

Motor and cognitive outcomes of low birth weight neonates born in a limited resource country: a systematic review

Authors' names and affiliations:

Graciane Radaelli^{a*1}, Eduardo Leal-Conceição^{a2}, Felipe K. Neto^{a3}, Melissa R. G. Taurisano^{a4}, Fernanda Majolo^{a5}, Fernanda T. K. Bruzzo^{a6}, Booi Linda^{c7}, Magda L. Nunes^{a,b8}

^a Brain Institute of Rio Grande do Sul (BraIns), Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil;

^b Professor of Neurology, School of Medicine, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil;

^c Concordia University (Montreal - Canadá)

***Corresponding Author:** Dra. Magda L. Nunes, Brain Institute Av. Ipiranga 6690, building 63 #103, 90610-000, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazi. *E-mail addresses:* nunes@pucrs.br.

1. ORCID id: 0000-0002-1208-362X; CV: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2829820424825932>; E-mail: graciane.radaelli@pucrs.br
2. ORCID id: 0000-0001-9789-698X; CV: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9279978831152698>; E-mail: co.eduardoleal@gmail.com
3. ORCID id: 0000-0002-7409-763X; CV: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/8874509308176842>; E-mail: felipekalil@yahoo.com.br
4. ORCID id: 0000-0002-6744-1500; CV: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2024133504597692>; E-mail: melissa.taurisano@acad.pucrs.br
5. ORCID id: 0000-0002-7955-078X; CV: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3363064142425982>; E-mail: fernanda.majolo@acad.pucrs.br
6. ORCID id: 0000-003-2903-3618; CV: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/0580402686566985>; E-mail: fernanda.bruzzo@acad.pucrs.br
7. ORCID id: 0000-0002-0863-8098; E-mail: linda.booi@concordia.ca
8. ORCID id: 0000-0002-3402-6810; CV: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/0580402686566985>; E-mail: nunes@pucrs.br

Funding

This research did not receive any other specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Abstract

Objective: To examine the outcomes of motor and cognitive development among neonates born with low birth weight (LBW) or very low birth weight (VLBW).

Data sources: Systematic review carried out in PubMed, Cochrane Library and Web of Science using the search strategy using combinations of the following keywords and terms: preterm birth OR prematurity OR premature Infants OR premature children AND low birth weight children OR very low birth weight children AND neurodevelopment OR cognitive development OR Motor development OR follow up AND humans. Articles searched were published from inception until July, 2019, and involved children born and evaluated in Brazil. The bias risk analysis was adapted from the STROBE scale, used to evaluate the methodology of the included studies.

Data synthesis: The search identified 2,214 publications. After screening for titles and abstracts and removing duplicate entries, full texts of 38 articles were reviewed. After reading full texts, 24 articles met the inclusion criteria (articles in Portuguese and English), dated from 1998 to 2017). Endnote Version X9 software was used for data extraction. Two reviewers performed the literature search and study selection independently. Disagreements were solved by consensus or by a third reviewer.

Results: it was evidenced an inferior motor development of children with LBW when compared to the control population, the standardized mean difference of [-1.15 (95% CI -1.56, -0.73), I^2 80%], children with LBW have lower cognitive development according the standardized mean difference of [-0,71 (95% CI -0.99, -0.44) I^2 67%].

Conclusion: Our review reinforces that impaired motor and cognitive outcome is a significant long-term outcome associated with LBW. The risk of impairment in those domains increases with decreasing gestational age.

Keywords: Motor development; outcome; prematurity; preterm infants; systematic review.

Introduction

Strong evidence shows that children born prematurely or small for gestational age have a greater predisposition to deficits and / or delayed neuropsychomotor development¹ and deficit rates are inversely related to gestational age and birth weight.²

Prematurity is a growing health problem worldwide, especially in developing countries where access to obstetric service and neonatal support is not guaranteed to the entire population.³ Worldwide 965.000 deaths occur in the neonatal period and 125.000 deaths between 1-5 years of age due to prematurity, representing the leading cause of neonatal and infant death.⁴ The worldwide incidence of deliveries before 37 weeks of gestation is 11.1% with large geographical differences, ranging from 5% in developed countries to 18% in countries with less economic power.⁵ In South America, the mortality of children born with very low birth weight reaches 26%,⁵ demonstrating their socioeconomic lability.

Intrauterine growth restriction (IUGR) is an abnormal fetal growth standard that happens in approximately ten percent of gestations and is related with neonatal morbidity and mortality⁶ IUGR is a condition in which the fetus does not reach the expected weight during pregnancy, is defined as a rate of fetal growth that is less than normal for the expected growth potential of a particular infant, because of genetic or environmental factors,⁷ it is a pathologic inhibition of intrauterine fetal growth and the failure of the fetus to achieve its growth potential⁸. In IUGR pregnancies, the fetus attempts to prevent damage by slowing its growth and shortening its gestation, causing prematurity.⁶

The terms IUGR and small for gestational age (SGA) have been used as equals in the literature, although there is a difference. IUGR reflects fetal suffering, though SGA only provides a measure of size and not a measure of antenatal growth quality.⁶ SGA is a term used to describe neonates whose birth weight is below than the usual amount for the number of weeks of pregnancy, they usually are below the 10th percentile for babies of the same gestational age, or 2 deviations below.⁷

Subjects born with IUGR experience several poorer developmental outcomes, involving cognitive, socioemotional and behavioral domains, compared with children born appropriate for gestational age.⁶ IUGR is one of the main causes of perinatal and neonatal morbidity and mortality and contributes to long-term chronic diseases.⁷⁻⁹ Neurodevelopmental impairment, immediate perinatal adverse events (prematurity, cerebral palsy, intrauterine fetal death, neonatal death) and also to adult pathologic conditions are leading consequences of the IUGR.^{8,10} These neonates have different types of short-term

and long-term problems making them vulnerable, both need immediately and long-term follow-up, especially for delayed onset of neurological disorder so that a quick intervention can be initiated on neurological and physical aspect and proceed to better disclosure.⁹

The exposure to undernourishment early in life appears to have detrimental effects on the developing brain.¹¹⁻¹³ Experimental studies conducted on animal models of early malnutrition and epilepsy, showed that malnutrition per se has effects not only on hippocampal morphology such as decreased neuronal density in CA1 and CA3 subfields and decreased NDMA expression during adulthood^{11,12} but also leads to progressive learning and memory disability.¹ However, the enriched environment led to a significant benefit in learning and retention of visual-spatial memory being able to reverse the cognitive impairment.¹³

