Poor *in-utero* growth, reduced beta cell secretion and high plasma glucose in childhood are harbingers of glucose intolerance in young Indians

Author	Highest degree	Affiliation
Chittaranjan S Yajnik	MD	Diabetes Unit, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Souvik Bandopadhyay	MSc	GlaxoSmithKline Asia Pvt. Ltd, Bengaluru, India Formerly- Indian Institute of Public Health, Hyderabad
Aboli Bhalerao	MSc	Diabetes Unit, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Dattatray S Bhat	MSc	Diabetes Unit, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Sanat Phatak	DM	Diabetes Unit, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Rucha Wagh	MSc	Diabetes Unit, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Pallavi Yajnik	MCom	Diabetes Unit, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Anand Pandit	MD	Department of Paediatrics, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Sheila Bhave	MD	Department of Paediatrics, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Kurus Coyaji	MD	Diabetes Unit, KEM Hospital Research Centre, Pune, India
Kalyanaraman Kumaran	DM	MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
Clive Osmond	PhD	MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
Caroline HD Fall	DM	MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

Corresponding author

Professor Chittaranjan S Yajnik

Director, Diabetes Unit

KEM Hospital Research centre

Pune, India

csyajnik@gmail.com

Abstract

Background

India is the world's paradoxical double capital for early life undernutrition and type 2 diabetes. The Pune Maternal Nutrition Study (PMNS) birth cohort offered a unique opportunity to investigate childhood growth and glucose-insulin metabolism as precursors to glucose intolerance in young adulthood.

Methods

PMNS is a community-based pre-conceptional birth cohort established in 1993, with serial information on parents, and on their children through pregnancy, childhood and adolescence. We compared the children's growth and glucose-insulin indices between those who were and were not glucose intolerant at age 18 years (ADA criteria). We developed a prediction model for 18-year glucose intolerance and replicated it in two other cohorts (Extended PMNS and Pune Children's Study).

Findings

At age 18 years (N=619) 37% men and 20% women were glucose intolerant even though 48% were underweight (BMI<18.5 kg/m^2). Glucose intolerant participants were shorter at birth, and had lower insulin secretion (both sexes) and insulin insensitivity (men) in childhood than those with normal glucose tolerance. Fasting plasma glucose (FPG) concentrations at 6- and 12-years of age strongly predicted glucose intolerance at 18 years. The risk was 2.5 times higher in the highest compared to the lowest quintile at 6 years, and 4.5 times at 12 years. Comparable findings were seen in the other cohorts. Mothers of glucose intolerant participants had higher glycemia in pregnancy.

Interpretation

Glucose intolerance in young rural Indians can be traced to linear growth faltering *in-utero*, reduced beta-cell secretion and higher glycemia since childhood. Our findings mandate a strategy for diabetes prevention starting much earlier than the current practice.

Introduction

India is experiencing a rapidly escalating epidemic of type 2 diabetes (T2D), [1] and simultaneously has the world's highest burden of low birth weight babies and under-five undernutrition. [2] Current thinking of etiology of T2D is based on studies in adults and ascribes it to obesity and overnutrition in genetically susceptible individuals. On this background, the high prevalence of diabetes in Indians, at a younger age and lower body mass index (BMI) than Europeans, appears paradoxical. [3] Recent reports suggest high rates of prediabetes in adolescents and young adults [2] and faster conversion from prediabetes to diabetes. [3, 4] The greatest rise in prevalence in the last 25 years has occured in the most economically deprived Indian states and in some places, there is a reversal of socioeconomic trends from a previously excess prevalence among the most affluent. [1] Taken together, these findings raise the possibility that historical deprivation and undernutrition are contributory factors to diabetes in a rapidly transitioning society.

There is growing acceptance of a life-course model (Developmental Origins of Health and Disease, DOHaD) for evolution of T2D. Adverse environmental exposures in early life, classically reflected in low birth weight, are associated with an increased risk of adult T2D. [5] The 'thrifty phenotype' hypothesis proposed that intra-uterine undernutrition disrupts the structure and function of key organs, which manifests as an increased risk of diabetes through both diminished insulin secretion and sensitivity.[6] While there is considerable information on newborn size and childhood growth as predictors of later T2D risk, [7] there is little data on childhood measures of glucose, and insulin secretion and sensitivity as predictors. [8] It is therefore unknown at what age metabolic susceptibility to future diabetes becomes evident, and whether impaired insulin insensitivity or secretion is the primary defect. Consequently, diabetes prevention trials still mainly target middle aged people who already have obesity and advanced metabolic abnormalities.

In the Pune Maternal Nutrition Study (PMNS), we had a unique opportunity to construct the first ever lifecourse trajectory of glucose-insulin indices and growth in young rural Indian adults, along with data on parental size and glucose intolerance. We have developed equations of early life characteristics and childhood glucose to predict glucose intolerance in young adulthood, and replicated these in two additional Indian birth cohorts.

Methods

Overview of the PMNS cohort

The PMNS (Fig. 1 and Supplementary Fig. 1) was established in 1993 in six rural villages near Pune, India to prospectively study associations of maternal nutritional status with fetal growth and later diabetes risk in the offspring. [9] Married, non-pregnant women (N=2,466) were followed up and those who became pregnant (F0 generation) were recruited into the study if a singleton pregnancy of <21 weeks' gestation was confirmed by ultrasound. Most delivered at home and only 4.2% required Caesarean section; 3 women had diabetes in pregnancy (WHO criteria, 1985). The children (F1 generation) were measured at birth and 6-monthly thereafter, and body composition and glucose-insulin indices were measured 6-yearly. We report 18-year measurements as the outcomes in this analysis.

Measurements of babies and children (F1 generation)

Detailed anthropometry was carried out using standardized methods at birth and every 6 months post-natally. [10] Comprehensive assessments of glucose and insulin concentrations, body composition and socio-economic status (SES) were made at 6, 12 and 18 years. Participants arrived at the Diabetes Unit the evening before, had a standard dinner, and fasted overnight. In the morning, a fasting blood sample was collected. At 6 years, an oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) was performed, using 1.75g/kg of anhydrous glucose, followed by further samples at 30 and 120 minutes. At 12 years, only a fasting sample was collected. At 18 years a full OGTT (75g anhydrous glucose) was repeated. Glucose was measured by the glucose oxidase/peroxidase method, and specific insulin by ELISA (CV for glucose <4% and insulin <8% at all time points, supplementary Table 3). Insulin sensitivity (HOMA-S) and beta cell function (HOMA-β) were calculated using data from the fasting samples and the iHOMA2 website. [https://www.phc.ox.ac.uk/research/technology-outputs/ihoma2 , last accessed August 2019] We calculated the Matsuda Index for insulin sensitivity and the Insulinogenic Index (ln{Insulin(30-min/fasting) /Glucose(30-min/fasting)} for early insulin secretion. [11, 12] Disposition index (β cell function adjusted for insulin sensitivity) was calculated as (insulinogenic index*Matsuda index) at 6 and 18 years and as HOMA-S*HOMA-β at 12 years. [13] Total fat and lean mass and body fat% were measured by Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (DXA). SES was evaluated using the Standard of Living Index (SLI), a scoring system developed for the National Family Health Survey of India based on the family's dwelling, land ownership and assets. [14]Higher scores denote higher SES.

The study was approved by village leaders and the KEM Hospital Research Centre Ethics Committee. Parents gave written consent; children under 18 years of age gave written assent and written consent after reaching 18 years.

Definitions

In adults, underweight was defined as a BMI <18.5 kg/m^2, overweight/obesity as a BMI ≥25 kg/m^2 and stunting as a height-for-age Z-score <-2 SD below the WHO average (<149.8 cm in women and <161.2 cm for men).

