Optimality scores for the neurological examination of healthy infants at age 6 and 10 weeks in the Tshwane District of South Africa

***Marna Nel[1,2,3], Ute Feucht[1,2,4], Helen Mulol[1,2,4], Carina Eksteen[3]**

[1]Research Centre for Maternal, Foetal, Newborn and Child Health Care Strategies, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

[2]Maternal and Infant Health Care Strategies Research Unit, South African Medical Research Unit, Pretoria, South Africa

[3]Department of Physiotherapy, Sefako Makgatho Health Science University, Ga-Rankuwa, South Africa

[4]Department of Paediatrics, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

***Corresponding author**:

E-mail:mnfis@mweb.co.za

Abstract

Background

The neurodevelopmental progress of infants (age below 3 months) is globally not well described, and a lack of published data on normative values of child development in this age group has been identified. In South Africa, the description of neurodevelopmental characteristics of infants at well-baby 6- and 10-week visits are omitted from the 'Road to Health Booklet', a nationally used patient-held clinical record. The neurodevelopmental status of infants in these age groups is thus not routinely monitored and the data is not documented. Important changes occur in the maturation of the central nervous system of infants at 6 weeks that signify this age as an important milestone for monitoring neurodevelopmental progress.

Methodology and findings

A prospective longitudinal study was performed on a sample of 35 term-born healthy, infants from low-risk pregnancies at 6- and 10-weeks postnatal age in the Tshwane District, South Africa. The Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination systematically recorded the status of posture, tone, reflexes, movements, orientation and behaviour in these age groups. Compound and total examination optimal scores were derived from raw scores of 34 neurological items in the proforma evaluation form by using cut-off points on the 5th, $10^{th,}$ and 90th percentiles. Infants who attended both the 6- and 10-week clinic visits were included. This study quantitatively confirmed consistent patterns of characteristic change occurring in muscle tone, posture, and visual behaviour of infants between 6 and 10 weeks.

Conclusion and significance

This study successfully recorded data on the neurodevelopmental assessment of infants from low-risk pregnancies at 6- and 10-weeks post-term age in Tshwane District, South Africa. The compound

and total examination optimality scores obtained in this study can presently guide health care professionals using this method of examination in the early identification of adverse neurological signs in such young infants.

Introduction

Neurodevelopmental progress in early infancy (age below 3 months) is globally not well described. Adverse maternal and foetal factors leading to stillbirth e.g., placental insufficiency, are often the cause of morbidities such as foetal growth restriction, premature birth, and neonatal encephalopathy in surviving and high-risk infants (1-7). These conditions are associated with insults to the foetal and neonatal brain and result in altered neural pathways from an early age leading to deviant neonatal behaviour, impaired neurological maturation, and neurodevelopmental delays (8-15).

Developing countries are burdened with high numbers of young children who fail to reach their developmental potential (16, 17). Hence, health care professionals are urgently called to identify at-risk infants and contribute to sustainable early childhood intervention by addressing and limiting adverse short- and long-term development sequelae in surviving and high-risk infants (7, 14, 16, 18-26).

The development of infants beyond the neonatal period, in particular at the 6- and 10-week postnatal age intervals, has been found to lack standardised normative values and detailed descriptions of milestone characteristics. In a follow-up study of healthy term infants, Guzzetta et al., (2005) described changes that occurred between birth and 3- to 10-weeks post-term age in the domains of *muscle tone*, *posture*, and *visual orientation*. The characteristics of change identified in these domains emphasized that the 6-weeks post-term age provides notable information and guidance that may enable health care professionals to identify and document the neurological maturation of infants beyond the neonatal period (27).

In South Africa (SA) health professionals use the patient-held clinical record called the 'Road-to-Health booklet' (RtHB) to document child growth, immunization and developmental progress during routine postnatal follow-up visits at primary healthcare facilities (28). This RtHB is incomplete in its

description of developmental milestones for infants aged 6 and 10 weeks. The public health sector in SA provides services to approximately 84% of its 55 million people and the current birth rate per woman is 2.4% (29). This means that a great number of infants in the age groups 6- and 10-weeks are not routinely monitored in terms of their neurodevelopmental progress and data regarding their neurological maturation process is therefore not documented (30).

The specific characteristics in the RtHB that describe the neurodevelopment in the domains of *hearing/communication, vision/visual adaptation, cognition/ behaviour, motor skills,* and *the measurement of head circumference* for 6- and 10-week-old term infants have not yet been included in this RtHB (28).

The repertoire of neurodevelopmental characteristics omitted from the RtHB correlates with the domains of infant neurodevelopment contained in the Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination (HNNE) (31). Dubowitz et al., (1980) developed the HNNE in which the fundamental characteristics in the domains of *posture and tone, tone patterns, reflexes, movements, abnormal signs* and *orientation and behaviour* of newborn term infant development are illustrated and described (31, 32). The tool's optimality scoring system, not only enabled a quantitative association of prenatal motor activity with optimal scores in the domains of *reflexes* and *movement patterns* in newborn infants from low-risk pregnancies but also predicted neurodevelopmental disability at one year (9, 33, 34). Normative data based on the HNNE optimality scoring system is available for preterm infants at term equivalent-, late preterm-, term-, and 4-weeks post-term age (15, 35-39).

The assessment instrument (HNNE) was developed in a high-middle-income country (HMIC) and has been standardised against predominant Caucasian populations (33, 40). Discrepancies in optimality scores were demonstrated between low-risk term-born infants in low-resource settings in Uganda and Ghana and the low-risk term-born infant population in the United Kingdom (UK) where the optimality scoring system was originally developed (41, 42).

The differences in the distribution of the scores in the developmental domains of infants raised the question of the validity of the original HNNE optimality scores for infants in developing countries (41-43). Nevertheless, the test continued to successfully indicate deviating performance in high-risk neonatal populations (38, 44-46), and provided neurodevelopmental screening in various developing countries; in conditions where resources were limited (41-43, 47, 48).

Further studies were recommended for infants from varying populations whose development can be longitudinally monitored to establish reliable normative global data for this age range (27, 33, 42). Population-level markers, such as optimality scores, for infants in the age groups 6- and 10 weeks from developing countries may enable health care professionals' effective monitoring of infant neurodevelopment during this window period, making timeous intervention at an early stage possible (22, 23, 25, 49).

Therefore, the first aim of this study was to assess and attribute scores to the distribution of neuro-behavioural characteristics of healthy 6- and 10-week term infants born from mothers with low-risk pregnancies according to SA ante-natal guidelines(50) in the Tshwane District in SA by implementing the HNNE. The second aim was to apply the HNNE optimality scoring system to the raw scores (RSs) obtained by this cohort of 6- and 10-week term infants. To our knowledge, no data of its kind in this age group has previously been documented.

Material and Methods

A prospective, longitudinal descriptive study was undertaken to assess and attribute RSs to the distribution of the neuro-behavioural characteristics of 6- and 10-week-old infants in Tshwane

District, SA between October 2019 and June 2020. Secondly, the HNNE optimality scoring system was applied to convert the frequency distribution of the RSs to optimality scores.

Study population

A non-probability purposive sample of thirty-five (35) infants that formed part of an ongoing ante-, peri-, and postnatal investigation - i.e., Umbiflow International Study and the UmbiBaby Study - were selected for participation in this study. Permissions to conduct the Umbiflow International study and the UmbiBaby study were obtained through the University of Pretoria Research Ethics Committee (reference nos. and 228/2018 and 283/2019, respectively) as well as institutional permissions from the relevant health services. Only thirty-five of 81 term-born infants participating in the UmbiBaby Study (19 males; 16 females) who attended both their 6- and 10-week neurological assessments were included in this part of the study.

The infants were born to mothers who were prospectively enrolled in the Umbiflow Study that screened an unselected population of women with low-risk pregnancies (according to SA antenatal guidelines) (50). The women were screened in the third trimester of their pregnancy (between 28 and 34 weeks) using the low-cost continuous-wave Doppler ultrasound device (Umbiflow^{TM}), developed by the South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC) and Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) (51, 52).