The average intelligence quotient (IQ) of a child with low birth weight (LBW) is lower than a child with adequate birth weight.¹⁴ In addition to the reduced IQ, there are also greater learning difficulties and a greater need for special education in small for gestational age (SGAs) and preterm infants than in the general population.¹⁵ Cognitive deficits, school difficulties, and behavioral problems are often reported by children born with LBW or extreme preterm infants.¹ While deficits have been reported across many cognitive domains, attention deficit is an area of concern for parents and teachers of premature children.¹⁶ Research shows that children born prematurely are much more at risk for neurobehavioral deficits even though there are individual variations and varying profiles and severity of deficits.¹

The data concerning the medium or long-term outcomes of preterm newborns in South American countries remain deficient, and specific follow-up programs are challenging to provide in public institutions. After discharge from a neonatal intensive care unit (NICU), most of these infants are followed at primary care facilities, leaving most of them without specific attention.¹⁷

Given the great impact of low birth weight and/or prematurity on aspects of children neurodevelopment, it is extremely necessary to carry out studies that investigate these phenomena in greater depth in more heterogeneous populations like the ones from limited resources countries. The aim of this study was to examine the cognitive and motor outcomes of children with LBW or very low birth weight (VLBW), from studies conducted with the Brazilian population. Our hypothesis is that being raised in a limited resource country might have additional negative effects in the outcomes studied.

Methods

This systematic review followed the criteria of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Checklist (PRISMA).¹⁸ The protocol of this systematic review was registered in international prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO) under number CRD42019112403.

Eligibility criteria

The criteria used for study inclusion were: original articles that established an association between gestational weight (GA), birth weight (BW), and neurodevelopment in Brazilian children; studies published from inception until July 2019, in Portuguese and English, and that used the cohort, case-control, longitudinal, cross-sectional, descriptive analytical, and retrospective methods. The dependent variables used in this review were the variables obtained as the result of tests (receptive language and/or expressive language). The independent variables were GA, BW, gender, age at time of evaluation, family income, and maternal level of education. For the purposes of the present study, prematurity was considered at three levels: borderline preterm (GA 35-36 weeks), moderately preterm (GA 31-34 weeks), and extremely preterm (GA \leq 30 weeks). Newborns with low BW were classified as LBW (< 2,500 g), VLBW (< 1,500 g), and ELBW (< 1,000 g).

Research strategies

A systematic review was carried out in the PubMed, LILACS and SciELO databases, using combinations of the following keywords and terms: preterm birth OR prematurity OR premature Infants OR premature children AND low birth weight children OR very low birth weight children AND neurodevelopment OR cognitive development OR Motor development OR follow up AND humans.

Data Synthesis

Endnote Version X9 software was used for data extraction. The databases were searched and duplicate entries were removed. Abstracts that did not provide sufficient information regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria were selected for full-text evaluation. In the second phase, the same reviewers independently evaluated the full text of these articles and made their selection in accordance with the eligibility criteria. Two reviewers (M.R.T. and

F.T.B.) performed the literature search and study selection independently. Disagreements were solved by consensus or by a third reviewer.

Risk of bias in individual studies

Two authors (M.R.T. and F.T.B.) were in charge of reviewing the methodological quality and the risks of bias according to the scale adapted from STROBE Statement¹⁹, considering only the studies that fit the inclusion criteria. A third author (G.R.) evaluated and defined any disagreements. The STROBE Statement scale aims to evaluate studies not related to randomized clinical trials; it comprises 22 applicable questions/items to assess the quality and biases of articles. These criteria assess the quality of data, internal validity (biases and confounding factors), external validity, and the ability of the study to detect a significant effect. To assess the risk of bias using the STROBE criteria, the articles of this systematic review were grouped into three different categories, each with a specific score: (a) first category: articles involving prevalence-type cross-sectional studies, with a maximum score of 12; (b) second category: articles with a cross-sectional and cohort methodological design, with a maximum score of 22; (c) third category: articles involving case-control studies, with intervention and maximum score of 22. To guarantee the proportion of results between the categories, the score obtained from each article was divided by the maximum possible score for each of the three established categories.

Statistical analysis

We performed random effects calculation of weighted estimated average Odds Ratios (OR). Heterogeneity and publication bias were assessed with the I^2 metric and funnel plots/Egger's test, respectively. For continuous outcomes, if the unit of measurement was consistent throughout trials, results were presented as weighted mean difference with 95% of confidence intervals (CIs). Calculations were performed using random effects method and the statistical method used was inverse variance. Statistical significance defined for the analyzes as $p < 0.05$. Statistical heterogeneity of the treatment effects among studies was assessed using Cochran's Q test and the inconsistency I^2 test. Statistical heterogeneity of the treatment effects among studies will be assessed using the Cochran's Q test and the inconsistency I-squared test, in which values above 25% and 50% are considered to be indicative of moderate and high heterogeneity, respectively.²⁰

Results

Study selection

The initial database search resulted in 2409 articles. After removing the duplicate files, 2279 articles were filtered according to our inclusion criteria, from that 2217 were excluded by analyzing the titles and abstracts, resulting in 62 articles for evaluation of the full text. From the articles remained, 25 articles were selected and included in this review.²¹⁻⁴⁴ The flowchart is shown in Fig. 1.

Study characteristics

Included studies were published between the years 1998-2017. The average sample size in the aforementioned studies was 95.64 (SD=48.95), ranging from 32-262 participants. Approximately 52,8% (SD=7,8%) of the included samples were females. The mean birth weight of the premature participants was 1.477 kg, with standard deviation \pm 0.424 and range 1.058-2.346 kg. The mean gestational age in the premature children was 32 ± 4.2 weeks (range: 23-33.2 weeks). Motor and cognitive assessments were performed at 29.2 ± 24.5 (0-96) months of birth. The details of the individuals studies are shown in Table 1.

Overview of functional relations with cognitive development in preterm

Of the included studies, 12 (48%) were cohort studies, (12) 48% cross sectional studies and 1 (4%) was a case-control study. Among cohort studies, 6 studies (50%) had a control group and 6 studies (50%) did not have a control group. In the cross-sectional studies, only 4 studies (33.3%) used a control group and 8 studies (66.7%) did not. The only case-control study that was included used a control group (100%). Most studies (19/76%) evaluated cognitive and motor outcomes, 4 studies (16%) only verified motor outcomes and 2 studies (8%) only cognitive outcomes.

