

Prevalence and Determinants of Low Birth Weight: An Experience from a Secondary Referral Unit Of Burdwan District, West Bengal (India)

Dr. Sanjay Kumar¹, Dr. Rakesh Kumar², Ms. Aparna Tewari³, Dr. Richa², Dr. Sasthi Narayan Chakraborty², Dr. Tapas Kumar Som²

¹(Associate Professor, Dept. of Community Medicine, IQ City Medical College & Narayana Hospital, India)

²(Assistant Professor, Dept. of Community Medicine, IQ City Medical College & Narayana Hospital, India)

³(9th Semester MBBS Student, IQ City Medical College & Narayana Hospital, India)

Corresponding author: Dr. Rakesh Kumar

Abstract: Low birth weight (LBW) defines a heterogeneous group of infants: some are born early, some are born growth restricted, and others are born both early and growth restricted. While the immediate consequences of LBW may be respiratory failure, hypoxia, intra-ventricular hemorrhage, its effect may manifest in adulthood causing a range of non communicable disease like cerebro-vascular accidents, Ischemic heart disease, cancer, metabolic syndrome. Our study aims to determine the prevalence and determinants of LBW in a secondary referral unit of Burdwan district, West Bengal (India). This cross-sectional, observational study was conducted among women delivered between May-June 2016 at a secondary referral unit and mother. A total of 332 mothers who delivered during data collection period were included in study. Prevalence of LBW was found to be 27.4%. Maternal age < 20 years & ≥ 30 years, Low Maternal education, Rural residence, BPL status, prematurity, high gravid & parity and maternal anaemia & severe maternal complications adversely & significantly ($p < .05$) favored occurrence of LBW. ANC registration, ≥ 4 ANC and IFA consumption significantly ($p < .05$) protected against LBW.

Key Words: Low Birth Weight, Newborn weight, Severe Maternal Complications, ANC

Date of Submission: 20-02-2018

Date of acceptance: 06-03-2018

I. Introduction

Low birth weight (LBW) has been defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as weight at birth of less than 2,500 grams (5.5 pounds)¹. Low birth weight defines a heterogeneous group of infants: some are born early, some are born growth restricted, and others are born both early and growth restricted. It is generally recognized that being born with low birth weight is a disadvantage for the baby. LBW infants are approximately 20 times more likely to die than normal weight babies². WHO estimates that about 25 million LBW babies are born every year, about 95% of them take birth in developing world³. Prevalence of LBW varies across regions and within countries. Regional incidence of LBW is 28% in South Asia and is highest among all regions⁴. Prevalence of LBW in different parts of West Bengal ranges between 28%-31.3%⁵⁻⁶. Determinants of Birth weight include maternal age, maternal nutrition, non pregnant weight, Gravida & parity, Educational status, etc⁷. Severe maternal complications (SMC) are defined as "potentially life threatening condition"⁸ especially pre-eclampsia / eclampsia are associated with LBW⁹. LBW is a public health problem and one of the strongest determinants of infant mortality and morbidity. While the immediate consequences of LBW may be respiratory failure, hypoxia, intra-ventricular hemorrhage, its effect may manifest in adulthood causing a range of non communicable disease like cerebro-vascular accidents, Ischemic heart disease, cancer, metabolic syndrome¹⁰. Most of the factors responsible for LBW are potentially modifiable and preventable, identification of these risk factors may guide targeted program modification and intervention to address this problem. This study was planned to determine the prevalence and determinants of LBW in a secondary referral unit of Burdwan district, West Bengal (India).

II. Material and Methods

This cross-sectional study was conducted among mother who delivered at a secondary referral unit of Burdwan district, West Bengal (India) between May-June 2016. A total 332 mother participated in this study.

Study Design: Cross-sectional

Study Location: Secondary Referral unit of Burdwan district, West Bengal (India).

Study Duration: May-June 2016.

Sample size: 332

Sample size calculation: Considering 28% prevalence of LBW in West Bengal⁵ minimum sample size (n) = $Z\alpha^2 pq/d^2$. Where, $Z\alpha = 1.96$ (95% confidence level), p (prevalence) = 0.28, $q = (1-p)$, $d = 20\%$ of p assuming, possible non-response rate of 10%. Minimum sample size calculated was 293 but we took all those who delivered during study period and consented to participate in study.