[http://www.who.int/growthref/who2007_height_for_age/en/, last accessed August 2020.] Central obesity was defined as a waist circumference ≥90 cm (men) and ≥80 cm (women) [https://www.idf.org/e-library/consensus-statements/60-idfconsensus-worldwide-definitionof-the-metabolic-syndrome.html, last accessed August 2020] and adiposity as a DXA-derived fat% >25% (men) and >35% (women). Glucose tolerance was classified (ADA criteria [15]) as normal (NGT), prediabetes (impaired fasting glucose [IFG] or impaired glucose tolerance [IGT]), or diabetes mellitus (DM). IFG, IGT and DM together were referred to as 'glucose intolerance'.

Parental measurements

Anthropometry and glucose tolerance (75 g OGTT) were measured in both parents during the index pregnancy (~28 weeks gestation) and at the 6-year follow up. Gestational diabetes was defined using WHO 1985 criteria [2-h Plasma glucose ≥ 7.8 mmol/l] and treated appropriately. Given the small number of GDM, we defined glucose intolerance as fasting plasma glucose (FPG) ≥ 5.1 mmol/l (95th centile of FPG in this population which also coincides with current IADPSG criteria). Anthropometry and only a fasting blood test were available at the 12-year follow-up. Parents were classified as underweight, normal or overweight/obese based on their follow-up data. Fathers were classified as glucose intolerant if they had IFG, IGT or diabetes at any follow up. Mothers were classified as glucose intolerant separately for pregnancy and at any stage post-partum.

Replication cohorts

Pune Children's Study Cohort (PCS): PCS is an urban cohort of children born in the KEM Hospital in 1987-89. [16] Briefly, the children were studied at 8-years (n=477) and 21 years (n=357) of age. Measurements were the same as those in the PMNS, and glucose tolerance (the outcome at age 21 years) was classified by the same ADA criteria. *Extended PMNS cohort:* This cohort included additional pregnant women (n=110) recruited after recruitment for PMNS was complete, in order to establish the validity of ultrasound protocols for gestational dating in the PMNS. The children and parents were followed up in the same way as the PMNS cohort. Ninety-two children had glucose tolerance data at 6, 12 and 18 years of age. Given the small numbers in this cohort, we used the upper third of 18-year FPG concentration as the outcome.

Statistical methods

The primary analysis was a comparison of serial glucose-insulin variables and body size measures between F1 participants who were NGT and glucose intolerant at age 18 years (Table 1). Variables with right-skewed distributions were log transformed; all variables were Z-standardised, and differences between NGT and glucose intolerant participants were expressed in Z-score units with 95% confidence intervals, to facilitate comparisons between variables. Associations of glucose intolerance at 18 years of age (outcome) with the F1 participants' own serial body size measures from birth, FPG

concentrations at 6 and 12 years of age, sex and SES, and parental body size and glucose tolerance (predictors) were analysed using logistic regression. We used interaction tests to investigate whether associations differed between the sexes. We created ROC curves to show the sensitivity and specificity of these variables in predicting glucose intolerance. The representativeness of participants was tested by comparing those studied and not studied at different stages using 2 sample t-tests (continuous normally distributed variables) or chi square tests (categorical variables) (Supplementary Figure 1).

Funding

The PMNS and the PCS were funded by the Wellcome Trust, UK (038128/Z/93, 059609/Z/99, 079877/Z/06/Z, 098575/B/12/Z and 083460/Z/07/Z), MRC, UK (MR/J000094/1) and Department of Biotechnology, GoI (BT/PR-6870/PID/20/268/2005). The funding agencies had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, manuscript writing or decision to submit the article.

Results

PMNS:

Characteristics at 18 years (Supplementary table 1): The analysis included 619 men and women with complete data (86% of the original live births). Mean BMI was 19.7 kg/m^2 in men and 18.7 kg/m^2 in women; 41% of men and 57% of women were underweight, and ~10% were stunted. Eight percent of men and 4% of women were overweight/obese while 6% of men and 5% of women were centrally obese. Sixteen percent each of men and women were adipose (DXA fat %). A total of 185 (30%) were glucose intolerant: one woman had DM, while 37% of men and 20% of women had prediabetes. Men had more IFG (27%) than women (9%) but rates of IGT were similar (11% in both sexes).

Lifecourse comparison between glucose intolerant and NGT participants (Table 1)

At 18 years, participants with glucose intolerance had lower insulin secretion (lower insulinogenic and disposition indices) and lower insulin sensitivity (lower HOMA-S and Matsuda index) than NGT participants. Glucose intolerant men, but not women were more adipose (higher BMI, fat% and waist circumference). Men and women with glucose intolerance at 18 years had higher glucose concentrations and lower disposition index at 6 and 12 years than the NGT group; men also had lower insulin sensitivity at age 6 years.

Glucose intolerant men and women were shorter in length at birth and at age 2 years, and lighter at 2 years, than the NGT group. There were no significant differences in birth weight or other birth measurements. Women but not men continued to be shorter and thinner (lower BMI and waist circumference) at age 6 years (Supplementary figure 2). Men, but not women, with glucose intolerance gained more weight and BMI during adolescence than the NGT group.

Glucose intolerant men and women were more likely than the NGT group to have a mother with glucose intolerance either in pregnancy or post-natally, and a mother who was not overweight or obese. Glucose intolerant women were also more likely to have a father with glucose intolerance.

Multivariate modelling of glucose intolerance at 18 years

Table 2 shows a multivariate regression analysis in which we predicted 18-year glucose intolerance using these lifecourse factors. Significant predictors in both sexes were a higher FPG concentration at age 6 or 12 years, smaller length or head circumference at birth, maternal pregnancy glucose intolerance, and a mother who had never been overweight/obese. Paternal glucose intolerance was associated with an increased risk of glucose intolerance in women, but not men. Greater adiposity at 18 years was associated with an increased risk only among men. Once birth length was included in the model, none of the childhood growth variables were significantly related to 18-year glucose intolerance (examined using conditional birth weight, and BMI and height gain from birth to 2 years, 2 to 6 years and 6 to 12 years) and these have not been included in the model shown in Table 2. SES was unrelated to glucose intolerance.

Prediction equations and ROC curves

There were strong linear associations between FPG at 6 and 12 years and prevalence of glucose intolerance at 18 years. The prevalence was 2.5 times higher among those in the highest fifth of FPG at 6 years, and 4 times higher at 12 years, than among those in the lowest fifth (Figure 2c, 2f). The predicted probability for 18-year glucose intolerance was 26% (men) and 15% (women) for a FPG of 4.5 mmol/l, and 44% (men) and 28% (women) for a FPG of 5.4 mmol/l at 6-years of age. It was 18% (men) and 12% (women) for a FPG of 4.6 mmol/l and 30% (men) and 19% (women) for a FPG of 5.2 mmol/l at 12-years of age (Supplementary figure 3).

We replicated this analysis using the PMNS predictive equations in the two other cohorts. In the PCS (N=355), 66 (19%) participants were glucose intolerant at age 21 years (5 T2D + 40 IFG + 21 IGT). They had higher BMI, and lower insulin sensitivity and insulin secretion than the NGT participants. They also had higher FPG concentrations (4.8 v 4.6 mmol/l, p=0.026) and lower HOMA disposition index at 8 years of age (12.9 v 15.3, p=0.026). The prevalence of glucose intolerance at 21 years of age was 1.7 times higher for those in the highest third of 8-year FPG than among those in the lowest third

(Supplementary figure 4a). In the Extended PMNS cohort, FPG concentration at age 12 years, but not 6 years, was positively associated with higher FPG concentration at 18 years. The prevalence of being in the highest third of FPG at 18 years was 3 times higher in those in the highest third of FPG at 12 years than among those in the lowest third (Supplementary figure 4b). The predicted probabilities for glucose intolerance in young adulthood based on childhood FPGs for these cohorts are shown in Supplementary figure 4c and 4d.