The most commonly used instruments used were: Bayley Scales of Infant Development, present in 13 (54.1%) studies; Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment and Denver Developmental Screening Test, both present in four studies (16.6%). An overview of functional relations with cognitive development in preterm/ low birth weight /very low birth weight children about the studies were demonstrated in Table 2.

Risk of bias assessment about studies shows

The assessment of the methodological quality and risk of bias is shown in Table 3. Of the 25 articles evaluated, a mean score of 93.16 (± 3.9) was obtained, with a maximum score

of 100.0% and a minimum score of 86%. Thirteen articles showed values below the mean score and, therefore, were considered as lower methodological quality.

Assessment of the Motor development in children

Regarding the evaluation of motor development, we included five studies that had a control group to compare the scores in relation to the sample of premature / low weight individuals. The studies were grouped according to the tests used and an average of the standardized difference was calculated is shown in Fig. 2. The randomized effect model indicated the standardized mean difference of [-1.15 (95% CI -1.56, -0.73), I^2 80%]. Thus, it is evidenced an inferior motor development of children with LBW when compared to the control population. The results of motor development described by cross-sectional studies without a control group, were only described according to Table 2, as it was not possible to calculate the scores due to the high heterogeneity between the studies.

Assessment of the cognitive development in children

To compare the results on cognitive development between the sample and the control population, five studies were included, according to the randomized effect model indicated the standardized mean difference of [-0,71 (95% CI -0.99, -0.44) I^2 67%], is shown in Fig. 3. Thusly, the studies indicated that children with LBW have lower cognitive development than term children. The results of cognitive development described by cross-sectional studies without a control group, were only described according to Table 2, as it was not possible to calculate the scores due to the high heterogeneity between the studies.

Discussion

Our review reinforces that impaired motor and cognitive outcome is a significant long-term complication associated with low birth weight or malnutrition. The risk of impairment increases the lower the weight.

Sacchi et al.⁶ examined cognitive outcomes of preterm and term-born children who had intrauterine growth restriction (IUGR) and were small for gestational age (SGA) compared with children who were appropriate for gestational age (AGA) during the first 12 years of life. Their main findings were that growth vulnerabilities assessed antenatally (IUGR) and at the time of birth (SGA) were significantly associated with lower childhood cognitive outcomes in preterm and term-born children compared with children with

AGA. These findings demonstrate the need for early interventions in these high risk groups as well as it reiterates the results of our study.

In a similar study, Kesavan et al.⁷ reinforces that IUGR infants suffer significant morbidity with immediate and long-term health consequences. These infants are at high risk throughout their life and should be carefully monitored at different stages to ensure timely interventions toward prevention and management of various disorders affecting most organ systems. Enhancing these data, Eickman et al.²³ showed that LBW infants had poorer motor and cognitive development than ABW term infants, concluding that birth weight is considered a risk factor for outcome. These results enhance our analysis, where motor and cognitive delays were found in children with LBW.

In the same path, Courchia et al.⁴⁶ reported cognitive outcomes of 632 preterm infants evaluated in a single center between 1980 and 2015. Significant cognitive impairment for all infants decreased by 9.4% ($p = 0.015$) across the study period. For larger infants (birthweight ≥ 750 g), significant impairment decreased by 14.6% ($p = 0.002$). In smaller infants (birthweight < 750 g) no significant changes were observed in cognitive outcomes over the study period. This cohort showed significant improvement in long term outcomes of infants since 1980.

Reinforcing the previously cited findings, Albu et al.⁸ and Sharma et al.⁹, associated IUGR with increased fetal and neonatal mortality and morbidity, being linked to immediate perinatal adverse events (prematurity, cerebral palsy, intrauterine fetal death, neonatal death). A selected study in our meta-analysis, Fuentesfria et al.²⁸ evidenced that VLBW preterm infants at 8 and 18 months corrected age showed significant differences in the neurodevelopment and growth pattern when compared with their full-term peers.

By exploring differences in neonatal body composition in a multi-ethnic population, and with the hypothesis that neonates from low and middle income countries (LAMIC) tend to have lower birth weight, Sletner et al.⁴⁷ found out that anthropometric measurements, such as abdominal circumference and ponderal index, were smaller in neonates from LAMIC origin when compared to western european neonates.

In a recent analysis of a Brazilian cohort.⁴³ a comparison between 83 infants with birth weight $\leq 1,500$ g, and 52 control infants was made. VLBW infants at 8 and 18 months corrected age showed significant differences in the neurodevelopment and growth pattern when compared with their full-term peers.

In 2013, a cross-sectional study included children aged 6-7 from a historical birth cohort with low birth weight ($< 2,500$ g) infants evaluated cognitive and behavioral

development of preterm and low birth weight newborns living in a disadvantageous socioeconomic environment at school age.⁴¹ The total intelligence quotient varied from 70 to 140. The borderline intelligence quotient was observed in 9.3% of the children and the Child Behavior Checklist indicated a predominance of social competence problems (27.8%, CI 19.2 to 37.9) compared with behavioral problems (15.5%, CI 8.9 to 24.2). Thus, their conclusion suggests that these infants are at risk for developing disturbances in early school age, such as mild cognitive deficits and behavioral disorders. This risk might increase under unfavorable socioeconomic conditions.

However, as limitations of our study, it is extremely important to point out that the majority of Brazilian follow-up studies are old and seem to demonstrate a lack of homogeneity. Although 24 Brazilian studies were selected, only five demonstrated homogeneity to perform meta-analysis. Yet, data when compared with the most recent world literature, mostly reiterate the relationship of prematurity with delayed neurological outcome, regardless of the scales used for analysis.^{48,49}

With this review it was shown that impaired neurodevelopmental outcome is a significant long-term complication associated with low birth weight and malnutrition. Also, IUGR and SGA increases the risk of neurodevelopmental impairment. Thus, low birth weight represents risks to cognitive and motor development of children born, especially in the early years of life. From the perspective of public health, it is essential that pediatricians are aware of the neuropsychomotor development of these children for proper treatment and follow-up.

Ethical Publication Statement

We confirm that we have read the Journal position on issues involved in ethical publication and affirm that this report is consistent with those guidelines.

Figure and tables captions:

Fig. 1. Summary of evidence search and study selection.

Fig. 2. Forest plots showing motor development in children.

