Effects of a novel infant formula on weight gain and body composition of infants: The INNOVA 2020 study

Julio Plaza-Diaz[1,2,3,#], Francisco Javier Ruiz-Ojeda[1,2,4,5,#], Javier Morales[6], Ana Isabel Cristina de la Torre[7], Antonio García-García[8,9], Cristóbal Coronel[10], Cyntia Crespo[10], Gema García-Ron[11], Ignacio Galicia[8], Marcos Maroto[8], Paola Ruiz[12], Raquel Martín[13], Susana Viver-Gómez[14] and Angel Gil[1,2,5,15,*]

[1]Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology II, School of Pharmacy, University of Granada, 18071, Granada, Spain

[2]Instituto de Investigación Biosanitaria IBS.GRANADA, Complejo Hospitalario Universitario de Granada, Granada 18014, Spain

[3]Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario Research Institute, Ottawa, ON K1H 8L1, Canada.

[4]RG Adipocytes and Metabolism, Institute for Diabetes and Obesity, Helmholtz Diabetes Center at Helmholtz Center Munich, Neuherberg, 85764 Munich, Germany.

[5]Institute of Nutrition and Food Technology "José Mataix", Centre of Biomedical Research, University of Granada, Avda. del Conocimiento s/n. 18016 Armilla, Granada, Spain

[6]Product Development Department, Alter Farmacia SA, 28880 Madrid, Spain.

[7]CS Presentación sabio. C/Alonso Cano 8, 28933 Móstoles, Madrid

[8]Instituto Fundación Teófilo Hernando (IFTH). Parque científico de Madrid. UAM.. C/ Faraday 7. Edificio CLAID. 28049. Madrid.

[9]Departamento de Farmacología, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

[10]CS Amante Laffón. Pz San Martín de Porres 8, 41010, Madrid.

[11]CS La Rivota. C/ de las Palmeras s/n, 28922 Alcorcón, Madrid.

[12]CS Las Américas, Av. De América 6, 28983 Parla, Madrid.

[13]CS Doctor Luengo Rodríguez, C/ Nueva York 16, 28938 Móstoles, Madrid.

[14]CS Valle de la Oliva. C/ Enrique Granados 2, 28222 Majadahonda, Madrid.

[15]CIBEROBN (CIBER Physiopathology of Obesity and Nutrition), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, 28029 Madrid, Spain

[#]Equally contributed

*** Correspondence:**
Prof. Angel Gil

Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology II, School of Pharmacy, University of Granada, Campus de Cartuja s/n, 18071, Granada, Spain

Phone: +34 695466922
agil@ugr.es

Abstract

Background: Breastmilk is the most appropriate food for infants and exclusive breastfeeding is highly recommended for the first six months of life to promote adequate growth and development and lower infant morbidity and mortality. Among the best-documented benefits of breastfeeding is the reduced risk of disease and infections such as pneumonia, diarrhea and acute otitis media. Nonetheless, there are situations in which the infant cannot be breastfed; therefore, it is essential to use an appropriately designed infant formula. As current infant formulas incorporate novel ingredients to partly mimic the composition of human milk, the safety and suitability of each specific infant formula should be tested by clinical evaluation in the target population. Here, we report the results of a multicenter, randomized, blinded, controlled clinical trial that aimed to evaluate a novel starting formula on weight gain and body composition of infants up to 6 and 12 months (INNOVA 2020 study), as well as safety and tolerability. The complete protocol of this study has been previously issued. **Study design**: 210 infants (70/group) were enrolled in the study, and completed the intervention until 12 months of age. For the intervention period, infants were divided into three groups: group 1 received the formula 1 (Nutribén® Innova1 or INN), with a lower amount of protein, and enriched in α-lactalbumin protein, and with a double amount of docosahexaenoic acid (DHA)/ arachidonic acid (ARA) than the standard formula; it also contained a thermally inactivated postbiotic (*Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis*, BPL1^{TM} HT). Group 2 received the standard formula or formula 2 (Nutriben® Natal or STD) and the third group was exclusively breastfed for exploratory analysis and used as a reference (BFD group). During the study, visits were made at 21 days, 2, 4, 6, and 12 months of age, with ± 3 days for the visit at 21 days of age, ± 1 week for the visit at 2 months, and ± 2 weeks for the others. During the first 6 months of the study, and until obtaining the main variable, the infants were only supplied with the starting formula or natural breastfeeding. **Results**: The primary outcome, weight gain, was higher in both formula groups than in the BFD group at 6 and 12 months, whereas no differences were found between STD and INN groups neither at 6 nor at 12 months. Likewise, BMI was higher in infants fed the two formulas compared with the BFD group. Regarding body composition, length, head circumference and tricipital/subscapular skinfolds were alike between groups. The INN formula was considered safe as weight gain and body composition were within the normal limits, according to WHO standards. The BFD group exhibited more liquid consistency in the stools compared to both formula groups. All groups showed similar digestive tolerance and infant behavior. However, most adverse events were reported by the STD formula group (291), followed by the INN formula (282) and the BFD groups (227). Nonetheless, most of the adverse events (95.5%) were not considered to be related to the type of feeding There were fewer respiratory, thoracic, and mediastinal disorders among BFD children. Additionally, infants receiving the INN formula experienced significantly fewer general disorders and disturbances than those receiving the STD formula Indeed, atopic dermatitis, bronchitis, and bronchiolitis were significantly more prevalent among infants who were fed the STD formula compared to those fed BFD formula or INN formula. To evaluate whether there are significant differences between formula treatments, beyond growth parameters, it would seem necessary to examine more precise health biomarkers including those based on omics sciences, such as metabolomics, proteomics and metagenomics.

Clinical Trial Registration: The trial was registered with Clinicaltrial.gov (NCT05303077) on March 31, 2022, and lastly updated on April 7, 2022.

Keywords: Arachidonic acid (ARA); α-lactalbumin; *Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis*, BPL1™; body composition; docosahexaenoic acid (DHA); infant formula; postbiotics: protein; safety.

1.- Introduction

Exclusive breastfeeding is the gold standard for infant feeding because it not only promotes adequate growth and development, excellent nutritional status, and appropriate psychological development, but also, due to the special composition of breast milk in bioactive and immunogenic substances, it effectively protects against numerous infectious diseases. In particular pneumonia and other respiratory infections caused by bacteria and viruses, diarrhea and allergic processes. In addition, breastfeeding promotes an optimal psycho-affective mother-child relationship and has a very low cost, practically nil (Ip et al., 2009;Walker, 2010;Black et al., 2013;Victora et al., 2016;Ogbu et al., 2021). Indeed, WHO and UNICEF recommend that children initiate breastfeeding within the first hour of birth and be exclusively breastfed for the first 6 months of life – meaning no other foods or liquids are provided, including water (World Health Organization, 2002;2022). However, from the age of 6 months, children should begin eating safe and adequate complementary foods while continuing to breastfeed for up to 2 years and beyond (World Health Organization, 2022).

Breastfeeding protects against disease in both developing (Black et al., 2013) and developed countries (Ip et al., 2009) and is beneficial not only for infants but also for mothers. Moreover, breastfeeding may protect later in life against obesity and metabolic diseases. Indeed, breastfed children perform better on intelligence tests, are less likely to be overweight or obese and less prone to diabetes later in life (Rameez et al., 2019;World Health Organization, 2022). Also, women who breastfeed have a reduced risk of breast and ovarian cancers (World Health Organization, 2022).

Despite worldwide efforts to promote breastfeeding, there are many social factors, especially premature return to work after childbirth and, in some cases, maternal illness, which cause many mothers to abandon breastfeeding prematurely (Balogun et al., 2015). In these cases, it is necessary to have infant formula with an optimal nutritional composition to promote adequate growth and development, and which are safe. In this regard, different entities such as ESPGHAN (Koletzko et al., 2005) and the AAP have established various recommendations for the composition of infant formulas. In addition, various governmental organizations, such as the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission (CODEX ALIMENTARIS, 2020), the European Union Commission (Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2016) and the US FDA (FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, 2018) have established strict compositional and control standards for infant formula foods to protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the food trade.