For the infant follow-up study mothers in Tshwane District were approached around the time of birth at Pretoria West Hospital, Laudium Community Health Centre, and Kalafong Provincial Tertiary Hospital. The mothers of the infants in this study gave written informed consent to participate in the UmbiBaby Study as a mother-infant pair at the 6-week postnatal clinic visit. The mother-infant pair was followed up at the University of Pretoria's Research Centre for Maternal, Foetal, Newborn and Child Health Care Strategies at Kalafong Hospital for their 6- and 10-week routine postnatal clinic visits.

The inclusion criteria were infants: 1) from mothers with singleton pregnancies; 2) born to mothers with low-risk pregnancies according to local antenatal care guidelines; 3) with known gestational ages, calculated during the Umbiflow Study; 4) who attended both 6- and 10-week clinic visits. The exclusion criteria were infants born to mothers: 1) younger than 18 years of age; 2) infants with chromosomal, structural abnormalities or severe medical conditions.

The neurological assessments were administered by scoring the neuro-behavioural characteristics of the 35 healthy term-born infants at 6- and 10-weeks postnatal age who attended both follow-up assessments. Demographic and nutritional information of the mother-infant pairs were also collected at every visit as part of the ongoing UmbiBaby investigation. The HNNE was administered by a single qualified physiotherapist experienced in administering and interpreting the assessment tool. The therapist is a presenter of the post-basic continuing professional development course called *Exploring Infant Behaviour*. This course aims at training health care professionals in administering and interpreting the HNNE based on infant behaviour, as described by Brazelton and Nugent, (1995) in the Neonatal Behavioural Assessment Scale (NBAS).

Assessment instrument

The HNNE is a standardised assessment instrument developed to assess the neurological state of newborn term infants in the first 48 hours after birth. The assessment was developed in the UK (53) and has subsequently been used in clinical and research settings for nearly 40 years (31). The assessment proforma was modified to its current form with the addition of an ‘optimality scoring system’ which was validated on 224 low-risk term infants in the UK within 48 hours after birth (33). To date, optimality scores have been determined and published for preterm, late preterm infant populations at term-equivalent age, and term infants at 4-weeks postnatal age (35-39). Normative data and subsequently optimality scores have not yet been published for term infants beyond this age. In conjunction with neuroimaging and neurophysiological techniques, the HNNE discriminated

between clinical patterns associated with neurological conditions such as hypoxic ischaemic encephalopathy, periventricular leukomalacia and intra-ventricular haemorrhage (31). The HNNE's correlation with other instruments and predictive validity showed total factor scores of F92.42 = 8.7; $p < 0.001$; R2 = 0.71 (40). This examination tool is suitable for clinical application with an administration time of 10 – 15 minutes and interrater reliability of 96% (31, 43, 54). The instrument does not require formal training or certification and can be self-taught through the Hammersmith Neurological Examination website (55).

This examination consists of 34 items that are characteristic of the functional state of the newborn infant's central nervous system. These characteristics are categorised in six domains known as *compounds*: 1) *posture and tone, 2) tone patterns, 3) reflexes, 4) spontaneous movements, 5) abnormal neurological signs,* and *6) orientation and behaviour* (33).

Raw Scores: The items are scored in a standard proforma according to a five-point scale. The description of different responses and characteristics for each item are distributed horizontally over five columns. The column that represents the predominant behaviour of the infant for each item, is circled and scored according to the number of columns 1 to 5. Half-scores are appropriate if the infant's performance falls between the description of two columns (e.g., a score of 2.5 if the infant displays characteristics between that of columns 2 and 3) These scores are defined as RSs. The RSs are not linear and the *'optimal score'* for each of the 34 items depended on the frequency distribution of RSs per item for the original study population. For example, for the posture item, a score of 1 to 2 would indicate decreased muscle tone, a score of 3 and 4 would be normal tone and a score of 5 would indicate increased muscle tone.

The distribution of the whole population was plotted for each item, and the 5th/95th and 10th/90th percentiles were used as cut-off points. Items falling between the 10th to 90th percentile were given a score of 1, between the 5th/10th or 90th/95th percentiles a score of 0.5, and below/above the

5th/95th percentile respectively, a score of 0. For the infants at 6- and 10-weeks post-term age in this study population, the same optimality scoring system was applied to their individual RSs (31).

Compound Scores: Compound scores were calculated for each of the 6 domains: *posture and tone, tone patterns, reflexes, spontaneous movements, abnormal neurological signs,* and *orientation and behaviour*. The compound optimality score for each domain is the sum of the optimality scores for the individual items in the particular domain. This score may range from 0 (if all the items in the compound are *sub-optimal*) to a maximum score equal to the number of items in the particular compound if every item in the domain is *optimal* with a score of 1 (33).

Total score: The total optimality score for the whole examination is the sum of the optimality scores of the 34 individual items. This score may range from 0 (if all the items are *sub-optimal*) to a maximum of 34 (if all the items are *optimal*). The distribution of the compound scores and total optimality scores were described as *optimal* when they fell above the 10th percentile, and *borderline* between the 5th and 10th percentile and *sub-optimal* below the 5thpercentile (33).

Clinical Examination

The environmental conditions in which the assessment was performed were controlled for noise, bright light, and temperature. Because the assessment elicited variable behavioural responses in the infants, it was performed with all infants in a baseline behavioural state 4 (quiet alert state) (56). The assessment was also done halfway between feeds to ensure comparable behaviour amongst infants as far as possible. The infants were examined on a flat wooden table with a thin mat for comfort but assuring a firm and comfortable surface for bony areas, e.g., the occiput during rolling of the head from side to side. After uncovering the infant (only the diaper was left on), the evaluation started with a short period (two minutes) of observing posture and spontaneous movement in the supine position. The characteristics of the items such as *posture and tone* of the head, trunk and limbs in supine, and the *quality and quantity of spontaneous movement* were assessed during this time.

To ensure optimal performance of the infant in a quiet state, the items for *eye appearance, auditory, visual orientation and alertness* in the *orientation and behaviour* domains were scored following the assessment of *posture* and *spontaneous movement*. By doing so, the scoring was not influenced by physical and tactile input that formed an essential part of the rest of the assessment. This sequence in performing the assessment enabled the examiner to successfully complete the assessment, noting the triggers in the infant's *irritability* and *crying* behaviour. The *Moro reflex* was administered at the end of the assessment as infants are often startled by their own response and may then be difficult to console. The assessment ended with the measurement of the infant's *head circumference*.

The findings for each item in the domains of *posture and tone, tone patterns, reflexes, spontaneous movements, abnormal neurological signs,* and *orientation and behaviour* were scored during the examination. The duration of the assessment was between 10 - 15 minutes but depended on the infants' behavioural state and responses. The infants' *consolability* (strategies required to be consoled), the intensity of the *cry* and general *irritability* (response to the handling and physical challenges of the examination) were assessed throughout the examination and were scored last.

Results

The bio-demographic data of the participating mother-infant pairs in this study are shown in Table 1. The infants resided in formal (60%) and informal settlements (40%) in the Tshwane District. The majority (60%) were delivered by Caesarean section and 40% were delivered through normal vaginal delivery. The mean gestational age- and sex-normalised z-scores for weight, length and head circumference were assessed at birth using the INTERGROWTH – 21st Newborn Size at Birth standard (57). Age- and sex-normalised and weight, length, head circumference and weight-for-length z-scores were assessed at 6 and 10 weeks using the WHO child growth standards (58). The mean z-scores for infant anthropometry at birth, 6 and 10 weeks all lay between -1 and +1, indicating

that the majority of the infants fell within the range for optimal growth (i.e. between the z-scores of -2 and +2). The average chronological ages at the follow-up assessments (i.e., mean time since birth) were 6.4 and 10.4 weeks, respectively. Twenty-five percent (25.7%) of mothers were HIV-infected, however, none of the infants in the study tested HIV positive.