Fig. 3. Forest plots showing cognitive development in children.

Table 1. Characteristics of the studies included in this systematic review.

Table 2. Overview of functional relations with cognitive development in preterm/ low birth weight /very low birth weight children.

Table 3. Risk of bias assessment adapted from STROBE.¹⁹

References

1. Araujo, LB, Quadros, DA, Murata, MPF, & Israel, VL. Neuropsychomotor development assessment of children aged 0 to 5 in early childhood public education centers. *Revista CEFAC*, 2019. 21(3), e12918. .
2. Saigal S, Doyle L. An overview of mortality and sequelae of preterm birth from infancy to adulthood. *The Lancet*. 2008; 371: 261–69.
3. Medina-Alva P, Duque KR, Zea-Vera A, Bellomo S, Cárcamo C, Guillen-Pinto D, et al. Combined predictors of neurodevelopment in very low birth weight preterm infants. *Early Human Development*. 2019; 130, 109–15.
4. Harrison MS, Goldenberg RL. Global burden of prematurity, *Semin. Fetal Neonatal Med*. 2016; 21:74-79.
5. Fernández R, D'Apremont I, Domínguez A, Tapia JL, Red Neonatal Neocosur. Survival and morbidity of very low birth weight infant in a south American neonatal network. *Arch. Argent. Pediatr*. 2014; 112: 405–12.
6. Sacchi C, Marino C, Nosarti C, Vieno A, Visentin S, Simonelli A. Association of Intrauterine Growth Restriction and Small for Gestational Age Status With Childhood Cognitive Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 26]. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2020;174(8):1-10.
7. Kesavan K, Devaskar SU. Intrauterine Growth Restriction: Postnatal Monitoring and Outcomes. *Pediatr Clin North Am*. 2019 Apr;66(2):403-423.
8. Albu AR, Anca AF, Horhoianu VV, Horhoianu IA. Predictive factors for intrauterine growth restriction. *J Med Life*. 2014 Jun 15;7(2):165-71.
9. Sharma D, Farahbakhsh N, Shastri S, Sharma P. Intrauterine growth restriction - part 2. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. 2016 Dec;29(24):4037-48.
10. Salam RA, Das JK, Bhutta ZA. Impact of intrauterine growth restriction on long-term health. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care*. 2014 May;17(3):249-54.


11. Alvarez PS, Simão F, Hemb M, Xavier LL, Nunes ML. Effects of undernourishment, recurrent seizures and enriched environment during early life in hippocampal morphology. *Int J Dev Neurosci.* 2014 Apr;33:81-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ijdevneu.2013.12.004.
12. Wearick-Silva LE, Sebben AD, Costa-Ferro ZSM, Marinowic DR, Nunes ML. Undernourishment and recurrent seizures early in life impair Long-Term Potentiation and alter NMDAR and AMPAR expression in rat hippocampus. *Int J Dev Neurosci.* 2019 Jun;75:13-18. doi: 10.1016/j.ijdevneu.2019.03.005.
13. Simão F, Porto JA, Nunes ML. Effects of enriched environment in spatial learning and memory of immature rats submitted to early undernourish and seizures. *Int J Dev Neurosci.* 2012 Aug;30(5):363-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ijdevneu.2012.04.002.
14. Breslau N, Chilcoat H, DelDotto J, Andreski P, Brown G. Low birth weight and neurocognitive status at six years of age. *Biological Psychiatry.* 1996; 40: 389–97.
15. Hille ETM, Ouden AL, Bauer, L, Oudenrijn, C van den Brand R, Verloove-Vanhorick SP. School performance at nine years of age in very premature and very low birth weight infants: Perinatal risk factors and predictors at five years of age. *The Journal of Pediatrics.* 1994; 125: 426–34.
16. Anderson PJ, De Luca CR, Hutchinson E, Spencer-Smith MM, Roberts G, Doyle LW, Victorian Infant Collaborative Study Group. Attention problems in a representative sample of extremely preterm/extremely low birth weight children. *Dev Neuropsychol.* 2011; 36:57–73.
17. Fan RG, Portuguese MW, Nunes ML. Cognition, behavior and social competence of preterm low birth weight children at school age. *Clinics (Sao Paulo).* 2013;68(7):915-21.
18. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group PRISMA. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Int J Surg.* 2010; 8:336-41.
19. STROBE. Information on the STROBE Statement. Available from: www.strobe-statement.org [cited March, 2020].
20. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in metaanalyses. *BMJ.* 2003;327(7414):557-60.
21. Bühler KEB, Limongi SCO, Diniz EMDA. Language and cognition in very low birth weight preterm infants with PELCDO application. *Arquivos de Neuro-psiquiatria.* 2009; 67: 242-49.

22. Carvalho AEV, Martinez FE, Linhares MBM. Maternal anxiety and depression and development of prematurely born infants in the first year of life. *The Spanish journal of psychology*. 2008; 11: 600-08.
23. Eickmann SH, Lira PICD, Lima MDC. Mental and motor development at 24 months of full-term low birthweight infants. *Arquivos de Neuro-Psiquiatria*. 2002; 60: 748-54.
24. Emond AM, Lira PI, Lima MC, Grantham-Mcgregor SM, Ashworth A. Development and behaviour of low birthweight term infants at 8 years in northeast Brazil: a longitudinal study. *Acta Paediatrica*. 2006; 95:1249-57.
25. Espírito Santo JD, Portuguese MW, Nunes ML. Status cognitivo-comportamental de prematuros de baixo peso ao nascimento em idade pré-escolar que vivem em país em desenvolvimento. *Jornal de Pediatria*. 2009; 85: 35-41.
26. Fan RG, Portuguese MW, Nunes ML. Cognition, behavior and social competence of preterm low birth weight children at school age. *Clinics*. 2013; 68: 915-21.
27. Fernandes LV, Goulart AL, Santos AMND, Barros MCDM, Guerra CC, Kopelman BI. Neurodevelopmental assessment of very low birth weight preterm infants at corrected age of 18-24 months by Bayley III scales. *Jornal de Pediatria*. 2012; 88: 471-78.
28. Fuentefria RN, Silveira, RC, Procianoy, RS. Neurodevelopment and Growth of a Cohort of Very Low Birth Weight Preterm Infants Compared to Full-Term Infants in Brazil. *American journal of perinatology*. 2018; 35: 152-62
29. Grantham-McGregor SM, Lira PI, Ashworth A, Morris SS, Assunção AM. The development of low birth weight term infants and the effects of the environment in northeast Brazil. *The Journal of Pediatrics*. 1998; 132: 661-66.
30. Guerra CC, de Moraes Barros MC, Goulart AL, Fernandes LV, Kopelman BI, dos Santos AM. Premature infants with birth weights of 1500–1999 g exhibit considerable delays in several developmental areas. *Acta Paediatrica*. 2014; 103: e1-e6.
31. Guimarães CL, Reinaux CM, Botelho AC, Lima G, Cabral Filho JE. Motor development evaluated by Test of Infant Motor Performance: comparison between preterm and full-term infants. *Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy*. 2011; 15: 357-63.
32. Lemos RA, Frônio JDS, Ribeiro LC, Demarchi RS, Silva JD, Neves LAT. Functional performance according to gestational age and birth weight of preschool children born premature or with low weight. *J Hum Growth Dev*. 2012; 22: 17-26.
33. Magalhães LC, Rezende FCAD, Magalhães CM, Albuquerque PDRD. Comparative analysis of motor coordination in term and pre-term birth children at seven years of age. *Revista Brasileira de Saúde Materno Infantil*. 2009; 9: 293-300.