ROC curves (Figure 3a and b) for 18-year glucose intolerance in the PMNS showed that the area under the curve (AUC) using sex and FPG was 0.658 at age 6-years and 0.700 at age 12 years. These values increased only marginally to 0.686 and 0.723 respectively when the model also included all the predictors shown in table 2.

Discussion

We found a high prevalence of glucose intolerance in this young thin rural Indian cohort, with men having twice the prevalence of women. Our novel intergenerational lifecourse data revealed several factors associated with this outcome, including parental glucose intolerance, reduced fetal and post-natal growth, and early childhood derangements of glucose-insulin measures. Higher childhood/adolescent FPG concentrations were strong and graded predictors of future glucose intolerance, which was predicted with 66% confidence by this measure alone at age 6 years. These findings are consistent with the 'thrifty phenotype' hypothesis, and challenge the current thinking that T2D is a disorder of β-cell decompensation due to adult obesity-related insulin resistance. [6, 17] We suggest that diabetes prevention should begin inter-generationally and from early childhood.

Parental factors

Intergenerational influences on glucose intolerance appear to reflect a combination of factors: while genetic factors must play a role, a specific influence of pregnancy glycaemia suggests an epigenetic programming effect. The parents and grand-parents of our cohort grew up in an impoverished drought-prone area. The mothers were short (mean height 1.52 m), thin (mean BMI 18.1 kg/m^2) and had low macro- and micro-nutrient intakes and heavy physical workloads in pregnancy. [9] Maternal glucose concentrations in pregnancy were relatively low, few mothers were obese, and very few had GDM (using the then prevalent WHO 1985 criteria). Even at these relatively lower glucose levels there was a significant positive association between maternal glucose, the size of their newborns [18] and now with glucose intolerance in young adulthood. Our results suggest that the current epidemic of diabetes in young Indians may be rooted in 'dual teratogenesis' i.e. simultaneous intrauterine exposure to

multiple nutritional deficits and (minimally) elevated maternal glucose. [19] Sex specific effects of paternal glycaemia suggest a role for imprinting, and deserves further investigation. [20]

Growth and sex

Rather than low birth weight we found an association of short birth length and small head circumference with future glucose intolerance. While an association of short birth length with later diabetes has been described in another Indian cohort [21], that with small head circumference is a new finding, together suggesting a role of failure of fetal brain-preservation and linear growth. This may be accompanied by a wider failure of organ development, especially of the pancreas and liver, which play a crucial role in glucose homeostasis. This is well demonstrated in animal models. [22,23] Glucose intolerant women continued to be shorter and thinner postnatally. These results are novel and support other evidence for a role of fetal undernutrition in the aetiology of T2D. The excess body mass gain during puberty in glucose intolerant males replicates findings in other birth cohorts, [7] though a third were still underweight. Being born small and growing big increases risk of future diabetes. [16]

Pathophysiology

A typical T2D patient demonstrates both reduced insulin secretion and insulin sensitivity. Which defect comes first? There are few lifecourse studies like ours. [24] Impaired β-cell secretion from an early age was found in both glucose intolerant men and women; men also had diminished insulin sensitivity and thus a 'double defect'. At 18 years, they had both lower insulin secretion and sensitivity, the latter suggesting either an effect of adolescence and/or glucotoxicity. This reveals the pitfalls of studying end-stage phenotypes to determine antecedent events. Considering insulin insensitivity the primary driver of diabetes in Indians was based on extrapolation from Western data in obese patients, and from our own description of the insulin resistant 'thin-fat' Indian. [3, 17] Stimulated β-cell function was not seriously investigated in these studies, and the relative insensitivity of HOMA-B to diagnose early defects of insulin secretion was overlooked. [25] Using the recently developed Swedish diabetes subtype algorithm [26] we have found that severely insulin deficient diabetes (SIDD) was the most common subtype in young Indian diabetic patients diagnosed before 45 years of age (submitted for publication). It is also interesting that the childhood insulin insensitivity in glucose intolerant men in our study preceded their weight gain during adolescence, thus raising the possibility of a mechanism independent of adiposity. The predominance of fasting hyperglycemia (IFG) in these young rural men corroborates the findings of a large national study in India and suggests increased hepatic glucose output from early age. [2]

Our cohort has experienced rapid transition on a background of multigenerational undernutrition. Over the last 150 years

(1830-1980) Indians failed to gain height while Europeans gained up to 15 cm. [27] The drivers of transition in our study area include a regular water supply from a dam (supporting irrigation and cash-crop farming), establishment of an industrial estate (generating paid employment), and improved literacy rates. Children in our study are 5 cm taller and are heavier than their parents. Such factors may have contributed to the finding that the greatest increase in diabetes prevalence between 1990 and 2016 in India occurred predominantly in the most deprived states, suggesting intolerance to transition. [1]

Implications

Our results demonstrate, for the first time in humans, continuous tracking of glycaemia from childhood to adulthood and a strong predictive value of childhood FPG for later glucose intolerance: the risk was 2.5 times for those in the highest fifth at 6 years and 4 times at 12 years compared to those in the lowest fifth. We were able to validate the prediction in two other cohorts in Pune. The i3C study also hinted at this from a single childhood timepoint and the Early Bird study showed that glucose concentrations track through early childhood into adolescence. [24, 28] These results should convince paediatricians to measure glucose concentrations in children, and policy makers to promote preventive measures at a younger age. Measurement of birth length and head circumference in addition to the usual measurement of weight would add to prediction of risk of future diabetes. The altered metabolic milieu from early childhood could epigenetically affect ova and the sperm, predisposing the next generation to higher risk. [20, 29] Our research will help to identify at-risk individuals in childhood and potentially reduce the risk of diabetes by therapies which improve insulin secretion as well as insulin insensitivity. These findings may be relevant to other developing populations with a history of nutritional deprivation, and will also have implications for treatment of T2D.

The strengths of our study are: exceptional follow up over 20 years (92% of survivors), longitudinal anthropometry from birth, and serial glucose-insulin data from childhood, both measured using uniform methods. Participants included were comparable to those excluded at each stage (Supplementary figure 1). The PMNS prediction model was validated in a rural as well as an urban cohort, thus increasing its generalisability. Limitations are that, this being an observational study, causality of associations cannot be ascertained, and we used epidemiological rather than gold standard invasive measures of insulin action and secretion.

In conclusion, glucose intolerance in thin young rural Indian adults is heralded by impaired insulin secretion and higher glycaemia from childhood, and is associated with slower skeletal and brain growth starting *in utero*. Diabetes in undernourished and transitioning populations may be the new avatar of malnutrition-related diabetes (MRDM), a previously

recognised sub-class of diabetes that fell into obscurity due to a lack of prospective data and an increasing focus on obesity-related diabetes. [30] Our findings remind us of the importance of history in determining our present and the future.