Table 1. Bio-demographic data of the mother-infant pairs in this study population.

	Birth	**6-week visit**	**10-week visit**
	n = 35	**n = 35**	**n = 35**
Infant sex, M/F	19/16	-	-
Gestational age at birth*, w (UmbiflowTM value)	39.2 ± 1.4	-	-
Mode of delivery	-	-	-
Normal vaginal delivery, n (%)	14 (40)	-	-
Caesarean section before labour, n (%)	6 (17.1)	-	-
Caesarean section during labour, n (%)	15 (42.9)	-	-
Apgar score at 5 minutes	-	-	-
0 – 6, n (%)	1 (2.9)	-	-
7 – 10, n (%)	34 (97.1)	-	-
Foetal distress, n (%)	5 (14.3)	-	-
Chronological age at assessment*, w	-	6.4 ± 0.6	10.4 ± 0.6
Weight*, kg	3.11 ± 0.6	4.9 ± 0.7	5.85 ± 0.8
Head circumference*, cm	34.7 ± 1.6	38.9 ± 1.4	40.5 ± 1.4
Length*, cm	50.0 ± 3.0	54.8 ± 2.6	58.6 ± 2.8
Weight for age Z-score*	0.24 ± 0.26	0.09 ± 1.17	0.12 ± 1.16
Head circumference for age Z-score*	0.85 ± 1.21	0.73 ± 1.24	0.98 ± 1.14
Length for age Z-score*	0.58 ± 1.60	0.74 ± 1.31	- 0.27 ± 1.36
Weight for length Z-score*	-	0.86 ± 1.33	0.61 ± 1.09
Mode of feeding	-	-	-
Breast, n (%)	27 (77.1)	26 (74,3)	24 (68,6)
Mixed, n (%)	6 (17.1)	6 (17.1)	7 (20.0)
Bottle, n (%)	2 (5.7)	3 (8.6)	4 (11.4)
Maternal age*, y	29.4 ± 5.7	-	-
Gravidity**	2 (1 – 5)	-	-
Maternal HIV status positive, n (%)	9 (25.7)	-	-
Description of neighbourhood	-	-	-
Formal settlement, n (%)	21 (60)	-	-
Informal settlement, n (%)	14 (40)	-	-

*Mean ± SD

** Median (range)

Abbreviations: SD = standard deviation; M = male; F = female; w = weeks; y = years; kg = kilograms; cm = centimetres

Clinical examination results

The 34 items of the HNNE proforma are illustrated in Figures 1 to 5, reflecting the 6 *compounds* of the examination (31). The distribution of RSs for all items at 6 and 10 weeks respectively and the percentage of infants who scored each RS are illustrated by a small table on the right side of every item. The distribution of RSs was determined by the frequency in which the characteristics were displayed in the performance of the infant in each of the 34 items. The scores that were frequently obtained by infants in both age groups and that were considered optimal (10th – 90th centile) by a score of 1, are indicated in the dark-grey areas. The light-grey columns indicate those RSs that were considered sub-optimal (5th – 10th/ 90th – 95th centile), by a score of 0.5. The RSs that fell outside the grey areas are considered non-optimal and therefore scored 0 (Figs. 1 – 5).

Compound optimality (summation of individual item optimality scores) and the total optimality score (summation of the 34 individual item optimality scores) ranges, mean values, standard deviations and percentages for the whole population at 6- and 10-weeks postnatal age are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Compound and total optimality scores for healthy term infants at 6- and 10- weeks post-term age (n = 35)

Compounds	Age (w*)	Range	Mean	SD	5th	10th	90th	95th	Optimal score (%)
1. Posture & tone	6 10	8 – 10 8 – 10	9.49 9.71	0.72 0.52	8 8.7	8 9.2	10 10	10 10	92 95
2. Tone patterns	6 10	4 – 5 4 – 5	4.87 4.97	0.61 0.17	4 5	4.5 5	5 5	5 6	95 99
3. Reflexes	6 10	3 – 6 3 – 6	5.68 5.80	0.71 0.62	4 4.7	5 5.5	6 6	6 6	93 97
4. Spontaneous movements	6 10	1.5 – 3 1 – 3	2.87 2.83	0.35 0.51	2 1.7	2.5 2.4	3 3	3 3	94 93
5. Abnormal signs	6 10	1 – 3 1.5 – 3	2.89 2.83	0.40 0.51	2 1.5	3 2.2	3 3	3 7	94 92
6. Orientation & behaviour	6 10	3 – 7 5 – 7	6.50 6.74	1.12 0.51	3.7 5.85	5.1 6	7 7	7 7	93 96
Total	6 10	24.5 – 34 29 – 34	32.13 32.89	2.34 1.25	27.8 30.7	29.2 31.2	34 34	34 34	94 94

*w = weeks postnatal age

Posture and tone

The frequency distribution of RSs in this domain was different for each of the 10 items at both 6 and 10 weeks (Fig. 1). Median score shifts of one column to the left from 6 weeks to 10 weeks indicated characteristics of diminished flexion posture and lesser resistance of upper limbs to traction and passive extension. Median score shifts of one to two columns involving flexor and extensor head control in sitting and extensor control in horizontal occurred to the right from 6 weeks to 10 weeks. The compound optimality scores for *posture and tone* ranged from 8 – 10 out of 10 at both 6 and 10 weeks. These scores were achieved by 92% of the total population of infants at the 6-week and 95% at the 10-week postnatal age. Scores below 8 at 6 weeks and below 9 at 10 weeks were considered sub-optimal (Table 2).

Tone patterns

Scores in this domain of the HNNE were obtained by comparing the RSs of selected individual items of limb tone and head control patterns from the *tone and posture* compound (Fig. 2). At 6 weeks 95% of infants scored ≥4.5 out of 5 and at 10 weeks 99% scored 5 out of 5. The distribution and median scores at 6 and 10 weeks were consistent in all 5 items. A compound optimality score below 4.5 at 6 weeks and below 5 at 10 weeks was considered sub-optimal (Table 2).

Reflexes

Palmar grasp RSs at 10 weeks were more widely distributed and showed a median score shift of two columns to the left on the proforma examination form indicating a diminished reflex response towards 10 weeks (Fig. 3). The compound optimality score for *reflexes* ranged between 3 – 6 out of 6 in both the 6 and 10-week age groups. Scores between 5 and 6 were found in 93% of infants at 6 weeks and 97% in infants at 10 weeks. Therefore, a compound optimality score below 5 was considered sub-optimal (Table 2).

Posture and tone



Figure 1. Raw score distribution of *posture and tone* items. Scores that were frequently obtained by infants in each age group and considered optimal (10th – 90th centile) by a score of 1, are indicated in the dark-grey areas in the small tables on the right of the HNNE proforma (55). The light-grey columns indicate RSs considered sub-optimal (5th – 10th/ 90th – 95th centile), by a score of 0.5. Non-optimal RSs that fell outside the grey areas, scored 0. The cell with the highlighted border represents the median score. *The same scoring principle applies to Figures 1 – 5* (33).