34. Manacero S, Nunes ML. Evaluation of motor performance of preterm newborns during the first months of life using the Alberta Infant Motor Scale (AIMS). *Jornal de Pediatria*; 2008; 84: 53-59.
35. Meio MD, Lopes CS, Morsch DS. Prognostic factors for cognitive development of very low birth weight premature children. *Revista de Saúde Pública*. 2003; 37: 311-18.
36. Meio MD, Lopes, CS, Morsch DS, Monteiro AP, Rocha SB, Borges RA, Reis AB. Pre-school cognitive development of very low birth weight preterm children. *Jornal de Pediatria*. 2004; 80: 495-502.
37. Mello RR, Dutra MVP, Silva KS, Lopes JMA. The predictive value of neonatal neurological assessment and neonatal cranial ultrasonography with respect to the development of very low birth weight premature infants. *Revista de Saúde Pública*. 1998; 32: 420-29.
38. Mello RR, Meio MD, Morsch DS, Silva KS, Dutra MV, Monteiro AV, Lopes JM. Normal neonatal cerebral ultrasonography in preterm infants-Is it possible to calm down the parents? *Jornal de Pediatria*. 1999; 75: 45-9.
39. Mello RRD, Silva KSD, Rodrigues MCCD, Chalfun G, Ferreira RC, Delamônica JVR. Predictive factors for neuromotor abnormalities at the corrected age of 12 months in very low birth weight premature infants. *Arquivos de Neuro-psiquiatria*; 2009; 67: 235-41.
40. Oliveira GE, Magalhães LC, Salmela LF. Relationship between very low birth weight, environmental factors, and motor and cognitive development of children of 5 and 6 years old. *Brazilian Journal of Physical Therapy*; 2011; 15: 138-45.
41. Procianoy RS, Koch MS, Silveira RC. Neurodevelopmental outcome of appropriate and small for gestational age very low birth weight infants. *Journal of child neurology*; 2009; 24: 788-94.
42. Reis ABR, Mello RRD, Morsch DS, Meio MDBB, Silva KSD. Mental performance of very low birth weight preterm infants: assessment of stability in the first two years of life and factors associated with mental performance. *Rev Bras Epidemiol*. 2012;15:13-24.
43. Schirmer CR, Portuguese MW, Nunes ML. Clinical assessment of language development in children at age 3 years that were born preterm. *Arquivos de Neuro-psiquiatria*. 2006; 64: 926-31.

44. Silva CAD, Brusamarello S, Cardoso FGC, Adamczyk NF, Rosa Neto F. Development of low birth weight preterm infants during the first two years of life. *Revista Paulista de Pediatria*. 2011; 29: 328-35.
45. Saccani, R., Martins, A. G., & de Oliveira, P. (). Desenvolvimento motor no primeiro ano de vida de crianças prematuras conforme o peso de nascimento. *Scientia Medica*, 2017; 27(3), 1.
46. Courchia B, Berkovits MD, Bauer CR. Cognitive impairment among extremely low birthweight preterm infants from 1980 to present day. *J Perinatol*. 2019; 39:1098-104.
47. Sletner L, Nakstad B, Yajnik CS, Mørkrid K, Vangen S, Vårdal MH, Holme IM, Birkeland KI, Jennum AK. Ethnic differences in neonatal body composition in a multi-ethnic population and the impact of parental factors: a population-based cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2013 Aug 29;8(8):e73058.
48. Bayley N. *Bayley Scales of Infant Development*. 2nd ed. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corp; 1993.
49. *Alberta Infant Motor Scale (AIMS): A Clinical Refresher And Update On Evaluation Of Normative Data*. 2015.

Fig. 1. Summary of evidence search and study selection



Motor Development



Cognitive Development




Table 1 Characteristics of the studies included in this systematic review.

Author	Year	Birth weight	Gestational age in weeks	Age of assessment (months)	Proportion girls	N
Mello et al.	1998	1185	32.2	21	0.65	70
Grantham-McGregor et al.	1998	2338 x 3210	37 x 37	6 to 12	0.615	262
Mello et al.	1999	1176	32	12 to 30	-	83
Eickman et al.	2002	3255 x 2332	>/=37	24	0.58	152
Meio et al.	2003	1903	32.04	48 to 60	0.64	79
Méio et al.	2004	1220	32	0 to 36	0.62	129
Emond et al.	2006	2346 x3212	39 x 40	96	-	164
Schirmer et al.	2006	1622 x 1483	33.18 x 32.03	36	0.53	69
Carvalho et al.	2008	1058	30.44	12	0.5	36
Manacero et al.	2008	1417 x 2090	32.4 x 33.2	4 to 8	0.34	88
Espirito Santo et al.	2009	1788	32.3	48 to 60	0.5	80
Mello et al.	2009	1126	29.6	12	0.53	100
Bühler et al.	2009	3291 x 1073	39.1 x 29.4	24	0.43	32
Magalhães et al.	2009	3215 x 1171	39.97 x 30.23	84	0.65	70
Procianoy et al.	2009	1130 x 1250	31.7 x 29.3	24	0.49	131
Silva et al.	2011	1236	31	24	0.42	69
Oliveira et al.	2011	3273 x 1201	39 x 30	60 to 72	0.6	46
Guimarães et al.	2011	3158 x 1424	38-40 x 23-33	36	0.5	92
Reis et al.	2012	1122	29	24	0.53	109
Fernandes et al.	2012	1172	30	18 to 2	0.51	58
Lemos et al.	2012	1439	31	2 to 7	0.51	98
Fan et al.	2013	1890	33,6	6 to 7	0.5	97
Guerra et al.	2014	1727 x 1762	33.3 x 33.2	18 to 24	0.51	100
Fuentefria et al.	2017	1098 x 3348	29.1 x 39.1	8 to 18	0.48	135
Saccani et al.	2017	1886 X 2878	36 x 36	0 to 12	-	42

Table 2 Overview of functional relations with cognitive development in preterm/ low birth weight /very low birth weight children.