Acknowledgements:

We are grateful to all study participants and their family members for co-operation over the years. We thank the late Prof DJP Barker, Dr B Coyaji, and Dr VN Rao for their support in setting up the PMNS. We thank Dr VS Padbidri and Dr L Garda, former and current Directors of Research, KEM Hospital Research Centre. We also thank the staff of the Diabetes Unit for their help in conducting the study, particularly Dr S Hirve, Dr N Joshi, Dr U Deshmukh, Dr A Bavdekar, Dr H Lubree, Ms R Ladkat, Ms N Memane, Mr C Joglekar, Ms S Bagate, Mr A Bhalerao, Mr S Chaugule, Ms R Dendge, Mr T Deokar, Ms M Gaikwad, Ms N Gurav, Ms S Jagtap, Ms J Kalokhe, Ms S Pandit, Ms F Rajgara, Ms D Raut, Ms L Ramdas, Ms M Raut, Ms R Saswade, and Mr V Solat. We thank Dr SS Naik, head of biochemistry, KEM Hospital for help in assay standardization. We are grateful to the Indian Council of Medical Research, the Department of Biotechnology, India, the Wellcome Trust, UK, and the Medical Research Council, UK for their funding support. We acknowledge the support of Dr N D Deshmukh and the Zilla Parishad, Pune.

Authors' contributions

CY and CF conceptualized the study. SB, AB, RW and CO were involved in statistical analysis. KJC, PY, KK, AP, SB contributed to conduct of the study. CY, SP, CF, CO prepared the manuscript. DB was involved in laboratory measurements.

Declaration of interests:

CY worked as visiting professor at the Danish Diabetes Academy and University of Southern Denmark during writing of this article. SB worked on this article when he was an assistant professor at the Indian Institute of Public Health, Hyderabad, Public Health Foundation of India. All the other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data sharing statement:

Data is available with Prof C S Yajnik for sharing to confirm our findings and for additional analyses by applying to the corresponding author with a 200 word plan of analysis. Data sharing is subject to KEMHRC Ethics Committee approval and Government of India's Health Ministry advisory committee permission.

References

1. India State-Level Disease Burden Initiative Diabetes Collaborators. The increasing burden of diabetes and variations among the states of India: the Global Burden of Disease Study 1990-2016. Lancet Glob Health. 2018;6:e1352-e1362.

2. Comprehensive National Nutrition Survery (2016- 2018) reports. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, Population Council and UNICEF. (https://nhm.gov.in/index1.php?lang=1&level=2&sublinkid=1332&lid=713), last accessed September 2020.

3. Yajnik CS. The insulin resistance epidemic in India: fetal origins, later lifestyle, or both? Nutr Rev. 2001;59:1-9.

4. Yajnik CS, Shelgikar KM, Naik SS, et al. Impairment of glucose tolerance over 10 years in middle-aged normal glucose tolerant Indians. Diabetes Care. 2003;26:2212-3.

5. Whincup PH, Kaye SJ, Owen CG, et al. Birthweight and risk of type 2 diabetes: a quantitative systematic review of published evidence. JAMA. 2008; 300: 2885-97.

6. Hales CN, Barker DJ. Type 2 (non-insulin-dependent) diabetes mellitus: the thrifty phenotype hypothesis. Diabetologia. 1992;35:595-601.

7. Bhargava SK, Sachdev HS, Fall CH, et al. Relation of serial changes in childhood body-mass index to impaired glucose tolerance in young adulthood. N Engl J Med. 2004;350:865-75.

8. Joshi SM, Katre PA, Kumaran K, et al. Tracking of cardiovascular risk factors from childhood to young adulthood - the Pune Children's Study. Int J Cardiol. 2014;175:176-178. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2014.04.105

9. Rao S, Yajnik CS, Kanade A, et al. Intake of micronutrient-rich foods in rural Indian mothers is associated with the size of their babies at birth: Pune Maternal Nutrition Study. J Nutr. 2001;131:1217-24.

10. Joglekar CV, Fall CH, Deshpande VU, et al. Newborn size, infant and childhood growth, and body composition and cardiovascular disease risk factors at the age of 6 years: the Pune Maternal Nutrition Study. Int J Obes (Lond). 2007;31:1534-44.

11. Matsuda M, DeFronzo RA. Insulin sensitivity indices obtained from oral glucose tolerance testing: comparison with the euglycemic insulin clamp. Diabetes Care. 1999;22:1462-70.

12. Wareham NJ, Phillips DI, Byrne CD, at al. The 30 minute insulin incremental response in an oral glucose tolerance test as a measure of insulin secretion. Diabet Med. 1995 ;12:931.

13. Bergman RN, Ader M, Huecking K, Van Citters G. Accurate assessment of beta-cell function: the hyperbolic correction. Diabetes. 2002 ;51:S212-20.

14. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), 2015-16: India. International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS) and ICF. 2017. (http://rchiips.org/nfhs/NFHS-4Reports/India.pdf), last accessed September 2020.

15. American Diabetes Association. 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes-2019. Diabetes Care. 2019;42:S13-S28.

16. Bavdekar A, Yajnik CS, Fall CH, Bapat S, Pandit AN, Deshpande V, Bhave S, Kellingray SD, Joglekar C. Insulin resistance syndrome in 8-year-old Indian children: small at birth, big at 8 years, or both? Diabetes. 1999 ;48:2422-9.

17. Kahn SE, Cooper ME, Del Prato S. Pathophysiology and treatment of type 2 diabetes: perspectives on the past, present, and future. Lancet. 2014;383:1068-83.

18. Kulkarni, S. R., K. Kumaran, S. R. Rao, S. D. Chougule, T. M. Deokar, A. J. Bhalerao, V. A. Solat, et al. "Maternal Lipids Are as Important as Glucose for Fetal Growth: Findings from the Pune Maternal Nutrition Study. Diabetes Care. 2013; 36: 2706-13.

19. Yajnik CS. Nutrient-mediated teratogenesis and fuel-mediated teratogenesis: two pathways of intrauterine programming of diabetes. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2009;104 Suppl 1:S27-31.

20. Su L, Patti ME. Paternal Nongenetic Intergenerational Transmission of Metabolic Disease Risk. Curr Diab Rep. 2019; 24;19:38.

21. Fall CH, Stein CE, Kumaran K, Cox V, Osmond C, Barker DJ, Hales CN. Size at birth, maternal weight, and type 2 diabetes in South India. Diabet Med. 1998;15:220-7.

22. Hoet JJ, Ozanne S, Reusens B. Influences of pre- and postnatal nutritional exposures on vascular/endocrine systems in animals. Environ Health Perspect. 2000;108 Suppl 3:563-8.

23. Hardikar AA, Satoor SN, Karandikar MS, et al. Multigenerational Undernutrition Increases Susceptibility to Obesity and Diabetes that Is Not Reversed after Dietary Recuperation. Cell Metab. 2015;22:312-9

24. Hu T, Jacobs DR Jr, Sinaiko AR, Bazzano LA, Burns TL, Daniels SR, et al. Childhood BMI and Fasting Glucose and Insulin Predict Adult Type 2 Diabetes: The International Childhood Cardiovascular Cohort (i3C) Consortium. Diabetes Care. 2020 ;dc200822. doi: 10.2337/dc20-0822. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 32873588.

25. Hockaday, D., M. Sayyad, and C. Yajnik. Counterpoint: Appreciating Homeostasis Model Assessment: More Useful Earlier Rather Than Later. Diabetes Care. 2007; 30: 2414-8.

26. Ahlqvist E, Storm P, Käräjämäki A, et al. Novel subgroups of adult-onset diabetes and their association with outcomes: a data-driven cluster analysis of six variables. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2018;6:361-369

27. NCD Risk Factor Collaboration (NCD-RisC). A century of trends in adult human height. Elife. 2016 26;5. pii: e13410.

28. Jeffery AN, Metcalf BS, Hosking J, Streeter AJ, Voss LD, Wilkin TJ. Age before stage: insulin resistance rises before the onset of puberty: a 9-year longitudinal study (EarlyBird 26). Diabetes Care. 2012;35:536-41.