Tone patterns

		column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5
Flexor tone 1	**On arm and leg traction**	Arm flexion < leg flexion	Arm flexion = leg flexion	Arm flexion> leg flexion but difference 1 column or <	Arm flexion > leg flexion and difference > than 1 column
Flexor tone 2	**In supine**		Arms and legs generally flexed	Strong arm flexion with strong leg extension intermittent	Strong arm flexion with strong leg extension continuous
Leg ext. tone	**Leg traction vs pop. angle**	Leg traction > than popliteal angle	Leg traction = popliteal angle	Leg traction < popliteal angle but difference 1 column <	Leg traction < popliteal angle and difference > than 1 column
Neck ext. tone	**Neck in ext. vs neck in flexion**	Head extension < head flexion	Head extension = head flexion	Head extension >head flexion. but difference 1 column <	Head extension >head flexion and difference > than 1 column
Inc. ext. tone	**Vent susp vs head lag**	Ventral suspension < head lag	Ventral suspension = head lag	Ventr suspension > head lag but difference 1 column <	Ventr suspension> head lag and difference > than 1 column

	1	.5	2	.5	3	.5	4	.5	5	
Flexor tone 1	0	0	29	0	69	0	2	0	0	6w
	0	0	37	0	60	0	3	0	0	10w
Flexor tone 2	0	0	3	0	94	0	3	0	0	6w
	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	10w
Leg ext. tone	0	0	20	0	54	0	26	0	0	6w
	0	0	29	0	54	0	17	0	0	10w
Neck ext. tone	0	0	3	0	88	0	9	0	0	6w
	0	0	3	0	97	0	0	0	0	10w
Inc. ext. tone	0	0	37	0	43	0	17	0	3	6w
	0	0	34	0	26	0	40	0	0	10w

Figure 2. Raw score distribution of *tone pattern* items. See score description under Fig.1.

Movements

The *head-in-prone* item at 10 weeks displayed a wider distribution towards the right from the mutual median RS. The compound optimality score for *movements* ranged from 1.5 to 3 out of 3 at 6 weeks and 1 to 3 out of 3 at 10 weeks (Fig. 4). The optimal score of ≥2.5 was achieved by 94% of infants at 6 weeks and 93% of infants at 10 weeks. A score below 2.5 was considered sub-optimal in both age groups (Table 2).

Abnormal signs

The median RS for tremors at 10 weeks shifted two columns towards the left from the 6-week median score. The median RS for startle behaviour at 10 weeks demonstrated a one-column shift to the right from the 6-week median score (Fig. 4). The compound optimality scores for *abnormal signs* ranged between 1 and 3 out of 3 at 6 weeks and 1.5 and 3 out of 3 at 10 weeks. A compound

optimality score of 3 was achieved by 94% of the 6-week-old infants and a score of 2.5 by 92% of the 10-week-old infants. Scores were considered sub-optimal if they were below 3 at 6 weeks and below 2.5 at 10 weeks (Table 2).

Reflexes

	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5	1	.5	2	.5	3	.5	4	.5	5	
Tendon	Absent	Felt, not seen	Seen	Exaggerated	Clonus	0	0	3	3	91	0	3	0	0	6w
						0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	10w
Suck/Gag	No gag / no suck	Weak irregular suck only No stripping	Weak regular suck Some stripping	Strong suck: • irregular • regular Good stripping	No suck but strong clenching	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	6w
						0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	10w
Palmar grasp	No response	Short, weak flexion of fingers	Strong flexion of fingers	Strong finger flexion, shoulder ↑	Very strong grasp; infant can be lifted off couch	0	0	6	0	40	0	54	0	0	6w
						0	0	26	3	37	0	34	0	0	10w
Plantar grasp	No response	Partial plantar flexion of toes	Toes curve around the examiner's finger			0	0	3	0	97	0	0	0	0	6w
						0	0	3	0	97	0	0	0	0	10w
Placing	No response	Dorsiflexion of ankle only	Full placing response with flexion of hip, knee & placing sole on surface			6	0	0	3	91	0	0	0	0	6w
						0	3	3	3	91	0	0	0	0	10w
Moro reflex	No response or opening of hands only	Full abduction at shoulder and extension of the arms; no adduction	Full abduction but only delayed or partial adduction	Partial abduction at shoulder and arm extension followed by smooth adduction	-No abduction or adduction; -Only forward extension of arms from the shoulders -Marked adduction only	0	0	11	0	54	3	26	0	6	6w
						0	3	31	0	49	3	11	0	3	10w

Figure 3. Raw score distribution of *reflex* items. See score description under Fig.1.

Orientation & behaviour

For both items involving visual orientation and alertness at 10 weeks, the median RSs shifted to the right with two columns from the 6-week median score. The median RS for consolability at 10 weeks shifted one column to the left from the 6-week median score (Fig. 5). The compound optimality scores for orientation and behaviour ranged from 3 to 7 out of 7 at 6 weeks and from 5 to 7 out of 7

at 10 weeks (Fig. 6). Scores of 5 to 7 were found in 93% of infants at 6 weeks and scores of 6 and 7 in 96% of infants at 10 weeks. Therefore, scores below 5 at 6 weeks and below 6 at 10 weeks were considered sub-optimal (Table 2).

Movements

	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5	1	.5	2	.5	3	.5	4	.5	5	
Movement (Quantity)	No movement	Sporadic and short isolated movements	Frequent isolated movements	Frequent generalised movements	Continuous exaggerated movements	0	0	0	0	9	0	91	0	0	6w
						0	0	0	0	0	0	94	3	3	10w
Movement (Quality)	Only stretches.	Frequent stretches and abrupt movements; some smooth movements	Fluent movements but monotonous	Fluent alternating movements of arms + legs; good variability	Cramped synchronised; mouthing jerky or other abn.mov.	0	0	3	0	17	3	77	0	0	6w
						0	0	6	0	17	3	69	3	3	10w
Head raising prone	No response	Infant rolls head over, chin not raised	Infant rolls head over , raises chin	Infant brings head and chin up	Infant brings head up and keeps it up	0	0	20	0	74	3	3	0	0	6w
						0	0	6	0	49	3	29	0	14	10w

Abnormal signs

	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5	1	.5	2	.5	3	.5	4	.5	5	
Abn. hand or toe posture		Hands open, toes straight most of the time	Intermittent fisting or thumb adduction	Continuous fisting or thumb adduction; index finger flexion, thumb opposition	Continuous big toe extension or flexion of all toes	0	0	6	0	94	0	0	0	0	6w
						0	0	29	3	63	0	6	0	0	10w
Tremor		No tremor or tremor only when crying	Tremor only after Moro or occasionally when awake	Frequent tremors when awake	Continuous tremors	0	0	46	3	46	0	6	0	0	6w
						0	0	63	0	31	0	6	0	0	10w
Startle	No startle, even to sudden noise	No spontaneous startle but reacts to sudden noise	2-3 spontaneous startles	More than 3 spontaneous startles	Continuous startles	0	3	71	0	23	0	3	0	0	6w
						0	0	51	3	34	0	11	0	0	10w

Figure 4. Raw score distribution of *movement* and *abnormal signs* items. See score description under Fig.1.

Orientation and behaviour

	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5
Eye movements	Does not open eyes		Full conjugated eye movements	Transient -nystagmus -strabismus -roving eye mov. -sunset sign	Persistent -nystagmus -strabismus -roving eye mov. -downward deviation
Auditory orientation	No reaction	Auditory startle; brightens and stills; no true orientation	Shifting of eyes, head might turn towards source	Prolonged head turn to stimulus; search with eyes; smooth	Turns head and eyes towards noise every time; jerky abrupt
Visuaal orientation	Does not follow or focus on stimuli	Stills, focuses, follows briefly to the side but loses stimuli	Follows horizontally and vertically; no head turn	Follows horizontally and vertically; turns head	Follows in a circle
Alertness	Will not respond to stimuli	When awake, looks only briefly	When awake, looks at stimuli but loses them	Keeps interest in stimuli	Does not tire (hyper-reactive)
Irritability	Quiet all the time, not irritable to any stimuli	Awakes, cries sometimes when handled	Cries often when handled	Cries always when handled	Cries even when not handled
Consolability	Asleep; awake, no crying; consoling not needed	Awake; cries briefly; consoling not needed	Awake; cries; becomes quiet when talked to	Awake; cries ; needs picking up to console	Awake; cries cannot be consoled
Cry	No cry at all	Whimpering cry only	Cries to stimuli but normal pitch		High pitched cry; often continuous