Study	Design	Age N Sex	BW(g), GA	Domains	Measures	Data analysis	Results
Bühler et al. ²¹	Cohort (incl control)	2 years N=32 n ₁ = 12 PT n ₂ =20 FT Sex unknown	≤1500 Mean BW: 1073 GA: 29.4 Vs ≥2500 BW:3291 GA: 39.1	Cognitive and expressive Language Motor	PELCDO	Analysis of variance, (Mann-Whitney test), Kruskal-Wallis test Spearman correlations tests	VLBW preterm infants displayed poorer cognitive development scores than term infants starting at 6 months of age. Expressive language among VLBW preterm infants was also delayed.
Carvalho et al. ²²	Cohort (no control)	N= 36 Mothers and their children	GA<37 BW<2500	Motor and cognitive Environment	Bayley-II Scale STAI and BDI	The data from the instruments was analyzed according to their respective standarts. STAI for identification of mothers with anxiety at an intermediary level. BDI>20 for depression. Data were analyzed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test. Was used the McNemar test for postpartum samples.	The majority of the infants exhibited normal development on Bayley-II at 12 months CCA; however, 25% of the infants displayed cognitive problems and 40% motor problems. The mothers' anxiety and depression symptoms decreased at the end of the first year of life of the pre-term infants and the children showed predominately normal development at this phase.
Eickman et al. ²³	Cross-sectional (incl control)	2 years N=152 64 boys 88 girls n ₁ = 76 LBW n ₂ = 76 ABW	1500-2499 BW: 2332±160 Vs. 3000-3499 BW: 2332±160	Motor and cognitive Environment	Bayley Scale HOME	Chi-squared, Analysis of variance (T-test), Multiple linear regression.	LBW term infants showed poorer motor development (95.1±19.2, p<.001) than ABW term infants (105.3±13.6) after controlling for SES factors. Mental development followed the same pattern (89.8±15.8 for LBW; 98.9±14.8, p<.001). BW was a risk factor for impaired motor and mental development (p=.010; p=.005). Socio-economic level and home stimulation were predictors of both motor and cognitive development (p<.01).
Emond et al. ²⁴	Cohort (incl control)	8 years N=164 n ₁ = 83 LBW-T n ₂ =81 ABW-T Sex unknown	1500-2499. BW: 2346±148 GA: 39±1.4; Vs. 3000-3499 BW: 3212±147 GA:40 ±1.3 All GA>37	IQ Memory Attention Motor and cognitive Coordination Behaviour School achievement Environment	WISC III WISC TEAch Bayley Scale M-ABC Strengths and Difficulties questionnaires Educational assessments HOME	Comparison of means, Chi-squared, Analysis of variance (T-test, Mann-Whitney test), Spearman correlations tests, Multiple linear regression.	LBW term infants were more vulnerable to have motor and cognitive impairments. Home factors (e.g. stimulation) as significant predictors on motor and cognitive scores. Low developmental levels among children with least-educated mothers. Growth in head size was strongly associated with IQ as a better predictor of cognitive outcomes than BW.

Table 2 Continued (II)

Fuentefria et al. 28	Cohort (incl control)	N= 135 Preterm infants (N=83) Control group (N=52)	Preterm infants GA: 29.1 BW:1098 Control group GA: 39.1 BW: 3348	Motor development Psychomotor development Nutritional State	AIMS BLS	SPSS, version 21.0. To compare the means between the groups, the Student's t-test was applied. For the control of confounding factors, the analysis of covariance (logistic regression) was utilized. In the comparison of proportions, Pearson's chi-square test was used. The associations between numerical variables in each group were evaluated by Pearson's correlation coefficient.	At 8 months corrected age, preterm infants scored significantly lower in total AIMS score (p 1/4 0.001). At 18 months, they scored significantly lower on the stand subscale from AIMS (p 1/4 0.040) and exhibited poor psychomotor development in the BLS (p 1/4 0.006). The nutritional status showed significant differences between the groups, in both age groups (p < 0.001). There were positive correlations between nutritional status and AIMS (r 1/4 0.420; p < 0.001) and BLS (r 1/4 0.456; p < 0.001) at 8 months, and between head circumference and BLS (r 1/4 0.235; p < 0.05) at 8 months and AIMS (r 1/4 0.258; p < 0.05) at 18 months. Conclusion Very low BW preterm infants at 8 and 18 months corrected age showed significant differences in the neurodevelopment and growth pattern when compared with their full-term peers.
Grantham-McGregor et al. 29	Cohort (incl control)	6 and 12 months N=262 n ₁ = 131 LBW n ₂ =131 ABW Sex unknown	<2500 Mean BW: 2338±152 vs. ≥2500 Mean BW:3210±142	Motor and cognitive Environment	Bayley Scale HOME	Chi-squared, Analysis of variance (T-test), Multiple linear regression	LBW term infants showed poorer motor and cognitive development than term infants. LBW term infants with literate mothers had higher scores than those with illiterate mothers (p=.003). Home factors as significant predictors on motor and cognitive scores.
Guerra et al. ³⁰	Cross-sectional (no control)	N = 100 With delay (N=55) Without delay (N=45)	With delay GA: 33.2 BW: 1727 Without delay GA: 33.3 BW: 1762	Motor and cognitive	Bayley-III Scale	The numerical variables were compared by the Mann-Whitney-U test or t-test and the categorical variables by the chi-square or Fisher's exact-test.	The percentages and 95% confidence intervals of those children with developmental delays were as follows: cognitive (2.0%; 0.6–7.0%), language (5.0%;2.2–11.2%), motor (3.0%; 1.0–8.5%), socio-emotional (13.0%; 7.8–20.1%), general adaptive (26.0%; 18.4–35.4%), conceptual (17.0%; 10.9–25.6%), social (46.0%; 36.6–55.7%) and practical (21.0%; 14.2–30.0%). Factors associated with delay in at least one developmental domain were as follows: caesarean delivery, low per capita income and peri-intraventricular haemorrhage. Factors associated with a reduction in developmental scores were as follows: non-white ethnicity, lower social class, caesarean delivery, male gender, peri-intraventricular haemorrhage, mechanical ventilation and length of hospitalisation.