29. Fleming TP, Watkins AJ, Velazquez MA, et al. Origins of lifetime health around the time of conception: causes and consequences. Lancet. 2018;391:1842-1852.

30. Abu-Bakare A, Taylor R, Gill GV, et al. Tropical or malnutrition-related diabetes: a real syndrome? Lancet. 1986 17;1:1135-8.

Table 1: Comparison of biomarkers between participants with normal glucose tolerance and glucose intolerant at age 18 years.

	MEN				WOMEN		
	NGT (median)N=221	**Glucose intolerant** (median) N=131	**Difference (Z-score) Glucose intolerant - NGT**	**p**	**NGT** (median)N=213	**Glucose intolerant** (median) N=54	**Difference (Z-score) Glucose intolerant - NGT**
			Mean (95% CI)				**Mean (95% CI)**
YEARS							
ight (cm)	**170.1**	**169.0**	**-0.19** (-0.40, 0.03)	0.09	**157.2**	**157.3**	**-0.14** (-0.44, 0.16)
ΛI (kg/m^2)	**18.8**	**19.6**	**0.29** (0.07, 0.50)	0.009	**18.1**	**17.4**	**-0.18** (-0.48, 0.12)
aist circumference (cm)	**70.5**	**72.6**	**0.30** (0.09, 0.52)	0.006	**67.4**	**66.3**	**-0.2** (-0.50, 0.10)
t percentage (%)	**12.5**	**14.8**	**0.37** (0.16, 0.59)	<0.001	**28.1**	**27.0**	**-0.03** (-0.33, 0.28)
S (SLI score)	**37**	**38**	**0.20** (-0.02, 0.41)	0.07	**36**	**36**	**-0.09** (-0.39, 0.21)
sting glucose (mmol/l)	**5.2**	**5.7**	**1.49** (1.35, 1.64)	<0.001	**5.1**	**5.6**	**1.19** (0.93, 1.45)
-min glucose (mmol/l)	**7.8**	**8.9**	**0.81** (0.62, 1.01)	<0.001	**8.0**	**9.1**	**0.95** (0.68, 1.23)
0-min glucose (mmol/l)	**5.7**	**7.0**	**0.92** (0.73, 1.12)	<0.001	**6.0**	**7.9**	**1.39** (1.14, 1.63)
sting insulin (pmol/l)	**48.0**	**66.0**	**0.57** (0.36, 0.78)	<0.001	**63.0**	**66.6**	**0.22** (-0.08, 0.53)
-min insulin (pmol/l)	**477.0**	**477.6**	**0.07** (-0.13, 0.31)	0.54	**578.4**	**588.3**	**-0.16** (-0.52, 0.09)
0-min insulin (pmol/l)	**258.0**	**352.2**	**0.51** (0.30, 0.72)	<0.001	**360.0**	**579.6**	**0.84** (0.56, 1.13)
OMA-S	**97**	**69**	**-0.63** (-0.83, -0.42)	<0.001	**75**	**70**	**-0.26** (-0.57, 0.04)
OMA-β	**92**	**94**	**0.04** (-0.18, 0.26)	0.71	**117**	**110**	**-0.28** (-0.58, 0.03)
sposition Index (HOMA)	**84.2**	**64.3**	**-1.25** (-1.39, -1.01)	<0.001	**84.1**	**71.3**	**-0.98** (-1.24, -0.68)
ulinogenic Index[a]	**1.83**	**1.53**	**-0.49** (-0.70, -0.28)	<0.001	**1.77**	**1.53**	**-0.56** (-0.85, -0.26)
atsuda Index[b]	**15.4**	**11.3**	**-0.70** (-0.90, -0.50)	<0.001	**12.2**	**9.07**	**-0.69** (-0.98, -0.48)
sposition Index[c]	**4.56**	**4.02**	**-0.55** (-0.76, -0.34)	<0.001	**4.26**	**3.66**	**-0.84** (-1.13, -0.56)
YEARS							
ight (cm)	**138.9**	**137.4**	**-0.20** (-0.42, 0.02)	0.07	**139.6**	**139.1**	**-0.17** (-0.47, 0.14)
ΛI (kg/m^2)	**14.6**	**14.7**	**0.02** (-0.20, 0.23)	0.88	**14.4**	**14.2**	**-0.08** (-0.39, 0.22)
aist circumference (cm)	**57.2**	**57.2**	**0.02** (-0.21, 0.24)	0.89	**56.0**	**55.0**	**-0.36** (-0.67, -0.06)
t percentage (%)	**13.4**	**14.5**	**0.19** (-0.04, 0.41)	0.10	**17.8**	**17.1**	**-0.02** (-0.33, 0.3)
sting glucose (mmol/l)	**4.8**	**4.9**	**0.40** (0.19, 0.62)	<0.001	**4.7**	**5.1**	**0.82** (0.54, 1.11)
sting insulin (pmol/l)	**27.6**	**30.6**	**0.10** (-0.12, 0.32)	0.37	**34.0**	**34.5**	**-0.01** (-0.31, 0.3)
OMA-S	**165**	**153**	**-0.12** (-0.34, 0.10)	0.28	**138**	**134**	**-0.02** (-0.32, 0.28)
OMA-β	**71**	**73**	**-0.06** (-0.28, 0.16)	0.61	**90**	**80**	**-0.39** (-0.69, -0.09)
sposition Index (HOMA)[d]	**123**	**112**	**-0.33** (-0.54, -0.11)	0.003	**122**	**108**	**-0.58** (-0.88, -0.29)