Sampling procedure: Non probability, Consecutive sampling.

Study population: All mothers who delivered at secondary referral unit during data collection period.

Inclusion criteria:

1. Singleton delivery

Exclusion criteria:

1. Twin delivery

Operational Definition¹:

Normal birth weight: 2500gm-4000gm

Low birth weight: <2500gm

Data Collection:

After obtaining written informed consent, mothers were interviewed using pre-tested, semi structured schedule. Data were collected on the clinic-social variables i.e., age, religion, education, Gravid & parity, mode of delivery, birth weight of baby. Maternal and Child Protection (MCP) card were reviewed to know details of Ante natal checkups (ANC). Bed head tickets (BHT) were also reviewed to collect data regarding complication during pregnancy, delivery outcome and birth weight of baby.

Statistical analysis:

Data were codified and analyzed using SPSS 20.0. Frequency of clino-social variables was calculated. Chi-square test was used to show association between categorical variables and independent t-test was used to show difference in mean weight among low birth weight and normal birth weight babies.

III. Result

Out of 332 newborn 91 (27.4%) were LBW and rest newborn babies were normal weight. Range of Birth weight was 1000-3700gm and mean weight was 2677.29 ± 454.59 gms. Table-1 shows the clinic-social characteristics of the study population. Minimum and maximum age of study subjects were 18 years and 40 years respectively. Mean age of the study subjects was 22.85 ± 4.18 years. 66.6% of the study subjects were in the age group of 20-29 years followed by 25.6% and 7.8% in the age group of < 20 years and ≥ 30 years respectively. Majority (84.3%) of the study subjects were Hindu followed by Muslim (15.7%). Most (33.7%) of the participants belonged to Scheduled caste followed by general caste (33.1%), Schedule tribe (17.5%) and other backward caste (15.7%). Majority (78.9%) of the subjects was from rural area and about 51.8% were below poverty line. 38.3% of study subjects received education up to class V, followed by class VI-X (36.1%) and > class X (25.6%). About 2/3rd (67.5%) were full term delivery while about 1/3rd (32.5%) were preterm. 53.0% study subjects were primi-gravida, 43.4% were multi gravida and 3.6% were grand multi gravida. 53.9% of the subjects were primipara followed by P₁₋₂ (42.6%) and P₃₋₄ (4.5%). Out of 332 study subjects only 298 (89.8%) registered for ANC and only 53.9% had ≥ 4 ANC. While all registered women received Iron & Folic Acid (IFA) tablets, only 72.1% of them actually consumed it. 66.3% were normal deliveries and rest (33.7%) was Lower uterine caesarian section(LUCS). 39.8% of study subjects had anemia. While no maternal deaths were reported during study period 31.9% of study subjects' experienced severe maternal complications. Most common complications was pre-eclampsia (59.3%) followed by Post partum hemorrhage (8.9%), infection (6.2%) and Dystocia (2.7). Table-2 shows the association of factors influencing LBW. Maternal age <20 years & ≥ 30 years, BPL status, less education, rural residence, prematurity, high gravid & parity, anemia and severe maternal complications significantly favored the occurrence of LBW, while, ANC registration, ≥ 4 ANC and IFA consumption were significantly protected against LBW. Mean birth weight difference between LBW and

normal weight babies were 694.9 grams (table-3). Difference in birth weight of babies was statistically significant.