Continuous research on the composition of human milk and the biological effects of its components (Christian et al., 2021) has led to the constant evolution of infant formula, especially during the last five decades, incorporating new food ingredients to meet not only the nutritional needs of infants, but also to contribute to the better development and functionality of their organs (Carver, 2003). Thus, based on certain studies suggesting that a high protein intake in the early stages of life may be the cause of obesity and increased risk of metabolic disease in later stages of life (Brands et al., 2014;Zheng et al., 2018), the protein composition of infant formulas has been adjusted both in quality and quantity, reducing the protein intake of infants to values very close to those obtained with breastfeeding. On the other hand, the relatively high content of long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids of both the n-6 and n-

3 series, especially arachidonic acid (AA, 20:4 n-6) and docosahexaenoic acid (DHA, 22:6 n-3) in human milk and their proven effects on the cognitive development of infants, has led to the incorporation of these fatty acids into infant formulas. In this regard, and despite the fact that EFSA and the European Union Commission have established mandatory compositional recommendations only for DHA content (EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products and Allergies, 2014;EU Commission, 2016), numerous researchers have argued and established consensus documents on the need for infant formulas to incorporate both AA and DHA in amounts comparable to the average composition of human milk. In this regard, infant formula should provide DHA at levels of 0.3% to 0.5% by weight of total fatty acids and with a minimum level of ARA equivalent to the DHA content (Koletzko et al., 2020;Campoy et al., 2021).

During the last two decades, advances in the knowledge of the composition of the intestinal microbiome of breast-fed infants and its beneficial effects on the host (Flaherman et al., 2018;Gopalakrishna and Hand, 2020) have led to the incorporation of both prebiotics and probiotics in infant formulas (Thomas et al., 2010;Braegger et al., 2011). In this regard, there is now some evidence of the effects of prebiotics and probiotics incorporated into infant formulas in the prevention of acute infectious diarrhea caused by different microorganisms, as well as in the treatment of antibiotic-associated diarrhea and the prevention of allergy (Thomas et al., 2010;Braegger et al., 2011;Szajewska et al., 2016;Adjibade et al., 2022). On the other hand, it is known that not only live probiotics but also their fermentation products and death cells derived of inactivated probiotics, referred to by ISAPP as postbiotics, can exert biological effects of interest on the intestinal microbiota (Salminen et al., 2021;Vinderola et al., 2022). In this regard, it has been described that *Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis* CECT 8145 inactivated by heat (BPL1^{TM} HT) has been reported to exhibit several biological effects of interest. Indeed, lipoteichoic acid from BPL1 BPL1^{TM} HT reduces fat deposition via the IGF-1 pathway in mice (Balaguer et al., 2022) and has anti-obesity effects in obese Zucker rats (Carreras et al., 2018). Moreover, daily consumption of the living strain BPL1^{TM} ameliorates several anthropometric adiposity biomarkers in abdominally obese adults (Pedret et al., 2019). Likewise, an infant formula supplemented with BPL1^{TM} HT reduced fat deposition in *C. elegans* and augmented acetate and lactate in a fermented infant slurry (Silva et al., 2020).

The current infant formulas contain novel ingredients that mimic the composition and functionality of human milk in part. Therefore, they should be tested clinically for tolerance, safety, and efficacy on growth and development. Hence, in the present study we aimed to evaluate the effect of a novel starting infant formula on weight gain in infants up to 6 and 12 months of age. This was compared to a standard infant formula. Other body composition parameters (anthropometric data), as well as safety and tolerability of both preparations, included digestive tolerance (flatulence, vomiting and regurgitation), and stool (consistency and frequency), behavior (restlessness, colic, nocturnal awakenings), and incidence of infections. Safety objectives included any adverse events resulting from the consumption of the study formula. As a further exploratory objective, we compared weight gain up to 6 and 12 months and changes in the other secondary variables among the infants who received the modified starter formula and the standard formula with a group of exclusively breastfed infants. The complete design and methodology of this randomized, multicenter, double-blind, parallel, comparative clinical trial of two infant formulas for infants with a reference of an exclusively breastfed infant group has been previously registered with Clinicaltrial.gov (NCT05303077) on March 31, 2022, and lastly updated on April 7, 2022, and published (Ruiz-Ojeda et al., 2022).

2.- Material and methods

2.1. Ethics

This clinical trial was carried out following the recommendations of the International Conference on Harmonization Tripartite, the ethical-legal principles established in the latest revision of the Declaration of Helsinki, as well as the current regional regulations that regulate pharmacovigilance and food safety. The study protocol and any material delivered to the subject, as well as any advertising material or compensation offered to the participating subjects. Prior to the study start, the Ethics Committee approves the study for Drug Research (ECDR). This approval was documented in a letter sent to each researcher specifying the date on which the ECDR met to give its approval. The present study was approved by the CEIm-R, the Committee for Technical Investigation in Regional Medicine in the Madrid Community (CEIm-R) dated 11/05/2018 under the name INNOVA2020 version 2.0. All personal data obtained in this study are confidential. They were treated in accordance with the Spanish Organic Law 3/2018, of December 5, on the Protection of Personal Data and guarantee of digital rights. The researcher or the institution allowed direct access to the data or source documents for monitoring, auditing, and review by the ECDR. This also allowed inspection of the trial by the health authorities.

2.2. Trial design

The INNOVA study was designed as a randomized, multi-center, double-blind, parallel, and comparative clinical trial of the equivalence of two starting infant formulas for infants. Furthermore, a third un-blinded group of breastfed infants was used as a further reference group for exploratory analysis. Blinding for both investigator and participant remained assured as both infant formulas were labeled the same. It is not mandatory to carry out specific clinical tests to demonstrate the nutritional and healthy properties of infant formulas as per the current EU legislation (EC Regulation No. 1924/2006) (Ruiz-Ojeda et al., 2022).

Parents were informed by pediatricians involved in the study of the possibility of participating in it at a meeting at 15 days of infant age. After accepting to participate, they came to the health center for the baseline visit a week later (visit at 21 days of age). The pediatrician requested, at the meeting at 15 days of life, that parents provide at the next visit relevant information from the maternal history that was required for the study and that was not available in the pediatric history. The visit that took place within the scheduled time was considered valid with a margin of ± 3 days in the visit at 21 days of age, ± 1 week in the visit at 2 months of age, and ± 2 weeks in visits at 4, 6 and 12 months of age. The inclusion criteria were healthy children of both sexes; term children (between 37 and 42 weeks of gestation), birth weight between 2500-4500 g, single delivery, and mothers with a body mass index, before pregnancy, between 19 and 30 kg/m^2. The exclusion criteria were, body weight less than the 5th percentile for that gestational age, allergy to cow's milk proteins and/or lactose, history of antibiotic use during the 7 days before inclusion, congenital disease or malformation that can affect growth, diagnosis of disease or metabolic disorders, significant prenatal and/or severe postnatal disease before enrollment, minor parents (younger than 18 years old), newborn of a diabetic mother, newborn of a mother with drug dependence during pregnancy, newborn whose parents/caregivers cannot comply with procedures of the study, and infants participating or have participated in another clinical trial since their birth. Participants had the right to withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason, without giving explanations or suffering any penalty for it. Likewise, the investigator could withdraw study participants if they did not comply with the study procedures. This is for any reason that, in the investigator's opinion, may pose the infants at risk or makes it necessary to suspend breastfeeding. The following treatments were forbidden in the trial: antibiotics during the 7 days prior to inclusion,

antibiotics for 10 days during the trial, any treatment, food or product that could interfere with the trial at any time, and breastfeeding which was different from that of the group assigned group in the trial.

The sample size of the trial is 210 children (70/group), based on the main outcome of weight gain, which is the main variable chosen according to the guidelines "Guidelines from the American Academy of Pediatrics Task Force on Clinical Testing of Infant Formulas" (Task force on clinical testing of infant formulas committee on nutrition. American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Nutrition et al., 1988). The infants were selected by Primary Care pediatricians in competitive recruitment. The study was carried out in 21 centers, all located in Spain, of which 17 recruited at least one subject. In total, 217 subjects signed the informed consent (IC) and 145 were randomized to receive one of the two infant formulas. Of these 145, 3 were randomization failures and 2 were screening failures, thus 140 infants who met all the inclusion criteria and no exclusion criteria were included in the study, and 70 were unblinded within infants exclusively breastfed. A total of 185 subjects completed all study visits, of which there were 25 dropouts, 12 in the breastfeeding group, 8 in the formula 1 group, and 5 in the standard formula group. The trial was registered with clinicaltrial.gov website (NCT05303077, https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05303077) on March 31, 2022, and lastly updated on April 7, 2022. Figure 1 summarizes the disposition of the subjects in the study.