Table 2 Continued (III)

Guimaraes et al. ³¹	Cross-sectional (incl control)	3 years N=92 n ₁ = 46 PT n ₂ = 46 FT Sex: Unknown	PT GA:28-33 31.1±1.5 BW:1424±321.1 Vs. FT GA:38-40 38.6±0.5 BW:3158±565.4	Motor	TIMP	Homogeneity of variance between groups, Analysis of variance (T-test, Mann-Whitney), Spearman and Pearson correlations, F-test.	PT infants showed poorer motor development (58±7.9; p<.001) than FT infants (67.9±5.3) after controlling for SES factors. 100% of PT were showed atypical motor development (p<.001) whereas 100% of FT infants showed normal scores. Prematurity was associated with impaired motor development.
Lemos et al. ³²	Cross-sectional (no control)	Preschool (2-7years) N=98	GA<37 BW<2500	Self-care Mobility Social function	PEDI	Chi-square and the variance analysis.	There was found a delay of 10,2%, 12,2% and 14,3% in the functional abilities in the areas of self-care, mobility and social function, respectively, and of 11,2%, 19,4% and 15,3% in the assistance level received from the caregivers (independence), in the same areas. It was not found statistically significant differences or associations between groups of different degrees of prematurity or birth weight and the PEDI performance.
Magalhães et al. ³³	Cross-sectional (incl control)	7 years	1.GA<=34 BW<=1500 2. GA>37	Motor	M-ABC test	Wilcoxon's test	Significant difference between the two groups in terms of the overall score (Z=-4,866, p<0,001) and the score for specific sub-sections of the M-ABC, the pre-term group performing less well than the term group
Manacero and Nunes ³⁴	Cross-sectional (no control)	<1year N=44 21 boys 23 girls n ₁ =14 <1750 n ₂ =30 ≥1750	≤2500 Subdivision <1750 BW: 1417±292 GA:32.4±0.7 vs. ≥1750 BW: 2090±278 GA:33.2±0.8	Motor	AIMS	Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	Despite BW differences, motor ability acquisition exhibited a normal progress at 40 weeks, 4 months, and 8 months according to mean percentile of normality on the AIMS (43.2% to 45.7%)
Meio et al. ³⁵	Cohort (no control)	N=94 (64,6% girls)	GA<37 BW<1500	Cognitive	WPPSI-R	T-student Chi-squared with Yates correction	Seventy-nine children aged 4 and 5 years were studied. The mean full WIPPSI-R score was 75.6 (±11.9). The incidence of abnormal 1 and 2 SD full score was 77.2% and 32.9%, respectively. After adjusting for the method of delivery, small for gestational age (OR=6.19, 95% CI 1.60-23.86), abnormal cerebral ultrasound exam (OR=5.90, 95% CI 1.04-9.83) and male sex (OR=3.20, 95% CI 1.32-26.35) were predictors of full score <70.
Meio et al. ³⁶	Cohort (no control)	N= 79/129 Age pre-school	GA<37 BW<1500	Cognitive	WPPSI-R	Epi-Info 6.0 SPSS 6.1 Chi-square T-student Fischer's test	No significant statistical difference was found between the groups (study and loss). Children who entered this study showed to have a borderline intellectual functioning at the moment of the evaluation. Results indicate they may face learning difficulties at school, thus requiring adequate stimuli that should be provided by the family and the

school.

Table 2 Continued (IV)

Mello et al. ³⁷	Cohort (no control)	(no N=70; Mean GA:32.2 weeks	GA<37 BW<1500	Motor and cognitive	Dubowitz & Dubowitz method and brain US	Analysis of variance through the F-test; the differences between the proportions were tested by chi-square. The statistical significance, prevalence, sensitivity, specificities, predictive values and confidence intervals were calculated.	25.7% of the children had neuromotor impairment, and 20.3% had cognitive impairment. Neonatal neurological examination was more sensitive than neuromotor change (sensitivity: 77.7%, specificity: 57.6%), and cognitive (sensitivity: 78.5%, specificity: 56.4%). Low predictive value for neuromotor change (38.9%) and cognitive (31.4%). Ultrasonography was discharged specificity for neuromotor (92.3%) and cognitive development (89.1%). The predictive value of ultrasonography was high for neuromotor abnormalities (69.2%) and low for changes cognitive (50.0%).
Mello et al. ³⁸	Cohort (no control)	12-30 months N=83	GA<37 BW<1500	Motor and cognitive	Bayley Scale	Comparison of means (Chi-squared, F-test.)	Cerebral ultrasonography (US) was normal in 68 babies (81.9%) and abnormal in 15 (18.8%). With a mean age of 21 months, 63 children (75.9%) had normal motor development and 20 (24.0%) had motor abnormalities. The cognitive development was normal in 68 children (81.9%). The negative predictive value of the cerebral US for motor development was 85.3%, and for cognitive development, 86.8%. The positive predictive value of the cerebral US for motor development was 66.7% and for cognitive development, 42.9%. The probability for children with normal neonatal ultrasonography to have normal motor and cognitive development is greater than 85%.
Mello et al. ³⁹	Cohort (no control)	N=100	BW: 1126 GA: 29.6	Motor and cognitive	Bayley Scale	A multivariate logistic regression model was constructed. Neonatal variables and neuromotor abnormalities up to 6 months of corrected age were selected by bivariate analysis.	Mean birth weight was 1126g (SD: 240). Abnormal neuromotor development was presented in 60 children at 12 months corrected age.