Table no 1: Shows clinic-social characteristics of study subjects.

| Clinico-Social characteristics | n (%) | Clinico-Social characteristics | n(%) |
|---|------------|---|------------|
| A | g | e | |
| <20yrs | 85(25.6) | Number of ANC | |
| 20-29 yrs | 221 (66.6) | <4 | 119 (35.9) |
| ≥30 yrs | 26 (7.8) | ≥4 | 179 (53.9) |
| Religion | | No ANC | 34 (10.2) |
| Hindu | 280 (84.3) | IFA Consumption | |
| Muslim | 52 (15.7) | Yes | 215 (72.1) |
| Caste | | No | 83 (27.9) |
| SC | 112 (33.7) | Anemia | |
| ST | 58 (17.5) | Yes | 132 (39.8) |
| OBC | 52 (15.7) | No | 200 (60.2) |
| General | 110 (33.1) | Low Birth Weight | |
| Residence | | Yes | 91 (27.4) |
| Rural | 262 (78.9) | No | 241(72.6) |
| Urban | 70 (21.1) | Mode of Delivery | |
| BPL card holder | | Normal Vaginal Delivery | 220 (66.3) |
| Yes | 172 (51.8) | LUCS | 112 (33.7) |
| No | 160 (48.2) | Severe maternal complications(SMCs) | |
| Educational status | | Yes | 106 (31.9) |
| Up to class V | 127 (38.3) | No | 226 (68.1) |
| Class VI-X | 120 (36.1) | Disease wise frequency of SMCs* | |
| >Class X | 85 (25.6) | Pre-eclampsia/eclampsia | 86 (59.3) |
| Gestational age at the time of delivery | | PPH | 13 (8.9) |
| <37 weeks | 108 (32.5) | Infection | 9 (6.2) |
| ≥37 weeks | 224 (67.5) | Dystocia | 4 (2.7) |
| Gravida | | *total >106 as more than one SMC was present in few study subjects. | |
| Primi-gravida | 176 (53.0) | | |
| Multi-gravida (2-4) | 144 (43.4) | | |
| Grand Multi-gravida (≥5) | 12 (3.6) | | |
| Parity | | | |
| P ₀ | 179(53.9) | | |
| P ₁ -P ₂ | 138(41.6) | | |
| P ₃ -P ₄ | 15(4.5) | | |
| ANC Registration | | | |
| Yes | 298 (89.8) | | |
| No | 34 (10.2) | | |

Table no 2: Clinico-social determinants of LBW

| C-S Factors | Low Birth Weight | | Total n (%) | χ ² (df) | p value |
|------------------------|------------------|------------|-------------|---------------------|---------|
| | Yes (%) | No (%) | | | |
| A g e G r o u p | | | | | |
| <20 years | 39 (45.9) | 46 (54.1) | 85 (100.0) | | |
| 20-29 years | 33 (14.9) | 188 (85.1) | 221 (100.0) | 59.1 (2) | 0.000 |
| ≥30 Years | 19 (73.1) | 7 (26.9) | 26 (100.0) | | |
| Religion | | | | | |
| Hindu | 77 (27.5) | 203 (72.5) | 280 (100.0) | | |
| Muslim | 14 (26.9) | 38 (63.1) | 52 (100.0) | 0.007 (1) | 0.540 |
| BPL status | | | | | |
| BPL | 57 (33.1) | 115 (66.9) | 172 (100.0) | | |
| Not BPL | 34 (21.3) | 126 (78.8) | 160 (100.0) | 5.9 (1) | 0.019 |
| Educational Status | | | | | |
| ≤ Class V | 47 (37.0) | 80 (63.0) | 127 (100.0) | | |
| Class VI- X | 28 (23.3) | 92 (76.7) | 120 (100.0) | 10.1 (2) | 0.007 |
| >Class X | 16 (18.8) | 69 (81.2) | 85 (100.0) | | |
| Residence | | | | | |
| Rural | 80(30.5) | 182(69.5) | 262(100.0) | | |
| Urban | 11 (15.7) | 59 (84.3) | 70 (100.0) | 6.1(1) | 0.015 |
| Gestational Age | | | | | |
| < 37 weeks | 83 (76.9) | 25 (23.1) | 108 (100.0) | | |
| ≥ 37 weeks | 8 (3.6) | 216 (96.4) | 224 (100.0) | 196.7 (1) | 0.000 |
| Gravida | | | | | |
| Primi-gravida | 50 (28.4) | 126 (71.6) | 176 (100.0) | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|----------|-------|
| Multi-gravida(2-4) | 30 (20.8) | 114 (79.2) | 144 (100.0) | 28.1 (2) | 0.000 |
| Grand-gravida(≥5) | 11 (91.7) | 1(8.3) | 12 (100.0) | | |
| Parity | | | | | |
| P ₀ | 47 (26.3) | 132 (73.7) | 179 (100.0) | | |
| P ₁ -P ₂ | 33 (23.9) | 105 (76.1) | 138 (100.0) | | |
| P ₃ -P ₄ | 11 (73.3) | 4 (26.7) | 15 (100.0) | 16.9(2) | 0.000 |
| ANC Registration | | | | | |
| Registered | 72 (24.2) | 226 (75.8) | 298 (100.0) | | |
| Un-Registered | 19 (55.9) | 15 (44.1) | 34 (100.0) | 15.4(1) | 0.000 |
| IFA Consumption (n=298)* | | | | | |
| Consumed | 37 (17.2) | 178 (82.8) | 215 (100.0) | | |
| Not Consumed | 35 (42.2) | 48 (57.8) | 83 (100.0) | 20.4(1) | 0.000 |
| Number of ANC(n=332) | | | | | |
| <4 | 52 (43.7) | 67 (56.3) | 119 (100.0) | | |
| ≥4 | 23 (12.8) | 156 (87.2) | 179 (100.0) | 41.5(2) | 0.000 |
| No ANC | 16 (47.1) | 18 (52.9) | 34 (100.0) | | |
| Anaemia | | | | | |
| Yes | 85 (64.4) | 47 (35.6) | 132 (100.0) | | |
| No | 6 (3.0) | 194 (97.0) | 200 (100.0) | 150.6(1) | 0.000 |
| Severe Maternal Complications | | | | | |
| Yes | 37 (34.9) | 69 (65.1) | 106 (100.0) | | |
| No | 54 (23.9) | 172 (76.1) | 226 (100.0) | 4.4(1) | 0.047 |
| Mode of Delivery | | | | | |
| NVD | 59 (26.8) | 161 (73.2) | 220 (100.0) | | |
| LUCS | 32 (28.6) | 80 (71.4) | 112 (100.0) | 0.115(1) | 0.795 |