1	.5	2	.5	3	.5	4	.5	5	
0	0	0	0	91	3	6	0	0	6w
0	0	0	0	97	3	0	0	0	10w
0	0	6	0	71	6	17	0	0	6w
0	0	6	3	66	0	26	0	0	10w
0	0	3	0	0	0	66	3	29	6w
0	0	0	0	3	3	29	0	66	10w
0	0	3	0	69	0	29	0	0	6w
0	0	6	0	40	3	51	0	0	10w
6	0	66	3	23	3	0	0	0	6w
23	0	69	0	9	0	0	0	0	10w
6	0	11	0	26	6	49	3	0	6w
23	0	9	3	26	6	34	0	0	10w
6	0	0	0	89	0	3	3	0	6w
23	0	6	0	71	0	0	0	0	10w

Figure 5. Raw score distribution of *orientation and behaviour* items. See score description under Fig.1

Total examination optimality score

A total optimality score for the examination was obtained when the optimal scores of all 34 items were added up. In this study, the total optimality scores for infants at 6-weeks post-term age ranged between 24.5 and 34 out of the 34 items. The range for total optimality scores of infants at 10-weeks post-term age was 29 to 34 out of 34 items. In the 6-week age group, 94% of the infants obtained a total examination optimality score between 29 and 34. Scores below 29 at 6 weeks were considered

suboptimal. In the 10-week age group, 94% of the infants obtained total examination optimality scores between 31 and 34. A score of 31 at 10 weeks was considered sub-optimal (Table 2).

Discussion

Despite the progress in research, programmes and policies that promote the health and well-being of mothers and children, 66% of children younger than five (5) years in developing countries still risk failure to reach their developmental potential (16, 17). Many maternal and foetal conditions are associated with adverse insults to the developing brain that cause altered brain structure and sub-optimal neurodevelopmental trajectories in the affected infant (1, 10, 20).

Health care professionals are urgently called to identify at-risk infants but also contribute to sustainable early childhood intervention by addressing and thus potentially limiting the risk of adverse short- and long-term development outcomes in surviving and high-risk infants (16, 19, 42). The existing studies that examined the neurological status and developmental characteristics of newborn infants, published normative data with optimality scores for preterm infants at term equivalent age and for term infants from birth to 4 weeks' post-natal age (35-37, 39).

Although these scores are very useful in a variety of settings, questions were raised about the validity of the original optimality scores of infants in settings other than developed countries (41, 42). Guzzetta et al., (2005) are the only researchers that studied infants longitudinally in the same age groups that compare to our study. The authors' study provided useful guidelines for screening infants at 6 weeks, but values such as optimality scores that can be used in well-baby clinics to identify infants at risk of developmental delay post-natal age were not provided. Their findings prompted us to use the HNNE in our longitudinal study and apply the optimality scoring system to a population of healthy infants aged 6- and 10 weeks in a developing country (27).

This current study assessed and documented the frequency distribution of neuro-motor and neuro-behavioural characteristics that were displayed by 35 healthy term-born infants, at the ages of 6 and 10 weeks during scheduled clinic visits in a developing country. The RSs obtained on the HNNE in this cohort of infants were converted to optimality scores by applying the HNNE optimality scoring system with cut-off points that resulted in a quantitative estimation of each item on the evaluation form (Supplementary Tables S1 - 6) (33).

The results of this current study quantitatively confirmed the changes in neurodevelopmental behaviour observed by Guzetta et al., (2005) in infants at 6 weeks. Our results confirmed that 6 weeks is a significant milestone age for identification of changes in postural muscle tone, head control and visual behaviour. The results of this study further showed consistent and notable changes in upper and lower limb tone, active head control in horizontal and vertical positions, and advanced visual orientation and alertness in this cohort of infants as they developed towards 10 weeks.

The results show different RS distributions for most items in the proforma, and different compound and total optimality score ranges for each age group. This enables us to separately explore the application of the optimality scoring system to the total UmbiBaby cohort in each age group at 6 and 10 weeks. Further comparisons of the data collected in this study were not possible as optimal scores in this age group have not yet been identified in the literature to the knowledge of this study.

The strength of the study lies in the longitudinal monitoring of the developmental trajectory of milestone characteristics between 6- and 10 weeks post-term age in a cohort of healthy infants in the Tshwane District of South Africa. These characteristics appear to be important changes that occur in healthy term infants across cultures and are therefore considered an important stepping stone for the early identification of neurodevelopmental risk factors in infants at 6 and 10 weeks.

Conclusion

This study provides foundational data in the process of developing a SA norm for identifying the motor and neuro-behavioural characteristics of 6- and 10-week-old infants. Before it can be generalised and incorporated into the RtHB, the findings of this study must be expanded on a larger and more representative population that are recruited in all the provinces of SA. Quantifying the observation and grading of the characteristics and the distribution of the infants' motor and neuro-behavioural responses, add value to the documentation of findings and therefore promote the collection of normative data for infants in these age groups. Such data will contribute to a greater understanding, effective monitoring and potentially the earlier identification of adverse neuro-motor and neuro-behavioural characteristics during routine and other follow-up clinics across SA.

Acknowledgements

The authors pay tribute to the mothers and infants who took part in this study. Their contribution provides invaluable information for interpreting infant development in South Africa. Our gratitude is extended to the research team for their administrative role in the recruitment, anthropometry, and the collecting of background information. In her private capacity, the first author wishes to express a sincere appreciation toward the Department of Paediatrics and the University of Pretoria's Research Centre for Maternal, Foetal, Newborn and Child Health Care Strategies at Kalafong Provincial Tertiary Hospital for the opportunity to participate in the UmbiBaby Study.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: Marna Nel, Carina Eksteen, Ute Feucht

Data curation: Marna Nel**,** Helen Mulol

Formal analysis: Marna Nel, Helen Mulol

Investigation: Marna Nel

Methodology: Marna Nel, Carina Eksteen

Project administration: Marna Nel, Ute Feucht, Helen Mulol

Resources: Ute Feucht, Helen Mulol, Marna Nel

Supervision: Ute Feucht, Helen Mulol, Carina Eksteen

Validation: Ute Feucht, Marna Nel, Carina Eksteen

Visualization: Marna Nel, Carina Eksteen

Writing – original draft: Marna Nel

Writing – review & editing: Marna Nel, Ute Feucht, Helen Mulol, Carina Eksteen

References

1. Lawn JE, Blencowe H, Waiswa P, Amouzou A, Mathers C, Hogan D, et al. Stillbirths: rates, risk factors, and acceleration towards 2030. Lancet. 2016;387(10018):587-603. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00837-5

2. Gardella B, Dominoni M, Caporali C, Cesari S, Fiandrino G, Longo S, et al. Placental features of fetal vascular malperfusion and infant neurodevelopmental outcomes at 2 years of age in severe fetal growth restriction. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2021;225(4): 413.e11. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2021.03.037

3. Gardosi J, Madurasinghe V, Williams M, Malik A, Francis A. Maternal and fetal risk factors for stillbirth: population based study. BMJ. 2013;346: f108. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f108

4. Tann CJ, Nakakeeto M, Willey BA, Sewegaba M, Webb EL, Oke I, et al. Perinatal risk factors for neonatal encephalopathy: an unmatched case-control study. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2018;103(3): F250-F6. DOI: 10.1136/archdischild-2017-312744

5. Lee AC, Katz J, Blencowe H, Cousens S, Kozuki N, Vogel JP, et al. National and regional estimates of term and preterm babies born small for gestational age in 138 low-income and middle-income countries in 2010. Lancet Glob Health. 2013;1(1): e26-36. DOI: 10.1016/S2214-109X(13)70006-8

6. Katz J, Lee ACC, Kozuki N, Lawn JE, Cousens S, Blencowe H, et al. Mortality risk in preterm and small-for-gestational-age infants in low-income and middle-income countries: a pooled country analysis. Lancet. 2013;382(9890):417-25. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60993-9