Oliveira et al. ⁴⁰	Case-control (incl control)	5-6 years N=46 n ₁ = 23 ≤1500 9 boys 14 girls n ₂ =23 ≥2500 Sex unknown	≤1500 Mean BW: 1201±177 GA: 30±2 Vs. ≥2500 BW:3273±348 GA: 39±0.4	Motor IQ Coordination ADHD symptoms Environment	M-ABC WISC DCDQ SNAP IV HOME	Comparison of means (Mann-Whitney test), Spearman correlations tests	LBW children were more vulnerable to have motor and cognitive impairments. Home factors as significant predictors on motor and cognitive scores.
Procianoy et al. ⁴¹	Cohort (incl control)	2 years N=96 49 boys 47 girls n ₁ =55 SGA n ₂ =41 AGE	SGA <1500 GA: 31.7±2 BW:1130±250 vs. AGE <1500 GA: 29.3±1.6 BW:1250±218 GA<37 BW<1500	Motor and cognitive	Bayley Scale	Comparison of means (Chi-squared, F-test.), ANOVA, ANCOVA	Mental and motor development were similar between both groups of term infants at 8,12,18, and 24 months corrected age. Both groups had similar neurodevelopment outcome.
Reis et al. ⁴²	Cohort (no control)	N=109 <2years (6m, 12m, 18-24m)	GA<37 BW<1500	Motor and cognitive	Bayley-II Scale MDI	The stability of the scores between assessments was verified by the analysis of variance for repeated measures. The association of the major social and neonatal characteristics with mental development was confirmed using multivariate analysis by linear regression,	The association of the major social and neonatal characteristics with mental development was confirmed using multivariate analysis by linear regression, considering the following outcomes: mental development indices at 6 months, 12 months and between 18-24 months of corrected age. The cognitive development index did not show stability during the first two years, except for children with neonatal pneumonia
Schirmer et al. ⁴³	Cross-sectional (no control)	3 years N=69 n ₁ =30 <1500 n ₂ =39 1500-2500 Sex unknown	≤2500 Subdivision <1500 vs. 1500-2500 All GA>37	Motor and cognitive Motor and cognitive Language	Denver-II Test Bayley-II Scale Language Assessment	Chi-squared, Analysis of variance (T-test), multivariate regression, Risks estimates (OR, Wald)	GA correlates with language development; GA predicts language acquisition. Gestational age<32 weeks increases 3 times the risk for delay in language acquisition.

Silva et al. ⁴⁴	Cross-sectional (no control)	4-24 months N=69	GA<37 BW<1500	Hand-eye coordination Language Posture Sociability	Brunet Scale Lèzine's Scale	Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics.	85%of scores within the normal range in the third assessment. The specific areas of hand-eye coordination and language had the worst initial results, while posture had the best scores. Correlation was found between birth weight and posture, language and social areas at the first assessment and between birth weight and social and hand-eye coordination at the third assessment.
Saccani et al. ⁴⁵	Cross-sectional (incl control)	0-12 months N=42 n1= 21 n2= 21	<2500 Mean BW: 1886±402 GA: 36 Vs ≥2500 BW:2878±348 GA: 36	Motor	Alberta Infant Motor Scale	The independent t-test, the chi-square test of Pearson and the Eta2 test (strong association> 0.60).	Fifteen (71.42%) children with low birth weight were classified as small for gestational age. The mean motor development score percentile was 17.90±17.74 for the LBW group and 34.57±25.80 for the ABW group, indicating a better motor development of the second group (p=0.02). There was a greater number of children with developmental delay in the LBW group (52.4%), whereas in the ABW group most were within the normal range (47.6%).

Abbreviations: GA, Gestational age; BW, birth weight; LBW, low-birthweight; ABW, adequate birth weight; VLBW, very low birth weight; SGA, small for gestational age; AGE, appropriate for gestational age; PT, Preterm infants; FT, Full term newborns; HOME, Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment; WPPSI-R, Wechsler Preschool and Primary Intelligence Scales; WISC III, Weschsler Intelligence Test for Children-III; WISC, Weschsler Intelligence Test for Children; TEAch, Test of Everyday Attention for Children; STAI, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory; BDI, Beck Depression Inventory; CCA, chronological corrected age; AIMS, Alberta Infant Motor Scale; ADHD, attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder; PELCDO, Protocol for Expressive Language and Cognition Development Observation; M-ABC test, Movement Assessment Battery for Children; DCDQ, Developmental Coordination Disorder Questionnaire; SNAP IV, Swanson, Nolan and Pelham IV Scale; TIMP, Test of Infant Motor Performance; PEDI, Pediatric Evaluation Disability Inventory; CBCL, Child Behavior Checklist; BLS, Brunet-Lèzini scale; CPRS-R, Conners' Parent Rating Scale-Revised; IQ, Intelligence quotient; US, Ultrasonography; p, Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation; r, Pearson's correlation coefficient; z, standard score; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; SD, standard deviation; ANOVA, analysis of variance; ANCOVA, analysis of covariance; SPSS, Statistical Package for Social Sciences.

Table 3 Risk of bias assessment adapted from STROBE¹⁹

No.	Author/Year	Obtained score/ maximum score	Relative frequency (%)
01	Bühler et al. ²¹	19/22 ^b	86
02	Carvalho et al. ²²	21/22 ^b	95
03	Eickman et al. ²³	21/22 ^a	95
04	Emond et al. ²⁴	22/22 ^b	100
05	Espirito Santo et al. ²⁵	21/22 ^a	95
06	Fan et al. ²⁶	20/22 ^a	91
07	Fernandes et al. ²⁷	20/22 ^a	91
08	Fuentefria et al. ²⁸	20/22 ^b	91
09	Grantham-McGregor et al. ²⁹	19/22 ^b	86
10	Guerra et al. ³⁰	20/22 ^a	91
11	Guimarães et al. ³¹	21/22 ^a	95
12	Lemos et al. ³²	20/22 ^a	91
13	Magalhães et al. ³³	20/22 ^a	91
14	Manacero and Nunes ³⁴	21/22 ^a	95
15	Meio et al. ³⁵	20/22 ^b	91
16	Meio et al. ³⁶	20/22 ^b	91
17	Mello et al. ³⁷	22/22 ^b	100
18	Mello et al. ³⁸	21/22 ^b	95
19	Mello et al. ³⁹	20/22 ^b	91
20	Oliveira et al. ⁴⁰	22/22 ^c	100
21	Procianoy et al. ⁴¹	22/22 ^b	95
22	Reis et al. ⁴²	22/22 ^b	100
23	Schirmer et al. ⁴³	20/22 ^a	91
24	Silva et al. ⁴⁴	20/22 ^a	91
25	Saccani et al. ⁴⁵	20/22 ^a	91

^a Cross-sectional prevalence study.

^b Cohort study.

^c Case-control study.