	MEN					WOMEN				
	NGT (median)N=221	**Glucose intolerant** (median) N=131	**Difference (Z-score) Glucose intolerant - NGT**		**p**	**NGT** (median)N=213	**Glucose intolerant** (median) N=54	**Difference (Z-score) Glucose intolerant - NGT**		
			Mean	**(95% CI)**				**Mean**	**(95% CI)**	
/EARS										
ight (cm)	**110.0**	**110.0**	**0.01**	(-0.21, 0.23)	0.92	**109.4**	**108.2**	**-0.38**	(-0.67, -0.08)	
/I (kg/m^2)	**13.4**	**13.6**	**0.11**	(-0.11, 0.33)	0.32	**13.1**	**12.9**	**-0.33**	(-0.62, -0.03)	
aist circumference (cm)	**50.1**	**50.6**	**0.13**	(-0.09, 0.35)	0.24	**50.0**	**49.5**	**-0.38**	(-0.68, -0.08)	
t percentage (%)	**17.2**	**17.8**	**0.14**	(-0.08, 0.35)	0.22	**20.4**	**20.6**	**-0.01**	(-0.31, 0.29)	
sting glucose (mmol/l)	**4.94**	**5.16**	**0.44**	(0.23, 0.65)	<0.001	**4.77**	**4.93**	**0.31**	(0.01, 0.61)	
-min glucose (mmol/l)	**8.21**	**8.10**	**0.07**	(-0.16, 0.27)	0.52	**8.10**	**8.55**	**0.30**	(-0.03, 0.57)	
0-min glucose (mmol/l)	**5.27**	**5.49**	**0.24**	(0.03, 0.46)	0.03	**5.57**	**5.38**	**0.25**	(-0.05, 0.55)	
sting insulin (pmol/l)	**16.80**	**20.94**	**0.28**	(0.07, 0.49)	0.01	**20.04**	**18.84**	**-0.16**	(-0.46, 0.14)	
-min insulin (pmol/l)	**138.0**	**131.7**	**0.06**	(-0.19, 0.23)	0.60	**163.3**	**153.7**	**0.06**	(-0.19, 0.41)	
0-min insulin (pmol/l)	**47.8**	**58.4**	**0.20**	(-0.05, 0.39)	0.07	**66.1**	**61.6**	**0.06**	(-0.27, 0.33)	
OMA-S	**262**	**218**	**-0.30**	(-0.51, -0.08)	0.008	**225**	**239**	**0.13**	(-0.17, 0.43)	
OMA-β	**48**	**52**	**0.06**	(-0.16, 0.27)	0.62	**61**	**48**	**-0.23**	(-0.53, 0.06)	
sposition Index (HOMA)	**143**	**119**	**-0.48**	(-0.51, 0.08)	<0.001	**139**	**140**	**-0.11**	(-0.46, 0.15)	
ulinogenic Index[a]	**1.57**	**1.54**	**-0.18**	(-0.40, 0.04)	0.11	**1.54**	**1.58**	**0.18**	(-0.12, 0.48)	
atsuda Index[b]	**58.5**	**52.5**	**-0.27**	(-0.48, -0.05)	0.01	**46.8**	**51.5**	**0.03**	(-0.27, 0.33)	
isposition Index[c]	**6.8**	**6.7**	**-0.29**	(-0.51, 0.07)	0.008	**6.8**	**6.7**	**-0.04**	(-0.35, 0.29)	
/EARS										
ight (cm)	**82.2**	**82.0**	**-0.13**	(-0.35, 0.09)	0.24	**81.3**	**79.6**	**-0.36**	(-0.66, -0.07)	
eight (kg)	**9.9**	**9.8**	**-0.06**	(-0.28, 0.15)	0.58	**9.2**	**8.8**	**-0.45**	(-0.75, -0.16)	
RTH										
eight (g)	**2700**	**2700**	**-0.01**	(-0.23, 0.22)	0.99	**2550**	**2500**	**-0.19**	(-0.50, 0.11)	
ngth (cm)	**48.2**	**47.8**	**-0.17**	(-0.39, 0.04)	0.11	**47.4**	**47.0**	**-0.41**	(-0.70, -0.11)	
ad circumference (cm)	**33.4**	**33.2**	**-0.17**	(-0.39, 0.05)	0.12	**32.7**	**32.5**	**-0.10**	(-0.40, 0.20)	
station (days)	**273**	**272**	**-0.05**	(-0.27, 0.16)	0.64	**273**	**273**	**-0.19**	(-0.49, 0.1)	
OTHER	**N=221**	**N=130**				**N=213**	**N=54**			
sting glucose (mmol/l) in pregnancy 8-wk)	**3.9**	**4.0**	**0.14**	(-0.09, 0.38)	0.23	**3.8**	**3.8**	**0.07**	(-0.26, 0.40)	

	MEN					WOMEN			
	NGT (median)N=221	**Glucose intolerant** (median) N=131	**Difference (Z-score) Glucose intolerant - NGT**		**p**	**NGT** (median)N=213	**Glucose intolerant** (median) N=54	**Difference (Z-score) Glucose intolerant - NGT**	
			Mean	**(95% CI)**				**Mean**	**(95% CI)**
			Odds Ratio	**95% CI**	**p**			**Odds Ratio**	**95% CI**
egnancy glucose intolerance (FPG ≥ mmol/l)	**14 (6.3%)**	**15 (11.5%)**	**1.91**	(0.89, 4.10)	0.10	**19 (8.9%)**	**9 (16.7%)**	**2.04**	(0.87, 4.81)
st-natal glucose intolerance M+IFG+IGT)	**62 (28.1%)**	**52 (39.7%)**	**1.67**	(1.01, 2.64)	0.03	**53 (24.9%)**	**17 (31.5%)**	**1.38**	(0.66, 2.61)
er Overweight/Obese	**58 (26.2%)**	**23 (17.6%)**	**0.60**	(0.35, 1.02)	0.06	**46 (21.6%)**	**8 (14.8%)**	**0.63**	(0.28, 1.43)
THER	**N=221**	**N=131**				**N=212**	**N=54**		
er glucose intolerant M+IFG+IGT)	**113 (52.3%)**	**64 (48.9%)**	**0.91**	(0.59, 1.41)	0.68	**77 (36.2%)**	**30 (55.6%)**	**2.21**	(1.20, 4.04)
er Overweight/Obese	**81 (36.7%)**	**44 (33.6%)**	**0.87**	(0.59, 1.54)	0.56	**71 (33.3%)**	**19 (35.2%)**	**1.08**	(0.51, 1.90)

[a]ln{Insulin(30-minute/fasting)/Glucose(30-minute/fasting)};
[b]10000/√{Glucose fasting * Insulin fasting * mean glucose (F, 30min, 120min) * mean insulin (F, 30min, 120min)} (glucose in mmol/l; insulin in pmol/l);
[c]Insulinogenic index + ln(Matsuda index);
[d](HOMA-S X HOMA-β)/100;
BMI: Body Mass Index; HOMA: Homeostatic Model Assessment models, SD: Standard deviation, SES: Socio economic status, SLI: Standard of Living Index.

Table 2: Multivariate regression with outcome as glucose intolerance at 18 years

				95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
Predictors	**B**	**Sig.**	**Exp(B)**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Female sex (yes=1/no=0)	**-1.689**	**0.000**	**0.185**	**0.093**	**0.365**
Mother ever underweight (yes=1/no=0)	0.158	0.481	1.172	0.754	1.821
Father ever underweight (yes=1/no=0)	-0.011	0.961	0.989	0.639	1.531
Mother ever overweight (yes=1/no=0)	**-0.568**	**0.045**	**0.567**	**0.325**	**0.989**
Father ever overweight (yes=1/no=0)	-0.179	0.454	0.836	0.523	1.336
Maternal pregnancy glucose intolerance (yes=1/no=0)	**0.640**	**0.045**	**1.896**	**1.015**	**3.540**
Father of male child ever glucose intolerant (yes=1/no=0)	-0.307	0.222	0.735	0.449	1.204
Father of female child ever glucose intolerant (yes=1/no=0)	**0.729**	**0.028**	**2.073**	**1.082**	**3.972**
Birth length (cm)	**-0.109**	**0.014**	**0.897**	**0.822**	**0.978**
Fasting glucose at 6y (Z)	**0.354**	**0.001**	**1.425**	**1.163**	**1.744**
Height at 18y (cm)	-0.026	0.122	0.975	0.943	1.007
Fat % (Z, male)	**0.514**	**0.000**	**1.672**	**1.274**	**2.195**
Fat % (Z, female)	-0.049	0.767	0.952	0.689	1.315
SES at 18y (SLI score)	0.020	0.096	1.021	0.996	1.045
Constant	**10.094**	**0.001**	**24201.504**		

- Maternal post-natal glucose intolerance instead of pregnancy glucose intolerance showed no significant association
- Head circumference at birth instead of birth length: B: -0.160, P: 0.023 OR: 0.852, CI: 0.742-0.978; weight, abdominal circumference and sum of skinfolds at birth did not show significant associations.
- 12y fasting glucose instead of 6y fasting glucose: B: 0.606, P<0.001, OR: 1.833, CI: 1.482-2.266.

Figures:

Figure 1: The Pune Maternal Nutrition Study



Married, non-pregnant women were followed up in six villages near Pune, India. Those who became pregnant (singleton, less than 21 weeks) were enrolled during pregnancy. Maternal glucose tolerance was measured at 28 ±2 weeks' gestation. Babies (F1 generation) were measured at birth and every 6 months thereafter by detailed anthropometry. Comprehensive measurements of body size and composition, and glucose-insulin metabolic function were performed every six years in the children until age 18 years and in both parents (F0 generation) when the child was aged 6 and 12 years. USG: Ultrasonography; DEXA: Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry; OGTT: Oral Glucose Tolerance Test.