*n=298 because only 298 study subjects were registered for ANC

Table no 3: Independent t-test showing Mean birth weight among newborns (n=332)

| Birth Weight (gms) | n=332 | Mean±SD | MeanDifference | t test | p-value |
|--------------------|-------|---------------|----------------|--------|---------|
| < 2500 | 91 | 2172.9±304.7 | -694.9 | 16.9 | 0.000 |
| ≥2500 | 241 | 2867.76±342.4 | | | |

IV. Discussion

In this study, the prevalence of LBW was found to be 27.5%. Mean birth weight came out to be 2677.29±454.59 grams. Studies from other parts of West Bengal reported prevalence of LBW to be between 28%-30%⁵⁻⁶. In a study done by Dasgupta A & Basu R, the prevalence of LBW in Sigur block of West Bengal was found to be 28.8%¹¹. However, many other National studies conducted in other regions of India (South-11.8%, North India-23.8%) and International studies (Nepal-11.9%, Iran-5.2%, Vietnam-7.9-12.5%, and Northern Ethiopia-10%) reported lower prevalence of LBW than this study¹²⁻¹⁷. As per DLHS-4 (2012-13)¹⁸, prevalence of LBW in West Bengal is 12.4% which is much lower than our study. One possible reason for this may be selective referral of high risk cases to the secondary referral unit. 45.9% of teenage mother and about 3/4th of the elderly mother delivered LBW. This high prevalence of LBW among teenage might be due to lack of awareness, poor nutritional status during adolescents and among elderly may be due to having inadequate spacing between successive pregnancies. Many other studies have reported similar association of teenage & elderly age mothers with the high prevalence of LBW^{5,13,19-21}. Like many other studies, BPL and less educated women had significantly higher proportion of LBW^{6,20-23}. Low birth weight was significantly higher among rural study population. It might be due to lack of accessibility to the health care facility for regular ANC and/or habit of strenuous work habit among rural women. Similar findings were reported by other researchers from across India & outside India²⁴⁻²⁷. Prematurity was significantly associated with low birth weight, which can be justified by the fact that maximum foetal weight gain occurs in the last trimester of pregnancy. Carmen R et al²⁸ & Jadhao et al²⁹ reported similar association of prematurity with LBW. Increasing Parity and Gravida was significantly associated with LBW, which may be due to the inadequate spacing. Many other researchers found similar results^{5, 13,16,21-23}. Similar to many other studies, ANC registration and ≥ 4 ANC and IFA consumption was found to be significantly protective against LBW^{6,12,13,16,21-23}. Maternal anaemia & severe maternal complications significantly and adversely influenced the birth weight. Association of LBW with maternal anaemia and severe maternal complications is also reported by many studies^{22-23,30-32}. Mean difference in birth weight among normal & low birth weight newborns was found to be 695 grams and the difference was statistically significant (table-3). While study done by Biswas et al⁶ reported no significant birth weight difference among normal & low birth weight babies, Ehsanpour S et al³³ reported a difference of 775.45 grams. Results of the study cannot be generalized as the study has been conducted in a referral unit which is bound to get more complicated cases.

