- up to 20 percent of all infants- are born each year, nearly 95% of them in developing countries.5,6 Worldwide, neonatal mortality is 20 times more likely for LBW babies compared to heavier babies (≤2.5 kg). Low
Birth weight infants are three times more likely than normal birth weight infants to have neuro-developmental complications and congenital abnormalities. Thus, this study was carried out with an aim to find out the prevalence of low birth weight in Sanwer block in Madhya Pradesh.

METHODS

Study type

The study type was prospective observational.

Study place

The study was conducted in community health center of Sanwer Tehsil (Indore district) in the state of Madhya Pradesh under the department of Community Medicine of Sri Aurobindo Medical College and PG Institute, Indore.

Study period

The study period was from January 2013 to March 2014.

Study procedure

Due permission from the Institutional Ethics Committee and informed consent from the respondents was sought before commencement of the study. All the low birth weight babies born during January 2013 to March 2013 in the community health center were included in the study.

A total of 150 babies were registered for follow-up, out of which 9 mothers denied consent, and 5 failed to complete the study, 136 completed the study. Data on mother (age, husband’s name, address, parity, postnatal prescription) and the born babies’ details (place of delivery, mode of delivery, sex, birth weight, involvement of doctor/nurse, number of postnatal visits to healthcare, motivators if any) were noted on the first visit.

Subsequent examination of height and weight was carried out at quarterly interval (3, 6, 9 and 12 months) up to 12 months. Simple random sampling was done in the study for selection of patients.

Statistical analysis

Statistical evaluation of the data obtained was done on SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software, version 16.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Descriptive analysis (mean±standard deviation) of the data was done. Chi-square test was applied and the level of significance was set at p<0.05 (highly significant).

RESULTS

Out of 136 cases observed till completion, 66 cases were of female neonates and 70 cases were of male neonates (Table 1). Out of 66 females, 36 cases (54.54%) were below the standard 2,500 g and next 20 cases were exactly 2,500 g. Out of the 36 below par cases, 34 cases (51.51%) were of MLBW (2,500-1,500 g) and only two (03.03%) cases were of VLBW (1,500-1,000 g). Thus only 10 female neonates (15.15%) were clearly above the required standard, and only 30 female neonates (45.45%) were out of LBW category – remaining 36 (54.54%) being either MLBW or VLBW. Out of 70 male neonates, 44 cases were below the standard 2,500 g and next 26 (33.33%) cases were exactly 2,500 g. Out of the 44 below par cases, 40 cases were of MLBW (2,500-1,500 g) and 4 cases were of VLBW (1,500-1,000 g). Thus, no male neonate (00.00%) was clearly above the required standard, and only 26 male neonates (37.14%) were just out of LBW category – remaining 44 (62.86%) being either MLBW or VLBW. This ratio is statistically insignificant. The male: female ratio in normal and low birth weight is shown in Figure 1.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characters (mean)</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth weight</td>
<td>2.16 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the mother</td>
<td>22.67 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postnatal visits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male neonates</td>
<td>51.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female neonates</td>
<td>48.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Male: female ratio in normal and low birth weight babies.

The ratio of home and institutional deliveries in normal and low birth weight has been portrayed in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Ratio of home and institutional deliveries in normal and low birth weight.
Birth weight wise distribution of parity has been depicted in Figure 3. Table 2 depicting sex-wise ratio of normal and low birth weight.

![Figure 3: Birth weight wise distribution of parity.](image)

Table 2: Sex-wise ratio of normal and LBW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Normal birth weight</th>
<th>LBW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.325

Table 3 designates the average weight and height in female neonates. Average female weight at time of birth was 2.1 kg, at 3 months it was 4.51 kg, at 6 months it was 5.45 kg, at 9 months it was 6.5 kg, at 12 months the average weight was 7.24 kg.

Table 3: Age-wise average weight and height in female neonates (kg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Female weight (kg)</th>
<th>Female height (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At birth</td>
<td>2.172727</td>
<td>46.48485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>4.519697</td>
<td>52.95455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>5.456061</td>
<td>60.13636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>6.578788</td>
<td>65.42424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>7.24697</td>
<td>70.39394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average female height at time of birth was 46.48 cm, at 3 months of age the height was 52.95 cm, at 6 months of age the height was 60.01 cm, at 9 months of age the height was 65.42 cm, at 12 months of age the average height was 70.39 cm.

Table 4 demonstrates the average weight and height in male neonates. Average male weight at time of birth was 2.15 kg, at 3 months of age the weight was 4.07 kg, at 6 months it was 5.81 kg, at 9 months it was 7.83 kg, at 12 months the average weight was 7.8 kg.

Table 4: Age-wise average weight and height in male neonates (cm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Female weight (kg)</th>
<th>Female height (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At birth</td>
<td>2.157143</td>
<td>47.37143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>4.708571</td>
<td>52.97143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>5.817143</td>
<td>60.14286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>7.008571</td>
<td>65.42857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>7.838571</td>
<td>70.32857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average male height at time of birth was 47.37 cm, at 3 months it was 52.97 cm, at 6 months of age the height was 60.14 cm, at 9 months it was 65.42 cm, at 12 months of age the average height was 70.32 cm.