Figure 2:

Prevalence of glucose intolerance at 18 years according to fifths of fasting plasma glucose concentration at 6-years (2a, 2b, 2c) and 12-years (2d, 2e, 2f).



Figure 3:

ROC curves showing the prediction of glucose intolerance at 18 years (outcome) by 6-year and 12-year fasting plasma glucose, and other predictors, in the PMNS cohort



All predictors: Parental glucose intolerance, underweight & overweight/obesity, birth length, fasting glucose at 6y, child's SLI, height & DXA fat % at 18y, and sex
3 predictors: Birth length, , fasting glucose at 6y and sex
2 predictors: fasting glucose at 6y and sex



All predictors: Parental glucose intolerance, underweight & overweight/obesity, birth length, fasting glucose at 12y, child's SLI, height & DXA fat % at 18y, and sex
3 predictors: Birth length, , fasting glucose at 12y and sex
2 predictors: fasting glucose at 12y and sex

Supplementary Table 1: Cohort characteristics at 18, 12, 6 and 2 years, and newborn and fetal measurements

Measure	Statistic	MEN (n=352)	WOMEN (n=267)
18 YEARS			
Age (years)	Mean (SD)	**18.2** (0.5)	**17.7** (0.6)
Height (cm)	Mean (SD)	**169.6** (6.7)	**156.9** (5.9)
Stunted (WHO z<-2)	N (%)	**33** (9.4)	**28** (10.5)
Weight (kg)	Mean (SD)	**56.8** (10.7)	**46.0** (7.8)
Body Mass Index (BMI, kg/m^2)	Mean (SD)	**19.7** (3.3)	**18.7** (3.1)
Underweight[a]	N (%)	**146** (41.5)	**151** (56.6)
Overweight/Obese[b]	N (%)	**27** (7.7)	**11** (4.1)
Waist circumference (cm)	Mean (SD)	**72.9** (9.1)	**68.0** (6.8)
Central obesity[c]	N (%)	**21** (6.0)	**13** (4.9)
Fat mass (kg)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**7.1** (4.4, 11.8)	**12.1** (9.3, 15.2)
Lean mass (kg)	Mean (SD)	**44.5** (5.4)	**30.4** (3.5)
Fat percentage (%)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**13.1** (8.9, 20.4)	**28.0** (22.9, 31.9)
Adipose[d]	N (%)	**56** (16.1)	**41** (15.5)
Fasting glucose (mmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**5.4** (5.2, 5.6)	**5.2** (5.0, 5.3)
30-min glucose (mmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**8.2** (7.5, 9.4)	**8.3** (7.5, 9.0)
120-min glucose (mmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**6.1** (5.3, 7.0)	**6.3** (5.5, 7.0)
Fasting insulin (pmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**52.8** (39.0, 75.8)	**63.6** (49.2, 81.0)
30-min insulin (pmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**477.3** (331.1, 707.9)	**579.0** (391.2, 768.6)
120-min insulin (pmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**280.2** (177.0, 423.6)	**392.4** (249.6, 579.0)
Impaired fasting glucose (IFG)[e]	N (%)	**94** (26.7)	**23** (8.6)
Impaired gluc tolerance (IGT)[f]	N (%)	**37** (10.5)	**30** (11.2)
Diabetes[g]	N (%)	**0** (0)	**1** (0.4)
Glucose Intolerant (DM+IFG+IGT)	N (%)	**131** (37.2)	**54** (20.2)
HOMA-S	Median (LQ, UQ)	**86** (62, 118)	**73** (58, 95)
HOMA-β	Median (LQ, UQ)	**94** (75, 115)	**115** (94,133)
Insulinogenic index[h]	Median (LQ, UQ)	**1.7** (1.4, 2.1)	**1.7** (1.4, 2.1)
Matsuda index[i]	Median (LQ, UQ)	**13.3** (9.6, 19.2)	**11.6** (8.7, 14.9)
Disposition index (HOMA)[j]	Median (LQ, UQ)	**79** (68, 92)	**84** (74, 95)
Disposition index[k]	Median (LQ, UQ)	**4.3** (3.9, 4.9)	**4.1** (3.7, 4.6)

12 YEARS			
Height (cm)	Mean (SD)	**138.7** (8.5)	**140.2** (8.4)
BMI (kg/m^2)	Mean (SD)	**14.9** (1.7)	**14.7** (2.2)
Waist (cm)	Mean (SD)	**58.1** (5.4)	**56.3** (5.3)
Fat percentage (%)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**13.8** (11.1, 17.4)	**17.5** (14.3, 22.2)
Fasting glucose (mmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**4.9** (4.6, 5.1)	**4.7** (4.5, 5.1)
Fasting insulin (pmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**28.2** (18.0, 40.8)	**34.0** (24.5, 47.2)
HOMA-S	Median (LQ, UQ)	**161** (116, 249)	**138** (101, 190)
HOMA-β	Median (LQ, UQ)	**72** (51, 92)	**88** (71, 108)
Disposition index (HOMA)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**120** (102, 141)	**120** (102, 140)
6 YEARS			
Height (cm)	Mean (SD)	**110.3** (4.8)	**109.3** (4.3)
BMI (kg/m^2)	Mean (SD)	**13.5** (0.8)	**13.2** (0.9)
Waist (cm)	Mean (SD)	**50.4** (2.6)	**50.1** (2.6)
Fat percentage (%)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**17.5** (13.9, 20.5)	**20.4** (17.6, 23.9)
Fasting glucose (mmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**5.1** (4.7, 5.3)	**4.8** (4.6, 5.2)
30-min glucose (mmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**8.2** (6.9, 9.3)	**8.1** (7.2, 9.2)
120-min glucose (mmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**5.4** (4.6, 6.2)	**5.6** (4.9, 6.3)
Fasting insulin (pmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**17.9** (9.1, 27.3)	**19.6** (9.7, 30.8)
30-min insulin (pmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**136.1** (86.1, 197.9)	**161.5** (18,37)
120-min insulin (pmol/l)	Median (LQ, UQ)	**49.9** (27.2, 81.6)	**64.8** (37.6, 103.7)
HOMA-S	Median (LQ, UQ)	**249** (167, 448)	**228** (149, 440)
HOMA-β	Median (LQ, UQ)	**50** (33, 71)	**60** (37, 81)
Insulinogenic index[h]	Median (LQ, UQ)	**1.6** (1.1, 2.1)	**1.5** (1.1, 2.1)
Matsuda index[i]	Median (LQ, UQ)	**55.4** (36.0, 80.2)	**47.5** (32.7, 69.2)
Disposition index (HOMA)[j]	Median (LQ, UQ)	**129** (105, 157)	**137** (107, 173)
Disposition index[k]	Median (LQ, UQ)	**6.8** (6.4, 7.1)	**6.8** (6.5, 7.1)
2 YEARS			
Height (cm)	Mean (SD)	**82.3** (3.4)	**80.8** (3.2)
Weight (kg)	Mean (SD)	**9.9** (1.1)	**9.2** (1.1)