7. Nkosi S, Makin J, Hlongwane T, Pattinson RC. Screening and managing a low-risk pregnant population using continuous-wave Doppler ultrasound in a low-income population: a cohort analytical study. S Afr Med J. 2019;109(5):347. DOI: 10.7196/SAMJ.2019.v109i5.13611

8. Mwaniki MK, Atieno M, Lawn JE, Newton CRJC. Long-term neurodevelopmental outcomes after intrauterine and neonatal insults: a systematic review. Lancet. 2012;379(9814):445-52. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61577-8

9. DiPietro JA, Kivlighan KT, Costigan KA, Rubin SE, Shiffler DE, Henderson JL, et al. Prenatal antecedents of newborn neurological maturation. Child Dev. 2010;81(1):115-30. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01384.x

10. Starčević M, Predojević M, Butorac D, Tumbri J, Konjevoda P, Kadić AS. Early functional and morphological brain disturbances in late-onset intrauterine growth restriction. Early Hum Dev. 2016;93:33-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2015.12.001

11. Baschat AA, Viscardi RM, Hussey-Gardner B, Hashmi N, Harman C. Infant neurodevelopment following fetal growth restriction: relationship with antepartum surveillance parameters. Ultrasound in Obstet Gynecol. 2009;33(1):44-50. DOI: 10.1002/uog.6286

12. Hartkopf J, Schleger F, Keune J, Wiechers C, Pauluschke-Froehlich J, Weiss M, et al. Impact of intrauterine growth restriction on cognitive and motor development at 2 years of age. Front Physiol. 2018;9:1278. DOI: 10.3389/fphys.2018.01278

13. Tolsa CB, Zimine S, Warfield SK, Freschi M, Rossignol AS, Lazeyras F, et al. Early alteration of structural and functional brain development in premature infants born with intrauterine growth restriction. Pediatr Res. 2004;56(1):132-8. DOI: 10.1203/01.PDR.0000128983.54614.7E

14. Tann CJ, Webb EL, Lassman R, Ssekyewa J, Sewegaba M, Musoke M, et al. Early childhood outcomes after neonatal encephalopathy in Uganda: a cohort study. EClinicalMedicine. 2018;6:26-35. DOI: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2018.12.001

15. Romeo DM, Ricci M, Picilli M, Foti B, Cordaro G, Mercuri E. Early neurological assessment and long-term neuromotor outcomes in late preterm infants: a critical review. Medicina. 2020;56(9):475. DOI: 10.3390/medicina56090475

16. Black MM, Walker SP, Fernald LCH, Andersen CT, DiGirolamo AM, Lu C, et al. Early childhood development coming of age: science through the life course. Lancet. 2017;389(10064):77-90. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7

17. Grantham-McGregor S, Cheung YB, Cueto S, Glewwe P, Richter L, Strupp B, et al. Developmental potential in the first 5 years for children in developing countries. Lancet. 2007;369(9555):60-70. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60032-4

18. Blakstad MM, Smith ER, Etheredge A, Locks LM, McDonald CM, Kupka R, et al. Nutritional, socioeconomic, and delivery characteristics are associated with neurodevelopment in Tanzanian children. J Pediatr. 2019;207:71-9.e8. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2018.10.066

19. Colella M, Frérot A, Novais ARB, Baud O. Neonatal and long-term consequences of fetal growth restriction. Curr Pediatr Rev. 2018;14(4):212-8. DOI: 10.2174/1573396314666180712114531

20. Cosmi E, Fanelli T, Visentin S, Trevisanuto D, Zanardo V. Consequences in infants that were intrauterine growth restricted. J Pregnancy. 2011;2011:364381. DOI: 10.1155/2011/364381

21. Hlongwane T, Cronje T, Nkosi B, Pattinson RC. The prevalence of abnormal Doppler's of the umbilical artery in a low-risk pregnant population in South Africa. EClinicalMedicine. 2021;34:100792. DOI: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100792

22. Richter LM, Daelmans B, Lombardi J, Heymann J, Boo FL, Behrman JR, et al. Investing in the foundation of sustainable development: pathways to scale up for early childhood development. Lancet. 2017;389(10064):103-18. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31698-1

23. Tomlinson M, Darmstadt GL, Yousafzai AK, Daelmans B, Britto P, Gordon SL, et al. Global research priorities to accelerate programming to improve early childhood development in the sustainable development era: a CHNRI exercise. J Glob Health. 2019;9(3):020703. DOI: 10.7189/jogh.09.020703

24. Kuruvilla S, Bustreo F, Kuo T, Mishra CK, Taylor K, Fogstad H, et al. The Global strategy for women's, children's and adolescents' health (2016-2030): a roadmap based on evidence and country experience. Bull World Health Organ. 2016;94(5):398-400. DOI: 10.2471/BLT.16.170431

25. Novak I, Morgan C, Adde L, Blackman J, Boyd RN, Brunstrom-Hernandez J, et al. Early, accurate diagnosis and early intervention in cerebral palsy: advances in diagnosis and treatment. JAMA Pediatr. 2017;171(9):897-907. DOI: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2017.1689

26. Salandy S, Rai R, Gutierrez S, Ishak B, Tubbs RS. Neurological examination of the infant. Clin Anat. 2019;32(6):770-7. DOI: 10.1002/ca.23352

27. Guzzetta A, Haataja L, Cowan F, Bassi L, Ricci D, Cioni G, et al. Neurological examination in healthy term infants aged 3-10 weeks. Biol Neonate. 2005;87(3):187-96. DOI: 10.1159/000082977

28. Francis D. Minister Botha launches Road to Health Booklet. In: Health Do, editor. 2011. (06/062022)https://www.gov.za/minister-botha-launches-road-health-booklet; (06/06/2022) https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/health/rthb_booklet.pdf

29. SAGovernment. Statistics SA 2022 (5/06/2022). Available from: https://www.statssa.gov.za/; https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/south-africa-population

30. Naidoo H, Avenant T, Goga A. Completeness of the Road-to-Health Booklet and Road-to-Health Card: Results of cross-sectional surveillance at a provincial tertiary hospital. S Afr J HIV Med. 2018;19(1). DOI: 10.4102/sajhivmed.v19i1.765

31. Dubowitz LMS, Dubowitz V, Mercuri E. The Neurological Assessment of the Preterm and Full-term Newborn Infant. Second ed. Bax MCO, editor: Mac Keith Press; 1999. 155 p. ISBN-13: 978-1898683155; ISBN-10: 1898683158

32. Dubowitz L, Ricci D, Mercuri E. The Dubowitz neurological examination of the full-term newborn. Ment Retard Dev Disabil Res Rev. 2005;11(1):52-60. DOI: 10.1002/mrdd.20048

33. Dubowitz L, Mercuri E, Dubowitz V. An optimality score for the neurologic examination of the term newborn. J Pediatr. 1998;133(3):406-16. DOI: 10.1016/s0022-3476(98)70279-3

34. Venkata SKRG, Pournami F, Prabhakar J, Nandakumar A, Jain N. Disability Prediction by Early Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination: a diagnostic study. J Child Neurol. 2020;35(11):731-6. DOI: 10.1177/0883073820930487

35. Mercuri E, Guzzetta A, Laroche S, Ricci D, van Haastert IL, Simpson A, et al. Neurologic examination of preterm infants at term age: comparison with term infants. J Pediatr. 2003;142(6):647-55. DOI: 10.1067/mpd.2003.215

36. Ricci D, Romeo DMM, Haataja L, van Haastert IC, Cesarini L, Maunu J, et al. Neurological examination of preterm infants at term equivalent age. Early Hum Dev. 2008;84(11):751-61. DOI: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2008.05.007

37. Romeo DM, Luciano R, Corsello M, Ricci D, Brogna C, Zuppa A, et al. Neonatal neurological examination of late preterm babies. Early Hum Dev. 2013;89(8):537-45. DOI: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2013.01.002