2.3 Formula characteristics

•Group 1 (Infant formula 1): Nutribén® Innova 1

•Group 2 (Infant formula 2): Nutribén® Standard

•Group 3: Breastfeeding (External control exploratory analysis)

Infants were recruited from Primary Care Pediatrics clinics by the pediatricians participating in the trial. Pediatricians informed and invited parents of 15-day-old infants who visited their offices regularly (for regular medical check-ups) to be involved in the trial. Infants that were not a candidate for breastfeeding (for different reasons) were proposed to participate in the formula-feeding groups. To keep the three arms of the trial balanced, one candidate breastfeeding subject was recruited at each center for every two infants supplemented with infant formula. The selection of the children of the breastfeeding group was made among those infants who met the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study and fit the categories of sex, body mass index of the mother before pregnancy (<25, >25kg/m2), and birth weight (<3500 g, >3500 g) of the last infant in the formula-fed group included in the center.

The experimental product object of this trial (Formula 1 or Nutribén® Innova 1, INN formula) and the Nutribén® Standard formula (STD formula) comply with the recommendations of the ESPGHAN (European Society of Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition) and with Regulation 609/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council regarding foods intended for children, infants and young children, foods for special medical purposes and complete diet substitutes for weight control and repealing Council Directives 92/51, Directives 96/8/EC, 1999/21/CE, 2006/125/CE and 2006/141/CE of the Commission, Directive 2009/38/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulations 41/2009 and 953/2009 of the Commission. More detailed information on the composition of each of the products can be found in additional information (Supplementary Table S1). Infant formulas are given ad libitum orally. The two trial formulations were administered following the preparation instructions in the manufacturer's package insert.

2.4 Measurements and evaluations

2.4.1 Anthropometric measures

Weight, length, and head circumference measurements were taken at all study visits (visit 1, 21 days, visit 2, 2 months, visit 3, 4 months, visit 4, 6 months, and visit 5, 12 months). From the visit scheduled for the fourth month of life, the mean arm circumference, the triceps skinfold, and the subscapular skinfold were added to the previous measurements. All these measurements were done in duplicate. Using as valid data the mean between the two. Each center had all the necessary materials to carry out these measurements. They needed to always use the same material with all subjects and, of course, the material should be calibrated.

2.4.2 Characteristics of the feces and digestive tolerance

We evaluated consistency and the number of stools/day) at times 21 days, 2, 4, 6 and 12 months of age were evaluated as well as, flatulence, vomiting and regurgitation at times 21 days, 2, 4, 6 and 12 months of age.

2.4.3 Behavior and global evaluation of the parents

Global evaluation of the parents. Infant's behavior. Restlessness, colic, and night awakenings were evaluated during 21 days, 2, 4, 6 and 12 months of age.

2.4.4 Morbidity, safety and tolerability of the products

Variables were evaluated within 1-year morbidity and in the course of 1 year, respectively. All adverse events have been coded according to MedDRA dictionary version 21.0 (MedDRA, 2018).

2.5 Statistical methods

The main objective of the study was to evaluate whether the weight gain was equivalent between treatment groups receiving formula 1 and 2, and it has been decided that the sample size of the trial is 210 children (70/group). Previous studies carried out on children fed from 0 to 6 months with different formulations of infant formula have shown a mean weight gain of around 20-25 g/day with a standard deviation between 5 and 6 g/day. In most of these studies, a difference in mean weight gain of 3 g/day was considered clinically relevant. Thus, the main objective was resolved by using a t-test for independent samples. Considering a power of 80%, a significance level of 5%, an equivalence limit of 3 g/day, and a common standard deviation of 5.5 g/day, we needed to recruit at least 59 children in each of the groups. Based on an estimated dropout rate of 20%, it was necessary to include 70 children in each of the groups, which means 140 infants. A third group of the same size (70 children) was included for the secondary comparisons between the bottle-fed and breastfed groups, maintaining the same significance and power in this secondary comparison as in the main comparison. Categorical variables are described as frequencies or percentages. Continuous variables are reported as mean and standard deviation. Between-group differences in measures of growth and body composition are analyzed using analysis of variance, including analysis of covariance and general models of analysis of variance for repeated measures when required. The Chi-square test is applied to compare discrete

variables between groups. The Bonferroni correction is used when comparisons are made between more than two groups. The alpha level of significance is set at 0.05. All evaluable infants have been included in the statistical analysis, considering "evaluable" all those who have the main measurement variable. Both, intention to treat and protocol-based statistical analyses are performed.

3.- Results

In **table 1** shows demographic and descriptive information. Here, gestational age, birth weight, childbirth delivery, assisted reproductive technology, and the mother's medical background were included, though no significant variables were shown. During visit 1 (21 days), only daily depositions per day were significantly higher for the BFD group in comparison with formula groups.

The parents or legal guardians returned to the center all the leftover containers (empty containers and containers with products) in order to record the amount of product dispensed and the amount of infant formula used up to the time of the visit; the corresponding weighing was performed and the percentage of product ingested by the participants was determined. Finally, the grams of formulation consumed by each infant, measured by weighing the leftover formulations or as indicated in the parents' diary corresponding to the periods between visits 1-2, 2-3 and 3-4, were available. The participants of this study included in the formula-feeding groups were considered compliant if they took at least 80% of the formula during the first six months while in the breastfeeding group it was considered a valid external control if more than 80% of the feedings were breastfeeding. All infants included in the BFD group, except one, consumed more than 80% of the formula during the first six months.

A repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed for grams consumed per day according to weighing, and significant differences were observed for visit, sex and infant birth weight, but not in relation to the formula used (data not presented). The ANOVA for grams consumed per day according to parents' diaries also showed significant differences as a function of visit, sex and infant birth weight, but not as a function of the formulation used (data not presented).

Table 1. Baseline demographics of the infants in the study

	BFD	STD	INN	P-value
N	70	70	70	
Gender (% of women)	28 (40.0)	29 (41.4)	33 (47.1)	0.738
Gestational age (weeks)	39.44 (1.1)	39.20 (1.1)	39.34 (0.9)	0.389
Birth weight (g)	3359.20 (403.9)	3300.87 (462.9)	3363.30 (408.7)	0.626
Birth weight >3500 g (%)	22 (31.4)	22 (31.4)	27 (38.6)	0.613
Childbirth delivery n, (%)				0.579
Cesarean section	13 (18.6)	17 (24.3)	20 (28.6)	
Distocyc	8 (11.4)	6 (8.6)	9 (12.9)	
Normal childbirth	49 (70.0)	47 (67.1)	41 (58.6)	
Assisted reproductive technology n, (%)	4 (5.7)	6 (8.6)	3 (4.3)	0.679
Assisted reproductive technology type (%)				0.066
In vitro fertilization	1 (25.0)	6 (100.0)	2 (66.7)	
Artificial insemination	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (33.3)	
Egg donation	1 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Maternal BMI (kg/m^2), (x, SD)	23.72 (3.2)	23.92 (3.3)	23.78 (3.0)	0.967
BMI mother>25 n, (%)	22 (31.4)	22 (31.4)	24 (34.3)	0.85
Single pregnancy n, (%)	70 (100.0)	70 (100.0)	70 (100.0)	NS
Mother's medical background n, (%)				0.849
Allergy	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	
Hypothyroidism	7 (10.0)	5 (7.1)	4 (5.7)	
Arterial hypertension	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)	
No	58 (82.9)	55 (78.6)	55 (78.6)	
Others	5 (7.1)	8 (11.4)	8 (11.4)	
Visit 1, (21 days)	**BFD**	**STD**	**INN**	**P-value**
Depositions per day	5.2 (3.2)	2.5 (2.0)	2.3 (1.4)	<0.001*
Weight	3921.8 (475.5)	3805.0 (507.5)	3916.6 (453.9)	0.268
Length	53.1 (1.9)	52.6 (2.2)	52.8 (1.7)	0.287
Head circumference	36.6 (1.0)	36.2 (1.3)	36.5 (1.2)	0.214

Data are expressed as mean and standard deviation, and frequency or percentage. BMI, body mass index; NS, non-significant