V. Conclusion

This study concludes that maternal age <20 years and ≥ 30 years, BPL status, poor maternal education, rural residence, prematurity, too many pregnancy, maternal anemia and severe maternal complications are significantly favoring the occurrence of low birth weight while ANC registration, ≥ 4 ANC visits and IFA consumption are significantly protective against low birth weight. As we can see most of the factors responsible for LBW are modifiable, a robust primary health care coupled with socio-economic development may decrease the burden of LBW.

References

- [1] World Health Organization, International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems, tenth revision, World Health Organization, Geneva, 1992.
- [2] Kramer M.S., 'Determinants of Low Birth Weight: Methodological assessment and meta-analysis', Bulletin of the World Health Organization, vol. 65, no. 5, 1987, pp. 663-737.
- [3] H.Watanabe, "The effect of prepregnancy body mass index and gestational weight gain on birth," INTECH Open Access Publisher, Vol.38,no.3,pp.120-129,2008.
- [4] United Nations Children's Fund. A
- [5] Strategic approach to Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent health (RMNCH+A) in India: UNICEF 2013. Available at: <http://www.unicef.org/india>.
- [6] Manna N, Sarkar J, Baur B, Basu G, Banyopadhyay L, "Socio-Biological determinants of low birth weight: A community based study from rural field practice area of Medical College, Kolkata, West Bengal (India). IOSR-JDMS, Vol.4, Issue-4, Jan-feb 2003, pp. 33-39.
- [7] Biswas R, Dasgupta A, Sinha R N, Chaudhuri R N, "An epidemiological study of low birth weight newborns in the district of Purulia, West Bengal." Indian Journal of Public Health, Vol-52, no-2, April-June 2008, pp.65-71. Available at : <http://www.ijph.in> on Thursday, January 25, 2018, IP: 47.11.127.251
- [8] Cloherty J P, Eichenwald E C, Hansen A R, Stark A R, "Manual of Neonatal Care-7th Edition. 2012, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, a Wolters Kluwer business, Philadelphia, PA 19103 USA.
- [9] World Health Organisation. Evaluating the Quality of care for Severe Pregnancy Complications: The WHO Near-Miss Approach for Maternal Health. Geneva Switzerland: World Health Organisation; 2011.
- [10] Ota E, Ganchimeg T, Morisaki N, Vogel JP, Pileggi C, Ortiz-Panozo E et al. Risk factors and adverse perinatal outcomes among term and preterm infants born small-for-gestational-age: secondary analyses of the WHO Multi-Country Survey on Maternal and Newborn Health. PLoS One. 2014;9(8):e105155. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0105155.
- [11] Kliegman R, Nelson textbook of Paediatrics-20th Edition. 2016, Elsevier Health Science,
- [12] Dasgupta A, Basu R, Determinants of low birth weight in a Block of Hooghly, West Bengal: A multivariate analysis. Int J Biol Med Res. 2011; 2(4): 838 – 842.
- [13] Kavitha Balaji, Sathish Sankar, Balaji Nandgopal. Low Birth Weight of Newborns: Magnitude of the Problem Seen in a 100 Bed Hospital of a Rural Area in Vellore District, Tamil Nadu (India). Indian J Com Med April 2010,35(2):362-64.
- [14] K. S. Negi, S. D. Kandpal, M. Kukreti. Epidemiological factors affecting Low Birth Weight. J K Science Jan-Mar 2006;8(1):31-4.
- [15] S. Kayastha, H. Tuladhar. A Study of LBW babies in Nepal Medical College. Nepal Med College J Dec 2007; 10(2):266-9.