38. Chin EYJ, Baral VR, Ereno IL, Allen JC, Low K, Yeo CL. Evaluation of neurological behaviour in late-preterm newborn infants using the Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination. J Paediatr Child Health. 2019;55(3):349-57. DOI: 10.1111/jpc.14205

39. Spittle AJ, Walsh J, Olsen JE, McInnes E, Eeles AL, Brown NC, et al. Neurobehaviour and neurological development in the first month after birth for infants born between 32-42 weeks' gestation. Early Hum Dev. 2016;96:7-14. DOI: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2016.02.006

40. Noble Y, Boyd R. Neonatal assessments for the preterm infant up to 4 months corrected age: a systematic review. Dev Med Child Neurol. 2012;54(2):129-39. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-8749.2010.03903.x

41. Hagmann CF, Chan D, Robertson NJ, Acolet D, Nyombi N, Nakakeeto M, et al. Neonatal neurological examination in well newborn term Ugandan infants. Early Hum Dev. 2015;91(12):739-49. DOI: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2015.08.005

42. Lawford HLS, Nuamah MA, Liley HG, Lee AC, Botchway F, Kumar S, et al. Gestational Age-Specific Distribution of the Hammersmith Neonatal Neurological Examination Scores Among Low-Risk Neonates in Ghana. Early Hum Dev. 2021;152:105133. DOI: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2020.105133

43. McGready R, Simpson J, Panyavudhikrai S, Loo S, Mercuri E, Haataja L, et al. Neonatal neurological testing in resource-poor settings. Ann Trop Paediatr. 2000;20(4):323-36. DOI: 10.1080/02724936.2000.11748154

44. Lawford HLS, Nuamah MA, Liley HG, Griffin A, Lekpor CE, Botchway F, et al. Associations between malaria in pregnancy and neonatal neurological outcomes. Int J Infect Dis. 2021;112:144-51. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.07.037

45. Tuiskula A, Metsäranta M, Toiviainen Salo S, Vanhatalo S, Haataja L. Profile of minor neurological findings after perinatal asphyxia. Acta Paediatr. 2022;111(2):291-9. DOI: 10.1111/apa.16133

46. Tuhkanen H, Pajulo M, Jussila H, Ekholm E. Infants born to women with substance use: Exploring early neurobehavior with the Dubowitz neurological examination. Early Hum Dev. 2019;130:51-6. DOI: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2018.12.019

47. Lawford HLS, Nuamah MA, Liley HG, Lee AC, Kumar S, Adjei AA, et al. Neonatal neurological examination in a resource-limited setting: What defines normal? Eur J Paediatr Neurology. 2020;29:71-80. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejpn.2020.08.010

48. Hieu NT, Gainsborough M, Simpson JA, Thuy NT, Hang NN, Taylor AM, et al. Neurological status of low-risk Vietnamese newborns: a comparison with a British newborn cohort. J Health Popul Nutr. 2006;24(1):57-63. DOI:10.3329/JHPN.V24I1.747

49. Ricci D, Guzzetta A, Cowan F, Haataja L, Rutherford M, Dubowitz L, et al. Sequential neurological examinations in infants with neonatal encephalopathy and low apgar scores: relationship with brain MRI. Neuropediatrics. 2006;37(3):148-53. DOI: 10.1055/s-2006-924333

50. Committee TNMG. Guidelines for maternity care in South Africa - A manual for clinics, community health centres and district hospitals: SA Department of Health; 2016 (5/06/2022). 4th Edition: https://www.idealhealthfacility.org.za/App/Document/Download/42

51. Umbiflow. (6/06/2022) https://www.up.ac.za/media/shared/717/Umbiflow/csir-umbiflowdevice.zp216494.pdf; (6/06/2022) https://www.up.ac.za/media/shared/717/Umbiflow/umbiflow-brochure.zp216495.pdf

52. Theron GB, Theron AM, Odendaal HJ, Bunn AE. Comparison between a newly developed PC-based Doppler umbilical artery waveform analyser and a commercial unit. S Afr Med J. 2005;95(1):62-4. http://www.samj.org.za/index.php/samj/article/view/1526/903

53. Dubowitz LM, Dubowitz V, Palmer P, Verghote M. A new approach to the neurological assessment of the preterm and full-term newborn infant. Brain Dev. 1980;2(1):3-14. DOI: 10.1016/s0387-7604(80)80003-9

54. Eeles AL, Olsen JE, Walsh JM, McInnes EK, Molesworth CM, Cheong JL, et al. Reliability of neurobehavioral assessments from birth to term equivalent age in preterm and term born infants. Phys Occup Ther in Pediatr. 2017;37(1):108-19. DOI: 10.3109/01942638.2015.1135845

55. Hammersmith NE. Hammersmith Neurological Examinations: WordPress; (5/06/2022). Available from: http://hammersmith-neuro-exam.com/

56. Brazelton TB, Nugent KJ. Neonatal Behavioral Assessment Scale. 3rd Edition: Mac Keith Press; 1995. ISBN: 0 898683 05 0

57. Villar J, Giuliani F, Figueras-Aloy J, Barros F, Bertino E, Bhutta ZA, et al. Growth of preterm infants at the time of global obesity. Arch Dis Child. 2019;104(8):725-7. DOI: 10.1136/archdischild-2018-315006

58. De Onis M, Onyango AW, Borghi E, Garza C, Yang H. Comparison of the World Health Organization (WHO) Child Growth Standards and the National Center for Health Statistics/WHO international growth reference: implications for child health programmes. Public Health Nutr. 2006;9(7):942-7. DOI: 10.1017/phn20062005

Supporting information

S1 Table. Conversion of raw scores into optimality scores for items assessing *posture and tone.*

(DOCX)

S2 Table. Conversion of raw scores into optimality scores for *tone patterns*.

(DOCX)

S3 Table. Conversion of raw scores into optimality scores for items assessing *reflexes*. (DOCX)

S4 Table. Conversion of raw scores into optimality scores for items assessing *movements*. (DOCX)

S5 Table. Conversion of raw scores into optimality scores for items assessing *abnormal signs*.

(DOCX)

S6 Table. Conversion of raw scores into optimality scores for items assessing *orientation and behaviour*.

(DOCX)

Posture and tone

	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Posture	Arms & legs extended	Legs slightly flexed	Leg well flexed but not adducted	Leg well flexed & adducted near abdomen	Abnormal posture a) opisthotonic b)	0	0	3	20	63	3	11	0	0	6w
						0	0	11	35	35	0	0	0	0	10w
Arm flexion	Arms do not flex	Arms flex slowly, not always not completely	Arms flex slowly, more complete	Arms flex quickly and completely	Arms difficult to extend, snap back forcefully	0	0	34	0	66	0	0	0	0	6w
						0	0	54	3	43	0	0	0	0	10w
Arm reaction	Arms remain straight, no resistance	Arms flex slightly or some resistance felt	Arms flex well till abdomen lifts, then straighten	Arms flex well approx 100° & maintained as shoulder lifts	Flexion of arms >100°, maintained when body lifts up	0	0	3	0	71	0	3	0	0	6w
						0	0	11	3	83	0	3	0	0	10w
Leg flexion	No flexion	Incomplete flexion, not every time	Complete but slow flexion	Complete fast flexion	Legs difficult to extend, snap back forcefully	0	0	19	3	37	0	11	0	0	6w
						0	0	80	3	17	0	0	0	0	10w
Leg reaction	Legs straight, no resistance	Legs flex slightly or some resistance felt	Legs flex well till bottom lifts up	Knee flexes well, remains flexed when bottom up	Flexion stays when back bottom up	0	0	0	0	74	0	26	0	0	6w
						0	0	0	0	88	0	43	0	0	10w
Pull-to-sit angle	180°	~180°	~130°	~80°	80°	0	0	0	6	46	6	43	0	0	6w
						0	0	11	11	48	6	31	0	0	10w
Head control 1	No attempt to raise head	Infant tries, effort better left than seen	Raises head but drops forward or back	Raises head, remains vertical if may wobble		0	0	3	0	85	3	11	0	0	6w
						0	0	0	0	23	3	74	0	0	10w
Head control 2	No attempt to raise head	Infant tries, effort better left than seen	Raises head but drops forward or back	Raises head, remains vertical if may wobble	Head upright or extended, cannot be passively flexed	0	0	6	3	77	3	11	0	0	6w
						0	0	0	0	20	3	77	0	0	10w
Head lag	Head drops & stays back	Tries to lift head but it drops back	Able to lift head slightly	Lifts head in line with body	Head in front of body	0	0	15	6	45	15	3	0	0	6w
						0	0	3	0	31	31	14	0	0	10w
Ventral suspension	Back curved, head & limbs hang straight	Back curved, head & limbs slightly flexed	Back slightly curved, limbs flexed	Back straight, head in line, limbs flexed	Back straight, head above body	0	0	26	9	51	9	6	0	0	6w
						0	0	11	6	26	23	31	0	3	10w