BIRTH			
Birth weight (g)	Mean (SD)	**2700** (365)	**2550** (371)
Birth length (cm)	Mean (SD)	**47.8** (2.4)	**47.1** (2.2)
Head circumference (cm)	Mean (SD)	**33.3** (32.3, 34.1)	**32.7** (31.8, 33.5)
Gestation (days)	Mean (SD)	**271** (12)	**272** (11)
SGA	N (%)	**169** (48)	**134** (50.2)
MOTHER (pre-pregnancy)		**N=352**	**N=267**
Height (cms)	Mean (SD)	**151.9** (5.03)	**151.8** (4.8)
BMI (kg/m^2)	Mean (SD)	**18.1** (1.8)	**17.9** (1.9)
FATHER (during wife's pregnancy)		**N=334**	**N=254**
Height (cms)	Mean (SD)	**164.5** (6.6)	**165.6** (5.3)
BMI (kg/m^2)	Mean (SD)	**21.0** (3.2)	**20.7** (3.2)

[a]BMI <18.5 kg/m^2; [b]BMI ≥25 kg/m^2; [c]Waist circumference ≥90 cm in men and ≥80 cm in women; [d]Fat percent (DXA) ≥25% (men) and ≥35% (women); [e]Fasting glucose 100-125 mg/dl (5.6-6.9 mmol/l) (ADA criteria); [f]120-minute glucose 140-199 mg/dl (7.8-11.0 mmol/l) (ADA criteria); [g]Fasting glucose ≥126 mg/dl (7.0 mmol/l) and/or 120-minute glucose ≥200 mg/dl (11.1 mmol/l) (ADA criteria); [h]ln{Insulin(30-minute/fasting)/Glucose(30-minute/fasting)}; [i]10000/√{Glucose fasting * Insulin fasting * mean glucose (F, 30min, 120min) * mean insulin (F, 30min, 120min)} (glucose in mmol/l; insulin in pmol/l); [j](HOMA-S X HOMA-β)/100; [k]Insulinogenic index + ln(Matsuda index). BMI: Body Mass Index; HOMA: Homeostatic Model Assessment models, SD: Standard deviation, LQ: Lower Quadrant, UQ: Upper Quadrant, IUGR: Intra-Uterine Growth Restriction, SGA: Small for Gestation Age.

Supplementary Table 2: Methods for anthropometry, sonography and body composition measurements in children

Anthropometry			
Measurement	Time point	Method	Least count
Weight	Within 72 hours of birth	Salter spring balance (Salter Abbey, Suffolk, U.K.)	Nearest 50 g
	6 monthly intervals up to 18 years	Electronic weighing scales (ATCO Healthcare Ltd, Mumbai, India)	Nearest 10 g
Crown heel length (Supine)	Within 72 hours of birth and 6 monthly upto 2 years	Portable Pedobaby Babymeter (ETS J.M.B., Brussels, Belgium)	Nearest 0.1 cm
Standing height	6 monthly intervals from 2- 5 years	Portable Harpenden stadiometer (Microtoise, CMS Instruments Ltd, London, UK)	Nearest 0.1 cm
	6 monthly intervals from 5-18 years	Wall-mounted stadiometer (Microtoise, CMS Instruments Ltd, London, UK)	Nearest 0.1 cm
Ultrasonography measurements			
Fetal Biometry	Intrauterine at 18, 28 and 34 weeks	Fetal biparietal diameter, head circumference, femur length, abdominal circumference on Aloka SSD 500, version 8.1	Nearest 0.1 cm for all measurements
Body composition by Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (DXA)			
Total fat and lean mass; % body fat	6, 12 year follow up in children	Lunar DPX-IQ 240, Lunar Corporation, Madison, USA	NA
	18 year follow up	Lunar Prodigy, GE Healthcare, Madison, USA	NA

Supplementary Table 3: **Quality assessment for glucose and insulin measurements in the Pune Maternal Nutrition Study (1993- 2013).**

	1994-97	**2000-02**	**2006-08**	**2013-14**
Glucose measurement				
Method	GOD-POD	GOD-POD	GOD-POD	GOD-POD
Equipment	Spectrum; Abbott, Irving, TX	Spectrum; Abbott, Irving, TX	Alcyon; Abbott, Irving, TX	Hitachi 902, Roche Diagnostics GmbH, Germany
Centrifugation temperature	Room temperature	Room temperature	4°C	4°C
Processed on	Same day	Same day	Same day	Same day
Internal QC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Internal CV (%)	<3	<3	<3	<3
External QC	NA	NA	BioRad EQAS	BioRad EQAS
EQAS CV (%)	NA	NA	3.4	2.7
Insulin measurements				
Method	1-step chemiluminescent immunoenzymatic assay*	2 site fluoroimmunometric assay	2 site fluoroimmunometric assay	ELISA
Equipment	Access Immunoassay System (Sanofi Pasteur Diagnostics, Chaska, Minn)	Delfia technique	Delfia technique	Mercodia AB, SE-754 50 Uppsala, Sweden
Centrifugation temperature	Room temperature	Room temperature	4°C	4°C
Sensitivity	2.3 pM/L	3 pM/L	3 pM/L	6 pM/L
Calibrated against	WHO 1st IRP (66/304)	WHO 1st IRP (66/304)	WHO 1st IRP (66/304)	WHO 1st IRP (66/304)
Internal QC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Internal CV	NA	NA	7.7%.	6.7%
External QC	No	UKEQAS	UKEQAS	UKEQAS
External CV	NA	<20 pM/L: 8.9% 45-90 pM/L: 6.8%	<20 pM/L: 8.2% 20-45 pM/L: 6.9% >45 pM/L: 8.6%	<20 pM/L: 6.4% 20-45 pM/L: 7.6% >45 pM/L: 5.5%

Supplementary figure 1: STROBE flow diagram for the Pune Maternal Nutrition Study.



Legend: #: The mothers of the 619 participants who had an OGTT at 18 years were similar in height and education at baseline to the 1,847 of 2,466 women who did not become pregnant during the initial study and hence did not get enrolled in the PMNS, $p > 0.05$ for both. $: The 619 participants who had an OGTT at 18 years were similar to the 103 who did not have an OGTT, in birth length and birth weight, $p > 0.05$ for both. Their parents were similar in socioeconomic status (SLI Median 27 in both, $p > 0.05$). OGTT: Oral Glucose Tolerance Test.

Supplementary figure 2: Comparative sizes across lifecourse of participants with glucose intolerance



Plots show comparative size (height and BMI expressed as Z scores) of men and women with glucose intolerance at age 18 years relative to those with normal glucose tolerance (represented by the 0 line). Z scores were derived using the WHO growth reference. The dark line represents the median and the dashed lines represent 95% confidence intervals.

Supplementary figure 3: Predictive probablity of glucose intolerance at 18 years in PMNS



Figure 3a and 3b show the predicted probability of glucose intolerance at 18 years according to FPG at 6- and 12-years respectively. The predictive equation generated using sex and FPG for the pooled data was

$$Y = \frac{\exp(c+ß1*\text{sex}+ß2*\text{FPG at 6y or 12y})}{1+\exp(c+ß1*\text{sex}+ß2*\text{FPG at 6y or 12y})}$$

For 6 years: Y = exp(-3.933-0.72*sex+0.045*FPG at 6y) ÷ {1+ exp(-3.933-0.72*sex+0.045*FPG at 6y)}.
For 12 years: Y = exp(-7.24-0.75*sex+0.084*FPG at 12y) ÷ {1+ exp(-7.24-0.75*sex+0.084*FPG at 12y)}.

Supplementary figure 4: Glucose intolerance in the PCS and Extended PMNS cohorts



Figures 4a and 4b show the prevalence of glucose intolerance at 21y in the PCS and at 18y in the extended PMNS cohort according to thirds of fasting plasma glucose at 8y and 12y respectively. Figures 4c and 4d show the predicted probability of glucose intolerance at 21y (PCS) and 18y (Extended PMNS) obtained by applying the prediction equation generated in the PMNS.