Table 2. Weight and differential daily weight gain in the entire study

Differential daily weight gain per day (g)						
Groups	**BFD**	**STD**	**INN**		**P-value**	
Visits	**(N=58)**	**(N=65)**	**(N=62)**	**STD vs. BFD**	**INN vs. BFD**	**STD vs. INN**
Visit 4 vs Visit 1	22.0 ± 4.6	24.24 ± 5.06	24.60 ± 5.29	0.01	0.004	0.693
Visit 5 vs visit 1	16.01 ± 2.66	17.41 ± 3.25	17.00 ± 2.95	0.011	0.057	0.457
Weight (g)						
Groups	**BFD**	**STD**	**INN**		**P-value**	
Visits	**(N=58)**	**(N=65)**	**(N=62)**	**Formula**	**Visit**	**Formula x visit**
Visit 1, 21 days	3951.3 ± 498.0	3805.8 ± 509.6	3916.9 ± 468.7			
Visit 2, 2 months	5285.1 ± 564.9	5193.7 ± 684.0	5236.6 ± 623.2			
Visit 3, 4 months	6558.6 ± 697.1	6733.0 ± 937.7	6843.1 ± 855.1	0.081	0.848	0.011
Visit 4, 6 months	7471.1 ± 846.3	7718.7 ± 1132.8	7903.1 ± 1063.5			
Visit 5, 12 months	9505.2 ± 985.6	9869.7 ± 1382.1	9797.6 ± 1234.4			

Data are expressed as mean and standard deviation

The primary variable (weight gain) consisted of the difference in infant weight (in g/day) between the initial recruitment visit and the 6-month visit, divided by the number of days between the two visits. This analysis was performed on the 187 infants who completed until visit 4 (6 months). The difference between visit 1 and visit 4 was calculated in days of 187 children individually (**Table 2**). When analyzing the mean difference in weight gain between the groups of children treated with the STD and INN formulations (**Table 2**), there was no statistically significant difference in weight gain between the two formulations. On the other hand, an ANOVA of the weight difference between visits 1 and 4 was performed for the STD and INN formulations controlling for the factors, gender, maternal body mass index (BMI) and birth weight. There were significant differences in weight difference between visits 1 and 4 as a function of gender and infant birth weight, but not as a function of formulation or mother's BMI (**Table 2**). The grams consumed per day were also related to the difference in weight between visits 1 and 4. Based on the weighing of leftover grams of the dispensed formulation, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) of the difference in weight of the children between visits 1 and 4 was performed as a function of formulation consumed (STD, INN), gender (male, female), maternal BMI (<25, >25), birth weight (<3500, >3500) and grams ingested per day. A moderate positive correlation (r=0.535) was observed between mean grams ingested per day (measured by weighing leftover formulations) and weight gain between visits 1 and 4 of the infants. This correlation changed significantly by gender (males achieved larger weight differences for the same daily grams of formulation consumed) and by birth weight (infants with birth weights > 3500 achieved larger weight differences for the same daily grams of formulation consumed) but not as a function of maternal BMI or formulation used.

This same MANOVA as a function of grams ingested daily according to parental diary also showed a positive correlation (r=0.626) between mean grams ingested per day (obtained from parental diary entries) and weight gain between visits 1 and 4 of the infants. This correlation changed significantly by gender (boys achieved larger weight differences for the same daily grams of formulation consumed)

and by birth weight (children with birth weights > 3500 achieved larger weight differences, especially those who consumed more daily grams of formulation) but not as a function of maternal BMI or formulation used.

Secondarily and foreseen in the study protocol, the weight gain of the infants who received each of the formulations studied was compared with the BFD group. The results of this analysis are shown in **Table 2**, where it can be seen that BFD infants had a significantly lower weight gain at 6 months of age than that shown by infants fed with either of the two formulations evaluated (STD and INN).

The same analysis was performed for the variable weight gain at 12 months of study. **Table 2** shows the number of children in each of the 3 groups studied with weight values recorded at visit 1 (21 days of age) and visit 5 (12 months ± 2 weeks). A comparison of the means of weight gain from the different formulations (STD vs. INN, STD vs. BFD and, INN vs. BFD, **Table 2**) revealed that at 6 months there is no significant difference in weight gain (measured in g/day) as well as at 12 months between the STD and INN formulations. Moreover, the secondary comparisons of each of the formulations with breastfeeding show an equalization between formulations with the INN formulation not being significantly different from breastfeeding. On the contrary, the total weight gain of the STD formulation group remained significantly higher than the BFD group at 12 months. ANOVA (data not presented) shows significant differences for visit ($p<0.001$) and for the interaction between formulation and visit ($p=0.004$), but not for formulation exclusively ($p=0.381$). The largest effect size was associated with the visit factor (0.8477).

Table 3. Length and head circumference in the entire study

Length (cm)			
Visits	**BFD (N=58)**	**STD (N=65)**	**INN (N=62)**
Visit 1	53.15 ± 2.08	52.49 ± 2.24	52.87 ± 1.78
Visit 2	57.89 ± 2.42	57.47 ± 2.33	57.95 ± 2.02
Visit 3	63.16 ± 2.42	63.24 ± 3.67	63.50 ± 2.16
Visit 4	66.68 ± 2.64	67.01 ± 3.26	67.15 ± 2.14
Visit 5	75.44 ± 2.90	75.82 ± 3.08	75.96 ± 2.54
Head circumference (cm)			
Visits	**BFD (N=58)**	**STD (N=65)**	**INN (N=62)**
Visit 1	36.66 ± 1.02	36.22 ± 1.34	36.51 ± 1.25
Visit 2	36.09 ± 1.17	38.87 ± 1.36	39.11 ± 1.63
Visit 3	41.56 ± 1.12	41.79 ± 3.73	41.64 ± 1.39
Visit 4	43.19 ± 1.22	43.18 ± 1.37	43.41 ± 1.45
Visit 5	46.40 ± 1.18	46.25 ± 1.53	46.29 ± 1.50

Data are expressed as mean and standard deviation

No significant differences were observed in length and head circumference, as well as, tricipital and subscapular skinfolds and mean upper arm circumference (**Tables 3** and **4**).

Table 4. Tricipital and subscapular skinfolds and mean upper arm circumference in visits 3, 4, and 5.

Tricipital skinfold (mm)			
	BFD (N=58)	**STD (N=65)**	**INN (N=62)**
Visit 3	12.32 ± 2.26	12.66 ± 2.67	12.78 ± 3.00
Visit 4	12.35 ± 2.23	12.60 ± 2.65	12.90 ± 2.99
Visit 5	12.34 ± 2.23	12.63 ± 2.65	12.84 ± 2.99
Subscapular skinfold (mm)			
	BFD (N=58)	STD (N=65)	INN (N=62)
Visit 3	9.92 ± 2.69	9.83 ± 2.72	10.25 ± 2.73
Visit 4	9.90 ± 2.49	9.94 ± 2.72	10.36 ± 2.73
Visit 5	9.91 ± 2.58	9.89 ± 2.73	10.30 ± 2.72
Mean upper arm circumference (cm)			
	BFD (N=58)	**STD (N=65)**	**INN (N=62)**
Visit 3	13.79 ± 1.30	13.89 ± 1.67	14.15 ± 1.21
Visit 4	14.41 ± 1.24	14.72 ± 1.46	14.98 ± 1.88
Visit 5	15.34 ± 1.26	15.29 ± 1.68	15.94 ± 1.39

Data are expressed as mean and standard deviation

Table 5. Body mass index, body fat percentage, and lean mass.