- [16] Mariam Vah daninia, Sedigheh S Tavafian, Ali Montazeri. Correlates of low birth weight in term pregnancies: a retrospective study from Iran. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth 2008,8:12.
- [17] Dinh PH, ToTH, Yuong TH, Hojer B, Persson LA. Maternal factors influencing the occurrence of low birth weight in northern Vietnam. Ann Trop Paediatr 1996 Dec;16(4):327-33.
- [18] Gabregzabihherher Y et al, The prevalence and risk factors for low birth weight among term newborns in Adwa General Hospital, Northern Ethiopia. Obstetric and gynecology International. 2017;1:1-7. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/2149156>
- [19] International Institute for Population Science (IIPS) and Macro International. District Level Household and Facility Survey 4: Fact Sheet, West Bengal. IIPS, Mumbai: 2012-13. Available at: <http://www.rchiips.org/pdf/dlfs4/report> Accessed on 20 January 2018.
- [20] Sareer BadShah, Linda Mason, Kenneth Mekelvie, Roger Payne, Paulo JG Lisbia. BMC Public Health 2008,8:197.
- [21] Hirve SS, Ganatra BR. Determinants of low birth weight: a community based prospective cohort study. Indian Pediatr Oct 1994,31(10):1221-5.
- [22] Kiran Anand, B. S. Garg. A Study of factors affecting LBW. Indian J Com Med 2000;25(2):57-62.
- [23] Mavalankar DV, Gray RH, Trivedi CR. Risk factors for preterm and term low birth weight in Ahmedabad, India. Int J Epidemiol April 1992;21(2):263-72.
- [24] Deshpande Jayant D, Phalke DB, Bangal V B, D Peeyuusha, Bhatt Sushen. Maternal risk factors for LBW Neonates: A Hospital based case control study in Rural Area of Western Maharashtra, India. National Journal of Com Med Oct-Dec 2011;2(3):394-98.
- [25] Nagargoje M M et al A case control study for risk factors of low birth weight in Nagpur city of Maharashtra Indian Journal of Community Health July 2010-June 2011; 22(2): 4-7.
- [26] Agarwal G et al Maternal Risk Factors Associated with Low Birth Weight Neonates in a Tertiary Care Hospital, Northern India J Community Med Health Educ. Vol.2:177.
- [27] Jain A.K., Determinants of Regional variation in Infants in Rural India Population Studies: 1985; 39: 407-24.
- [28] Jolanta D et al "Maternal socio-economic factors and the risk of low birth weight in Lithuania" Medicina. 2004; 40(5): 475-82.
- [29] Carmen R et al. Low birth weight in Spain associated with socio-demographic factors Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 1995; 49:38-42.
- [30] Jadhao A R, Parekar L M, Ughade S N. Socio-demographic determinants of Low Birth Weight in newborn: A case control Study. International Journal of Biomedical and Advance Research 2016; 7(12): 587-591.
- [31] Idris MZ, Gupta A, Mohan U, Kumar A, Srivastava, Das V. Maternal health and low birth weight among institutional deliveries. Indian J Comm Med. 2000;25(4):156-60.
- [32] Kamaldoss T, Abel R, Sampatkumar V. Epidemiological co-relates of low birth weight in rural Tamil Nadu. Indian J Paediatr. 1992;59:299-304.
- [33] Deswal BS, Singh JV, Kumar D. A study of risk factors for low birth weight. Indian J Comm Med. 1999;24(3):127-31.
- [34] Ehsanpour S, Hemmati E, Abdeyazdan Z. Comparison of neonatal growth in normal, low and very low birth weights until 18 months. Iran J Nurs Midwifery Res. 2012 Feb; 17(2 Suppl1): S131-S136.