Tone patterns

		column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5										
Flexor tone 1	On arm and leg traction	Arm flexion > leg flexion	Arm flexion = leg flexion	Arm flexion > leg flexion but difference 1 column or 2	Arm flexion > leg flexion and difference > than 1 column	1	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	0	
						0	0	79	0	69	0	2	0	0	6w
						0	0	57	0	60	0	3	0	0	10w
Flexor tone 2	In supine		Arms and legs generally flexed	Strong arm flexion with strong leg extension intermittent	Strong arm flexion with strong leg extension continuous	0	0	3	0	91	0	3	0	0	8W
						0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	10w
Leg tractions	Leg traction vs pop. angle	Leg traction > than popliteal angle	Leg traction = popliteal angle	Leg traction < popliteal angle but difference 1 column <	Leg traction < popliteal angle and difference > than 1 column	0	0	20	0	81	0	20	0	0	9W
						0	0	20	0	81	0	17	0	0	10W
Neck tractions	Neck in ext. vs neck in flexion	Head extension > head flexion	Head extension = head flexion	Head extension > head flexion, but difference 1 column >	Head extension > head flexion and difference > than 1 column	0	0	3	0	88	0	8	0	0	6w
						0	0	3	0	87	0	0	0	0	10w
Vent tone	Vent susp vs head leg	Ventral suspension > head leg	Ventral suspension = head leg	Ventr suspension > head leg but difference 1 column <	Ventr suspension > head leg and difference > than 1 column	0	0	37	0	43	0	17	0	3	6w
						0	0	34	0	26	0	40	0	0	10w

Reflexes

	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5
Tendon	Absent	Poll, not noon	Boon	Pingponted	Clonus
Babinski	No gag / no nunk	Weak irregular nunk only no stepping	Weak regular nunk Some stepping	Strong nunk: - irregular - regular Good stepping	No nunk but strong stepping
Achilles	No response	Ehon, weak flexion of fingers	Strong flexion of fingers	Strong finger flexion, shoulder ↑	Very strong grasp: baby can be lifted off ground
Patellar	No response	Partial plantar flexion of toes	Toes curve around the examiner's finger		
Biceps	No response	Hesitation of arms only	Full placing response with flexion of hip, knee & placing foot on surface		
Triceps	No response or opening of hands only	Full adduction of shoulder and extension of the arms; no adduction	Full adduction but only delayed or partial adduction	Partial adduction of shoulder and arm extension followed by strong adduction	No adduction or abduction; Only forward extension of arms from the shoulders •Marked adduction only

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
0	0	1	1	91	0	1	0	0	6W
0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	10W
0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	6m
0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	10m
0	0	6	0	48	0	51	0	0	6m
0	0	46	3	37	0	14	0	0	10W
0	0	3	0	97	0	0	0	0	6m
0	0	3	0	97	0	0	0	0	10m
0	0	0	9	91	0	0	0	0	6m
0	1	1	1	91	0	0	0	0	10m
0	0	11	0	91	3	16	0	0	6m
0	1	31	0	37	3	11	0	1	10W

Movements

	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5
Movement (Quantity)	No movement	Sporadic and short isolated movements	Frequent isolated movements	Frequent generalised movements	Continuous exaggerated movements
Movement (Quality)	Only stretches	Frequent stretches and abrupt movements; some smooth movements	Quiet movements but monotonous	Quiet alternating movements of arms + legs; good variability	Cramped synchronised; mourning jerky or other abn mov
Head raising prone	No response	Infant rolls head over, chin not raised	Infant rolls head over, raises chin	Infant brings head and chin up	Infant brings head up and keeps it up

1	5	2	5	3	5	4	5	5	
0	0	0	0	0	0	91	0	0	8w
0	0	0	0	0	0	94	3	3	10w
0	0	3	0	17	3	77	0	0	8w
0	0	6	0	17	3	69	3	3	10w
0	0	20	0	24	3	3	0	0	6w
0	0	0	0	40	3	20	0	14	10w

Abnormal signs

	column 1	column 2	column 3	column 4	column 5
Abnormal or low posture		Hands open, toes straight most of the time	Intermittent listing or thumb adduction	Continuous listing or thumb adduction, index finger flexion, tsumis opposition	Continuous big toe extension or flexion of all toes
Tremor		No tremor or tremor only when crying	Tremor only after More or occasionally when awake	Frequent tremors when awake	Continuous tremors
Startle	No startle, even to sudden noise	No spontaneous startle but reacts to sudden noise	2-3 spontaneous startles	More than 3 spontaneous startles	Continuous startles

1	5	2	5	3	5	4	5	5	
0	0	6	0	94	0	0	0	0	6w
0	0	29	3	63	0	6	0	0	10w
0	0	46	3	46	0	6	0	0	6w
0	0	63	0	31	0	6	0	0	10w
0	3	71	0	23	0	3	0	0	6w
0	0	31	3	34	0	11	0	0	10w

Orientation and behaviour

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
Eye movements	Does not open eyes		Full conjugated eye movements	Transient -nystagmus -strabismus -swing eye now -sunset sign	Persistent -nystagmus -strabismus -swing eye now -downward deviation
Auditory orientation	No response	Auditory stimulus brightens and alerts; no true orientation	Shifting of eyes, head might turn towards source	Prolonged head turn to stimulus; eyes with eyes; smooth	Turns head and eyes towards noise every time; jerky abrupt
Visual orientation	Does not follow or focus on stimuli	Still, focuses, follows briefly in the side but loses stimuli	Follows horizontally and vertically; no head turn	Follows horizontally and vertically; turns head	Follows in a circle
Alertness	Will not respond to stimuli	When awake, looks only briefly	When awake, looks at stimuli but loses them	Focuses interest in stimuli	Does not tire (hyper reactive)
Irritability	Quiet all the time, not irritable to any stimuli	Awakes, cries sometimes when handled	Cries often when handled	Cries always when handled	Cries even when not handled
Consolability	Asleep, awake, no crying, consoling not needed	Awake, cries briefly, consoling not needed	Awake, cries, becomes quiet when talked to	Awake, cries, needs picking up to console	Awake, cries cannot be consoled
Cry	No cry at all	Whimpering cry only	Cries in stimuli but normal pitch		High pitched cry; often continuous

0	0	0	0	91	1	6	0	0	6w
0	0	0	0	97	1	0	0	0	10w
8	8	6	8	91	6	17	8	8	6m
0	0	6	1	66	0	26	0	0	10m
8	8	9	8	8	8	66	9	99	6m
0	0	0	0	1	1	99	0	66	10m
0	0	1	0	69	0	99	0	0	6m
8	8	6	8	48	9	91	8	8	10m
6	0	66	3	33	1	0	0	0	6w
33	0	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	10w
8	0	11	0	48	8	17	3	0	6w
43	0	9	3	46	6	31	0	0	10w
0	0	0	0	96	0	3	3	0	6w
99	8	6	8	91	8	8	8	8	10m