Body mass index (kg/m^2)					**P-value**	
Visits	**BFD (N=58)**	**STD (N=65)**	**INN (N=62)**	**Formula**	**Visit**	**Formula x visit**
Visit 1	13.94 ± 1.11	13.75 ± 1.04	13.97 ± 1.07			
Visit 2	15.74 ± 1.08	15.67 ± 1.30	15.56 ± 1.28			
Visit 3	16.42 ± 1.22	16.97 ± 3.61	16.94 ± 1.59	0.487	<0.001	<0.001
Visit 4	16.78 ± 1.30	17.15 ± 1.83	17.49 ± 1.81			
Visit 5	16.69 ± 1.28	17.11 ± 1.64	16.94 ± 1.54			
Body fat percentage					**P-value**	
Visits	**BFD (N=58)**	**STD (N=65)**	**INN (N=62)**	**Formula**	**Visit**	**Formula x visit**
Visit 3	19.35 ± 3.53	19.60 ± 3.39	20.37 ± 3.67			
Visit 4	20.36 ± 3.53	20.30 ± 3.73	21.29 ± 3.93	0.249	0.005	0.958
Visit 5	20.84 ± 3.64	21.02 ± 3.82	21.61 ± 4.01			
Lean mass (g)					**P-value**	
Visits	**BFD (N=58)**	**STD (N=65)**	**INN (N=62)**	**Formula**	**Visit**	**Formula x visit**
Visit 3	5284 ± 559	5403 ± 709	5436 ± 615			
Visit 4	5942 ± 654	6135 ± 823	6207 ± 782	0.215	<0.001	0.054
Visit 5	7509 ± 703	7805 ± 1023	7670 ± 967			

Data are expressed as mean and standard deviation

In the case of BMI, the ANOVA (**Table 5**) shows significant differences for visit ($p<0.001$) and for the interaction between formulation and visit ($p<0.001$), but not for formulation ($p=0.487$). The largest effect size was associated with the visit factor (0.4230, data not provided). In addition, we have reported that it was from the third visit onwards that the mean BMI was higher in the STD and INN formulations compared to the BFD group; hence, the interaction effect appears as significant (**Table 5**). For the body fat percentage, the ANOVA (**Table 5**) shows significant differences for visit ($p=0.005$), but not for the interaction between formulation and visit ($p=0.958$) and for formulation ($p=0.249$). The largest effect size is associated with the visit factor (0.0236, data not shown). Finally for the lean mass, the ANOVA (**Table 5**) shows significant differences for visit ($p<0.001$), but not for the interaction between formulation and visit ($p=0.054$) and for formulation ($p=0.215$). The largest effect size is associated with the visit factor (0.6093, data not provided).

In the case of BMI percentiles, the ANOVA (**Table S2**) reveals significant differences for visit ($p=0.009$) and the interaction between formulation and visit ($p=0.006$), but not for formulation ($p=0.504$). The largest effect size is associated with the visit factor (0. 0222, data not provided). In the ANOVA, there were significant differences in the height percentiles for visit ($p=0.011$), for the interaction between formulation and visit ($p<0.001$), but not for formulation ($p=0.433$, **Table S2**). The largest effect size is associated with the visit factor (0.0154, data not shown). Finally, in the weight percentiles, the ANOVA (**Table S2**) shows significant differences for visit ($p<0.001$) and for the interaction between formulation and visit ($p<0.001$), but not for formulation ($p=0.368$). The largest effect size is associated with the visit factor (0.0228, data not provided).

The time course of the study shows a difference between breastfed infants presenting stools of a more liquid consistency (**Table S3**), although these differences ceased to be significant at visit 5 (see **table S3**). Likewise, the daily number of stools was higher in breastfed infants at visits 1, 2 and 3, but these differences ceased to be significant at visits 4 and 5 (**Table 6**).

Table 6. The daily number of stools.

Number of daily depositions	**Visit 1**	**Visit 2**	**Visit 3**	**Visit 4**	**Visit 5**
		BFD			
Mean (SD)	5.2 (3.2)	3.1 (2.3)	2.3 (1.5)	2.0 (1.4)	1.8 (1.0)
Median [Min, Max]	5 [3, 8]	3 [1, 4]	2 [1, 3]	2 [1, 2]	2 [1, 2]
		STD			
Mean (SD)	2.5 (2.0)	1.5 (0.7)	1.3 (0.6)	1.5 (1.0)	1.9 (0.9)
Median [Min, Max]	2 [1, 4]	1 [1, 2]	1 [1, 2]	1 [1, 2]	2 [1, 2]
		INN			
Mean (SD)	2.3 (1.4)	1.6 (0.8)	1.6 (0.9)	1.6 (0.9)	1.9 (0.8)
Median [Min, Max]	2 [1, 3]	1 [1, 2]	1 [1, 2]	1 [1, 2]	2 [1, 2]

Data are expressed as mean and maximum and minimum

Table 7 shows the tabulation of the different categories of digestive tolerance between each two visits. An increase in the percentage of children with high tolerance is seen throughout the study without significant differences between the different formulations and compared with the BFD group.

Table 7. Digestive tolerance

Digestive tolerance	BFD (N=65)	STD (N=66)	INN (N=64)
Period between visits 1 and 2			
Adequate	33 (50.8%)	38 (57.6%)	29 (45.3%)
Constipation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.6%)
Flatulence	11 (16.9%)	8 (12.1%)	12 (18.8%)
Vomiting	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)
Others			
Colic	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.1%)
Irritability	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Regurgitation	19 (29.2%)	19 (28.8%)	20 (31.3%)
Period between visits 2 and 3			
Digestive tolerance	BFD (N=65)	STD (N=66)	INN (N=64)
Adequate	38 (62.3%)	43 (65.2%)	33 (52.4%)
Constipation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.6%)
Flatulence	2 (3.3%)	2 (3.0%)	7 (11.1%)
Vomiting	0 (0%)	2 (3.0%)	0 (0%)
Others			
Irritability	2 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Regurgitation	19 (31.2%)	19 (28.8%)	22 (34.9%)
Period between visits 3 and 4			
Digestive tolerance	BFD (N=65)	STD (N=66)	INN (N=64)
Adequate	37 (63.8%)	52 (78.8%)	44 (69.8%)
Constipation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Flatulence	6 (10.3%)	2 (3.0%)	4 (6.4%)
Vomiting	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Others			
Diarrhea	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.6%)
Abdominal pain	0 (0%)	1 (1.5%)	0 (0%)
Period between visits 4 and 5			
Digestive tolerance	BFD (N=65)	STD (N=66)	INN (N=64)
Adequate	56 (96.6%)	64 (98.5%)	59 (95.2%)
Constipation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Flatulence	1 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.6%)
Vomiting	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Others			
Regurgitation	1 (1.7%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.6%)

Data are expressed as counts and percentages

The infant's behavior was recoded as altered mood or pleasant mood according to the guardians or parents. **Table S4** shows how the percentage of infants with altered behavior decreased throughout the study. No significant differences were observed among the three ways of feeding.

The study found no differences in tolerability between the different groups (**Table S5**). According to the safety of the different formulations, the majority of the adverse events (n=754) were mild - Grade 1 (94.3%), 13 were moderate-Grade 2 (1.6% of the total) and none were severe-Grade 3. The intensity was not recorded for 33 of the events (4.1%) (**Table 12**). There were no differences between the different groups concerning the intensity of the events. For example, there were 93.0% of mild events in the BFD group, 91.8% in the INN group, and 97.6% in the STD group.

Table 8. Adverse events across the study

Total adverse events	**BFD (N=70)**	**STD (N=70)**	**INN (N=70)**
Subjects with at least one adverse event (%)	62 (88.6%)	57 (81.4%)	61 (87.1%)
Total number	227	291	282
Mild - Grade 1	211	284	259
Moderate - Grade 2	3	3	7
Severe - Grade 3	0	0	0
Potentially fatal - Grade 4	0	0	0
Lethal - Grade 5	0	0	0
Unknown	13	4	16
Adverse events related to feeding	**BFD (N=70)**	**STD (N=70)**	**INN (N=70)**
Subjects with at least one adverse event (%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.4%)	1 (1.4%)
Total number	1	2	2
Mild - Grade 1	1	2	2
Moderate -Grade 2	0	0	0
Severe - Grade 3	0	0	0
Potentially fatal - Grade 4	0	0	0
Lethal - Grade 5	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0

Data are expressed as counts and percentages

Most of the adverse events (95.5%) were not considered to be related to the type of feeding (**Table 8**), but only 5 were considered possibly related (**Table 8**). All of them were mild, with 1 growth failure, within the BFD group that led to the introduction of artificial breastfeeding together with breastfeeding, two events, neonatal constipation, and abdominal pain, recorded by one infant within the INN group, led to the change of formula and the abandonment of the study and two (infantile colic and infant reflux) recorded by one infant within the STD group that led to the change of formula and the abandonment of the study (**Table 8**). . For adverse events that occur with a frequency greater than 1%, BFD infants exhibited the lowest incidence and infants fed INN formula experienced significantly fewer general disorders and disturbances compared with the STD group. Indeed, the infants who were

fed STD formula had a significantly higher incidence of atopic dermatitis, bronchitis and bronchiolitis events than the infants who were fed BFD or INN formula (**Table 9**).

Table 9. Adverse events that occur with a frequency greater than 1%.