Average height in LBW female neonate at time of birth was 46.47 cm and in normal birth weight baby was 47.34 cm, at 3 months average height in LBW was 52.92 cm and NBW was 52.97 cm, at 6 months of age the height in LBW was 59.11 cm and NBW was 60.13 cm, at 9 months of age the height in LBW was 64.38 cm the NBW was 65.43 cm, at 12 months of age average height in LBW was 69.31 cm and NBW was 70.34 cm.

DISCUSSION

In any community, mothers and children constitute a priority group. In developing countries, they comprise approximately 70% of population. Mothers and children not only constitute a large group, but they are also a vulnerable or special risk group.

Mean birth weight of the child in the studied sample was 2.16 kg and the age of mother at the time of delivery was 22.67 year. Thus, this sample represented a population of normal reproductive age (<18 years being taken as early motherhood as per WHO guidelines) with below par normal birth weight wise ratio of normal and LBW.

Out of 136 neonates, 80 (58.8%) were low birth weight and this is far more than already reported in any Indian research report. International Institute of Population Sciences, National Family Health Survey, India published a report of 2005 in 2007 and quoted a rate of 21%. Based on the same National Family Health Survey (NFHS) data of 2005-2006, another report quoted the prevalence of LBW as nearly 20%.

Thus, in this sample, there was slight male (51.47%) preponderance but it was statistically insignificant. Many other Indian studies reported similar outcomes but in any study the sex ratio was not significantly different except one.

ELBW (<1,000 g) was not represented in the population and even very low birth weight babies (1000-1,500 g) were much less. A similar scenario is seen in the case of male babies. This precludes any gross developmental problem.
being statistically significantly apparent in such a small population.13

Out of 70 male neonates, 44 cases were below the standard
2,500 g and next 26 (33.33%) cases were exactly 2,500 g. Out of the 44 below par cases, 40 cases were of MLBW (2,500-1,500 g) and 4 cases were of VLBW (1,500-1,000 g).

Thus, no male neonate (00.00%) was clearly above the
required standard, and only 26 male neonates (37.14%) were just out of LBW category- remaining 44 (62.86%) being either MLBW or VLBW. As per χ² value, sex wise differentiation of birth weight was not significant.

A recent study in West Bengal revealed LBW of 21.49%
among infants. They elaborated that the risk of LBW was
higher among women those age <20 years and
BMI<18.5 kg/m². The main determinants of LBW in this
study were preterm delivery (AOR=1.93) and history of
chronic illness (AOR=2.09).14

Another large-scale study showed 3.7% of LBW. The
highest odds of LBW in this study were associated with
female newborns (OR: 1.49; 95% CI: 1.47-1.50). Determinants associated with LBW were low educational
level of mother, black races, age ≥35 years, less prenatal
care visits and primiparous women.15

Another study from Ethiopia demonstrated 34.1% of the
term newborns with low birth weight.

It was emphasized in the study that special attention should
be given to pregnant mothers to get enough rest, extra diet
supplements, and improved antenatal services available
and approachable to all pregnant women.16

In our study incidence of LBW was higher among
multiparous women which was in contradiction to a study
which depicted that nulliparity was independently
associated with LBW as compared to multiparity.17

Hinkle et al portrayed that the association between parity
and birthweight was non-linear with the greatest increase
observed between first and second-born infants of the
same mother.18

Limitations

Our study, being post-natal and observational could not
cover other factors of overall low birth weight. Studies on
large population are required, being even more confirmatory, if it is interventional. If the factors are other
than genetic, and thus modifiable, appropriate measures to
be taken.

CONCLUSION

Birth weight has been proved as the pointer of infant
wellbeing. Special attention should be given to maternal
nutrition to prevent low birth weight. National
programmes targeting to address low birth weight are the
need of the hour.

Funding: No funding sources
Conflict of interest: None declared
Ethical approval: The study was approved by the
Institutional Ethics Committee

REFERENCES

1. Kumar N, Alagur K, Chokhandre P K. Low birth

Low Birth Weight Babies. Med J Armed Forces

3. Oladeinde HB, Oladeinde OB, Omoregie R, Onifade
AA. Prevalence and determinants of low birth
weight: the situation in a traditional birth home in

4. Karimi M, Fallah R, Dehghanpoor A, Mirzaei M.
Developmental status of 5-year-old moderate low

5. Tibrewala NS, Tibrewala SN, Tibrewala VN. Epidemiology and prevention of low birth weight
babies in a developing country. Bull Int Pediatr

6. Adami Z, Ameme DK, Nortey P, Afari EA, Kenu E.
Determinants of low birth weight in neonates born in
three hospitals in Brong Ahafo region, Ghana, 2016-
an unmatch ed case-control study. BMC Pregnancy

7. Deshmukh JS, Motghare DD, Zodpey SP, Wadhva
SK. Low birth weight and associated maternal factors

March 2021.

Chakraborty S, Bharati P. Prevalence and causes of
low birth weight in India. Malays J Nutr.


11. Deshpande JD, Phalke DB, Bangal VB. Maternal risk
factors for low birth weight neonates: a hospital
based casecontrol study in rural area of western

Low Birth Weight Babies. Med J Armed Forces

13. Whincup PH, Kaye SJ, Owen CG, Huxley R, Cook
DG, Anazawa S, et al. Birth weight and risk of type