MedDRA dictionary version 21.0 (MedDRA, 2018)	BFD (N=70)		STD (N=70)		INN (N=70)	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
Cold	42	18.50%	47	16.15%	38	13.48%
Pyrexia	16	7.05%	24	8.25%	11	3.90%
Bronchiolitis*	8	3.52%	19	6.53%	11	3.90%
Upper respiratory tract infection	11	4.85%	11	3.78%	15	5.32%
Infantile colic	14	6.17%	9	3.09%	10	3.55%
Conjunctivitis	5	2.20%	11	3.78%	15	5.32%
Bronchitis*	5	2.20%	15	5.15%	6	2.13%
Neonatal constipation	6	2.64%	10	3.44%	9	3.19%
Acute otitis media	4	1.76%	6	2.06%	13	4.61%
Rhinorrhea	9	3.96%	5	1.72%	6	2.13%
Gastroenteritis	4	1.76%	8	2.75%	8	2.84%
Cough	9	3.96%	7	2.41%	5	1.77%
Vaccination complication	1	0.44%	10	3.44%	7	2.48%
Laryngitis	1	0.44%	9	3.09%	7	2.48%
Atopic dermatitis*	1	0.44%	11	3.78%	2	0.71%
Seborrheic dermatitis	2	0.88%	4	1.37%	5	1.77%
Neonatal diarrhea	2	0.88%	3	1.03%	5	1.77%
Oral candidiasis	4	1.76%	3	1.03%	2	0.71%
Nasopharyngitis	1	0.44%	2	0.69%	6	2.13%
Infantile eczema	1	0.44%	5	1.72%	2	0.71%
Diaper dermatitis	2	0.88%	2	0.69%	4	1.42%
Rash	3	1.32%	2	0.69%	2	0.71%
Neonatal disorder	2	0.88%	1	0.34%	4	1.42%
Upper respiratory tract infection	2	0.88%	1	0.34%	3	1.06%
Wheezing	2	0.88%	3	1.03%	1	0.35%
Infant reflux	1	0.44%	2	0.69%	3	1.06%
Otitis media	4	1.76%	1	0.34%	1	0.35%
Gastroesophageal reflux disease	4	1.76%	0	0.00%	1	0.35%
Heart murmur	4	1.76%	1	0.34%	0	0.00%
Diarrhea	1	0.44%	0	0.00%	4	1.42%
Dermatitis	1	0.44%	3	1.03%	0	0.00%
Traumatic head injury	0	0.00%	1	0.34%	4	1.42%
Abdominal pain	0	0.00%	1	0.34%	3	1.06%
Bronchial hyperreactivity	0	0.00%	3	1.03%	0	0.00%
Decreased appetite	0	0.00%	3	1.03%	0	0.00%
Pharyngotonsillitis	0	0.00%	1	0.34%	3	1.06%
Umbilical hernia	0	0.00%	1	0.34%	3	1.06%
Viral rash	0	0.00%	1	0.34%	3	1.06%
Traumatic injury to the mouth	1	0.44%	0	0.00%	3	1.06%
Total	173		246		225	

Data are expressed as counts and percentages, *P<0.05 BFD and INN vs. STD group.

4.- Discussion

The present randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial has been designed to determine whether a novel starting infant formula with reduced protein content and lower casein to whey protein ratio of approximately 70/30 by increasing the content of α-lactalbumin, might be beneficial to the health of infants. Furthermore, this product contains higher levels of DHA and ARA, as well as a post-biotic thermally inactivated (BPL1^{TM} HT), compared with standard infant formula. An exclusively breastfed population was followed-up as a reference. At 6 and 12 months, infants receiving either INN or STD formula gained more weight than the BFD group, while no difference was observed between STD and INN formulas. BMI was also higher in infants fed the two formulas than in those fed BFD. In terms of body composition, length, head circumference, and tricipital/subscapular skinfolds were similar between the groups. It is important to note that the INN formula was considered safe based on weight gain and body composition, which were within the normal limits, according to WHO standards. Compared to both formulas, BDF produced stools that were more liquid in consistency. Throughout the study period, all groups exhibited similar digestive tolerance and infant behavior. In terms of the total number of adverse events reported, the STD formula has the highest number (291), followed by the INN formula (282) and finally, the BFD group (227). However, the majority of them were not related to type of feeding. Nonetheless, infants fed either BFD or the INN formula exhibited significantly lower episodes of atopic dermatitis, bronchitis and bronchiolitis events than those fed the STD formula.

Breastfeeding is one of the most effective methods for ensuring a child's health and well-being (Dieterich et al., 2013). Despite this, nearly two out of three infants are not exclusively breastfed for the recommended six months - a rate that has not improved in the past two decades (Jama et al., 2020). It is recommended that infants consume breast milk as their primary source of nutrition. It is a safe, clean product containing antibodies that help protect children against a wide range of common childhood diseases (Rollins et al., 2016; Victora et al., 2016). During the first few months of life, breastmilk provides the infant with all the nutrients and energy required, and for the remainder of the first year, breastmilk continues to meet about half of the child's nutritional needs, and for up to one-third of the child's nutritional requirements in the second year (World Health Organization, 2022)

In general, the low rate of exclusive breastfeeding can be attributed to a variety of factors, including maternal smoking, educational level, and the need to return to work (Scott et al., 2006; Libuda et al., 2014; Papadopoulos et al., 2022). In the current situation, three out of five infants are not breastfed in the first hour of their lives (World Health Organization, 2022). When breastfeeding is not possible, unsuitable, or inadequate, an interruption or cessation is warranted. Around the world, only 38% of infants are exclusively breastfed (Martin et al., 2016). Only 75% of American infants have been breastfeeding from birth. By the age of three months, however, 67%, or 2.7 million, of them are consuming some amount of infant formula (CODEX ALIMENTARIS, 2020). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, only 13% of first-time mothers who meet the recommendation to exclusively breastfeed for six months meet the recommendation for "any breastfeeding" after six months (Eidelman et al., 2012). Although infant formulas have been partially formulated to mimic the nutritional profile of human breast milk for normal infant development and growth, there is still a need for further research to improve these formulas (Kent, 2015).

It is pertinent to note that, in addition to exposure to metabolic and endocrine factors during pregnancy (Monasta et al., 2011), protein intake in formula-fed infants during their first year of life may have a significant impact on growth later in life and the risk of obesity and metabolic disorders in adulthood (Koletzko et al., 2009;Zheng et al., 2018). The protein content of infant formula is usually greater than

that of human milk to provide all essential amino acids in adequate quantities. The research indicates that infants fed a formula containing more protein gain more weight during the first year of life and are heavier at 2 years of age than infants consuming a formula containing less protein (Koletzko et al., 2009), which reduces the risk of obesity at school age (at age 6). Both formulas gained more weight than the BFD group at 6 months as measured by differential daily weight gain per day (g), while no difference was observed between STD and INN formulas. After 12 months, the STD group was significantly higher than BFD and INN groups. INN formula contains 8% less protein per 100 kcal than the STD. In the first six to eight weeks of life, there is almost no difference between breast milk and formula-fed infants in terms of growth (gain in weight and length). Formula-fed infants gain weight and length more rapidly than breast-fed infants from about two months of age to the end of their first year of life (Ziegler, 2006). The results of a recent review suggest that the difference in weight gain between formula-fed and breastfed infants is relatively small, comparable, and significantly less than the nutritionally significant differences used in determining sample size (Wallingford and Barber, 2019). Compared with exclusively breastfed infants, formula-fed infants gained weight more rapidly and out of proportion to linear growth. Lean mass accretion was greater than fat mass accretion in this study.

The intake of infant formula does not appear to be associated with an increased risk of obesity later in life (Bell et al., 2017), however, controversy surrounds this issue at present. New research from First Steps Nutrition Trust identifies the key steps required to protect children from overweight and obesity during the first 1,000 days of their lives, including the requirement that services become Baby Friendly accredited. It is possible to promote a healthy weight in the early years by taking 18 key actions, including increasing investment in universal breastfeeding support, regulating misleading commercial influences on infants and young children, and providing more assistance to families in introducing solids and responding to feeding needs at an appropriate age (Unicef, 2022). In two longitudinal studies, it was found that infant feeding mode (breastfeeding, mixed feeding, formula feeding) and breastfeeding duration were associated with BMI z-score trajectory in early childhood, but not the timing of solid food introduction. Based on these findings, extended breastfeeding can be encouraged and supported as a method of preventing childhood obesity (Zheng et al., 2021). The WHO commissioned a systematic review and meta-analysis of the association between breastfeeding and overweight or obesity. Overall, 159 studies were assessed, concluding that breastfeeding was associated with a reduction in overweight and obesity, and that publication bias and residual confounding were unlikely to explain this association (Horta et al., 2022).

The modifications in the infants' formula, such as reducing the caloric content of standard infant formula or adding milk fat globule membranes or altering the protein and fat content, may have some benefits for infants who are exclusively formula fed, particularly early in life before the introduction of complementary foods (Greer and Kleinman, 2014). A formula containing reduced energy and protein density and supplemented with bovine milk fat globule membrane showed positive effects on cognitive development and the incidence of acute otitis in infants without affecting body weight parameters compared with standard formula (Timby et al., 2014;Timby et al., 2015).

The protein content in both formulas was within the range recommended by the EFSA after it proposed to limit the maximum protein content of infant formulas to 2.5 g per 100 kcal. For infant formulas, it is critical to consider the whey/casein ratio in addition to the total amount of protein (Martin et al., 2016;Bohn et al., 2022). In the INN formula, the proportion of whey/casein was reduced to 70:30, rather than 60:40 in the STD formula. Indeed, there was a higher concentration of α-lactalbumin, (20%) compared to STD, which contains only 10%. There was no significant difference between the groups

in terms of length, head circumference, tricipital and subscapular skinfolds, and upper arm circumference.

International expert consensus suggests that infant formulas that contain DHA at a concentration of 0.3% to 0.5% by weight of total fat and AA at a minimum level equivalent to the amount of DHA should be clinically tested (Koletzko et al., 2020; Campoy et al., 2021). In this study, we used an advanced formula enhanced with a double amount of DHA/AA in comparison with a STD formula to provide evidence about weight gain and body composition, among other outcomes. Throughout the study, the percentage of children with high tolerance increased without significant differences between formulations and also compared to the group receiving BFD. According to the guardians or parents, the infant's behavior was classified as altered mood or pleasant mood. There was a decrease in the number of infants with altered behavior throughout the study. The three methods of feeding did not show any significant differences.

National and sub-national governments regulate food safety and other issues relating to food, more or less effectively. Globalization of the food system, however, necessitates guidance, monitoring, and regulation at the global level. Especially for countries with little control over their own food systems, which are vulnerable to pressures from outside, this is particularly true (Kent, 2015). In terms of the intensity of adverse events, tolerability and safety, there were no differences between the different groups (BFD, STD and INN formula). In different contexts and using different methods, infants are fed a variety of products. The formula for infants is available in many variations, many of which are superior to other methods of feeding and some of which are inferior to others. In the present study, *Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis* was added to the INN formula as a postbiotic (Carreras et al., 2018;Nataraj et al., 2020), which may have some beneficial effects on body composition, metabolism, and the composition of the gut microbiota (Carreras et al., 2018;Nataraj et al., 2020).

There was a significant difference between BFD infants presenting stools of a more liquid consistency, although this difference no longer existed at visit five. As well, BFD infants had more stools per day at visits 1, 2, and 3, but these differences ceased to be significant at visits 4 and 5. STD formula group reported the most adverse events (291), followed by the INN formula (282) and BFD group (227). There were no differences in safety across the study between the different groups. However, some differences were observed between the two formulas, showing a significant reduction in general disorders and disturbances among children who received the INN formula. STD formula-fed infants were more likely to cause atopic dermatitis, bronchitis, and bronchiolitis than BFD or INN formula fed infants. Changes in the formulation of the INN may have contributed to the decrease in adverse events. Additionally, changes in the intestinal microbiota will need to be assessed.

In conclusion, this randomized, multicenter, double-blind, parallel and comparative clinical trial involved the evaluation of a novel infant formula with reduced content of total protein and modification of the whey/casein ratio by increasing the content of α-lactalbumin, increased levels of both AA and DHA, and postbiotic in comparison with standard infant formula. For exploratory analysis, a third unblinded group of breastfed infants was used. Both formulas gained more weight at 6 and 12 months than the BFD group, while no difference was observed between STD and INN formulas. Infants fed both formulas had a higher BMI than those fed BFD. Body composition, head circumference, and tricipital/subscapular skinfolds were similar between the two groups in terms of length, head circumference, and tricipital/subscapular skinfolds. We should note that the INN formula is safe and it showed a reduction in atopic dermatitis, bronchitis, and bronchiolitis in infants compared to STD formula. The consistency of the stools produced by BDF was more liquid in comparison with both formulas. Each group demonstrated similar digestive tolerance and infant behavior throughout the

study period. For further analysis, it would be necessary to examine more precise health biomarkers including those derived from the omics sciences, e.g. metabolomics, proteomics, metagenomics, etc., to determine to what extent there are significant differences between treatments, beyond growth parameters.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Author Contributions

AGG, IG and MM were responsible for a careful review of the protocol, design, and methodology. FJRO, JPD and AG provided continuous scientific advice for the study and the interpretation of the results. These authors also wrote and critically reviewed the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

The present study was funded by Alter Farmacia S. A. The funding sponsor had no role in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, or interpretation of the data, and the writing of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

We thank to the pediatrician team who participated in this study: Alba Corrales; Alfonso Carmona; Amalia López; Ana Isabel Rodriguez; Ana Maderuelo; Ana Terrén-Lora, Carlos Nuñez de Prado; Eduardo Ortega; Esther Martin; Eva Castillo; Isabel Mayordomo; José Fernando Ferreira; José María Aguilar Diosdado; Maite Santos-Garcia; Mari Carmen Pino Zambrano; María José Carnicero; Maria Teresa Santos; Vasilica Doina and Xavier Riopedre.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary material is expressed as tables and is found in the supplemtary file (Tables S1-S5).

Data Availability Statement

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

Adjibade, M., Davisse-Paturet, C., Divaret-Chauveau, A., Adel-Patient, K., Raherison, C., Dufourg, M.N., Lioret, S., Charles, M.A., and De Lauzon-Guillain, B. (2022). Enrichment of Formula in Probiotics or Prebiotics and Risk of Infection and Allergic Diseases up to Age 5.5 Years in the Nationwide Etude Longitudinale Francaise depuis l'Enfance (ELFE) Cohort. *J Nutr* 152**,** 1138-1148.

Balaguer, F., Enrique, M., Llopis, S., Barrena, M., Navarro, V., Alvarez, B., Chenoll, E., Ramon, D., Tortajada, M., and Martorell, P. (2022). Lipoteichoic acid from Bifidobacterium animalis subsp. lactis BPL1: a novel postbiotic that reduces fat deposition via IGF-1 pathway. *Microb Biotechnol* 15**,** 805-816.

Balogun, O.O., Dagvadorj, A., Anigo, K.M., Ota, E., and Sasaki, S. (2015). Factors influencing breastfeeding exclusivity during the first 6 months of life in developing countries: a quantitative and qualitative systematic review. *Maternal & child nutrition* 11**,** 433-451.

Bell, K.A., Wagner, C.L., Feldman, H.A., Shypailo, R.J., and Belfort, M.B. (2017). Associations of infant feeding with trajectories of body composition and growth. *Am J Clin Nutr* 106**,** 491-498.

Black, R.E., Victora, C.G., Walker, S.P., Bhutta, Z.A., Christian, P., De Onis, M., Ezzati, M., Grantham-Mcgregor, S., Katz, J., and Martorell, R. (2013). Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *The lancet* 382**,** 427-451.

Bohn, T., Castenmiller, J., De Henauw, S., Hirsch-Ernst, K.-I., Knutsen, H.K., Maciuk, A., Mangelsdorf, I., Mcardle, H.J., Naska, A., Pelaez, C., Pentieva, K., Siani, A., Thies, F., Tsabouri, M.V., Bresson, J.-L., Castle, L., Fewtrell, M., Przyrembel, H., Dumas, C., Titz, A., and Turck, D. (2022). Nutritional safety and suitability of a specific protein hydrolysate derived from whey protein concentrate and used in an infant and follow-on formula manufactured from hydrolysed protein by HIPP-Werk Georg Hipp OHG (dossier submitted by meyer.science GmbH). *EFSA Journal* 20**,** 1-13.

Braegger, C., Chmielewska, A., Decsi, T., Kolacek, S., Mihatsch, W., Moreno, L., Piescik, M., Puntis, J., Shamir, R., Szajewska, H., Turck, D., Van Goudoever, J., and Nutrition, E.C.O. (2011). Supplementation of infant formula with probiotics and/or prebiotics: a systematic review and comment by the ESPGHAN committee on nutrition. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 52**,** 238-250.

Brands, B., Demmelmair, H., Koletzko, B., and Project, E. (2014). How growth due to infant nutrition influences obesity and later disease risk. *Acta paediatrica* 103**,** 578-585.

Campoy, C., Am, C.T., De La Garza Puentes, A., Sáenz De Pipaón, M., Verduci, E., Koletzko, B., Casanova, G., Larqué, E., Valenzuela, R., and Jm, M.V. (2021). Controversy about the critical role of long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids, arachidonic acid (ARA) and docosahexaenoic acid (DHA), during infancy. *Nutricion Hospitalaria*.

Carreras, N.L., Martorell, P., Chenoll, E., Genoves, S., Ramon, D., and Aleixandre, A. (2018). Anti-obesity properties of the strain Bifidobacterium animalis subsp. lactis CECT 8145 in Zucker fatty rats. *Benef Microbes* 9**,** 629-641.

Carver, J.D. (2003). Advances in nutritional modifications of infant formulas. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 77**,** 1550S-1554S.

Christian, P., Smith, E.R., Lee, S.E., Vargas, A.J., Bremer, A.A., and Raiten, D.J. (2021). The need to study human milk as a biological system. *Am J Clin Nutr* 113**,** 1063-1072.

Codex Alimentaris (2020). *STANDARD FOR INFANT FORMULA AND FORMULAS FOR SPECIAL MEDICAL PURPOSES INTENDED FOR INFANTS. Formerly CAC/RS 72-1972. Adopted as a worldwide Standard in 1981. Amended in 1983, 1985, 1987, 2011, 2015, 2016, 2020. Revised in 2007.* [Online]. Available: https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/es/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCXS%2B72-1981%252FCXS_072e.pdf [Accessed 2022-06-12].

Dieterich, C.M., Felice, J.P., O'sullivan, E., and Rasmussen, K.M. (2013). Breastfeeding and health outcomes for the mother-infant dyad. *Pediatr Clin North Am* 60**,** 31-48.

Efsa Panel on Dietetic Products, N., and Allergies (2014). Scientific Opinion on the essential composition of infant and follow-on formulae. *EFSA Journal* 12**,** 3760.

Eidelman, A.I., Schanler, R.J., Johnston, M., Landers, S., Noble, L., Szucs, K., and Viehmann, L. (2012). Breastfeeding and the use of human milk. *Pediatrics* 129**,** e827-841.

Eu Commission (2016). Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2016/127 of 25 September 2015 supplementing Regulation (EU) No 609/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the specific compositional and information requirements for infant formula and follow-on formula and as regards requirements on information relating to infant and young child feeding. *OJEC* 59**,** 1-29.

Flaherman, V.J., Narayan, N.R., Hartigan-O'connor, D., Cabana, M.D., Mcculloch, C.E., and Paul, I.M. (2018). The effect of early limited formula on breastfeeding, readmission, and intestinal microbiota: a randomized clinical trial. *The Journal of pediatrics* 196**,** 84-90. e81.

Food and Drug Administration, F. (2018). *Infant formula requirements pertaining to current good manufacturing practice, quality control procedures, quality factors, records and reports and notifications.* [Online]. Available: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfcfr/CFRSearch.cfm?CFRPart=106 [Accessed 2022-06-12].

Gopalakrishna, K.P., and Hand, T.W. (2020). Influence of Maternal Milk on the Neonatal Intestinal Microbiome. *Nutrients* 12.

Greer, F.R., and Kleinman, R.E. (2014). An infant formula with decreased weight gain and higher IQ: are we there yet? *Am J Clin Nutr* 99**,** 757-758.

Horta, B.L., Rollins, N., Dias, M.S., Garcez, V., and Pérez-Escamilla, R. (2022). Systematic review and meta-analysis of breastfeeding and later overweight or obesity expands on previous study for World Health Organization. *Acta Paediatrica*.

Ip, S., Chung, M., Raman, G., Trikalinos, T.A., and Lau, J. (2009). A summary of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality's evidence report on breastfeeding in developed countries. *Breastfeed Med* 4 Suppl 1**,** S17-30.

Jama, A., Gebreyesus, H., Wubayehu, T., Gebregyorgis, T., Teweldemedhin, M., Berhe, T., and Berhe, N. (2020). Exclusive breastfeeding for the first six months of life and its associated factors among children age 6-24 months in Burao district, Somaliland. *Int Breastfeed J* 15**,** 5.

Kent, G. (2015). Global infant formula: monitoring and regulating the impacts to protect human health. *Int Breastfeed J* 10**,** 6.

Koletzko, B., Baker, S., Cleghorn, G., Neto, U.F., Gopalan, S., Hernell, O., Hock, Q.S., Jirapinyo, P., Lonnerdal, B., Pencharz, P., Pzyrembel, H., Ramirez-Mayans, J., Shamir, R., Turck, D., Yamashiro, Y., and Zong-Yi, D. (2005). Global standard for the composition of infant formula: recommendations of an ESPGHAN coordinated international expert group. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 41**,** 584-599.

Koletzko, B., Bergmann, K., Brenna, J.T., Calder, P.C., Campoy, C., Clandinin, M.T., Colombo, J., Daly, M., Decsi, T., and Demmelmair, H. (2020). Should formula for infants provide arachidonic acid along with DHA? A position paper of the European Academy of Paediatrics and the Child Health Foundation. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 111**,** 10-16.

Koletzko, B., Von Kries, R., Closa, R., Escribano, J., Scaglioni, S., Giovannini, M., Beyer, J., Demmelmair, H., Gruszfeld, D., Dobrzanska, A., Sengier, A., Langhendries, J.-P., Rolland

Cachera, M.-F., Grote, V., and European Childhood Obesity Trial Study Group (2009). Lower protein in infant formula is associated with lower weight up to age 2 y: a randomized clinical trial. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 89**,** 1836-1845.

Libuda, L., Stimming, M., Mesch, C., Warschburger, P., Kalhoff, H., Koletzko, B.V., and Kersting, M. (2014). Frequencies and demographic determinants of breastfeeding and DHA supplementation in a nationwide sample of mothers in Germany. *European journal of nutrition* 53**,** 1335-1344.

Martin, C.R., Ling, P.R., and Blackburn, G.L. (2016). Review of Infant Feeding: Key Features of Breast Milk and Infant Formula. *Nutrients* 8.

Meddra, M. (2018). "Introductory Guide for Standardised MedDRA Queries (SMQs) Version 21.0".).

Monasta, L., Batty, G., Macaluso, A., Ronfani, L., Lutje, V., Bavcar, A., Van Lenthe, F., Brug, J., and Cattaneo, A. (2011). Interventions for the prevention of overweight and obesity in preschool children: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Obesity reviews* 12**,** e107-e118.

Nataraj, B.H., Ali, S.A., Behare, P.V., and Yadav, H. (2020). Postbiotics-parabiotics: the new horizons in microbial biotherapy and functional foods. *Microb Cell Fact* 19**,** 168.

Ogbu, C.E., Fongue, S., Ogbu, S.C., and Kirby, R.S. (2021). Infant feeding practices and asthma in children aged 6 months to 5 years using a propensity score approach. *Cent Eur J Public Health* 29**,** 284-289.

Papadopoulos, N.G., Balan, T.A., Van Der Merwe, L.F., Pang, W.W., Michaelis, L.J., Shek, L.P., Vandenplas, Y., Teoh, O.H., Fiocchi, A.G., and Chong, Y.S. (2022). Mixed Milk Feeding: A New Approach to Describe Feeding Patterns in the First Year of Life Based on Individual Participant Data from Two Randomised Controlled Trials. *Nutrients* 14**,** 2190.

Pedret, A., Valls, R.M., Calderon-Perez, L., Llaurado, E., Companys, J., Pla-Paga, L., Moragas, A., Martin-Lujan, F., Ortega, Y., Giralt, M., Caimari, A., Chenoll, E., Genoves, S., Martorell, P., Codoner, F.M., Ramon, D., Arola, L., and Sola, R. (2019). Effects of daily consumption of the probiotic Bifidobacterium animalis subsp. lactis CECT 8145 on anthropometric adiposity biomarkers in abdominally obese subjects: a randomized controlled trial. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 43**,** 1863-1868.

Rameez, R.M., Sadana, D., Kaur, S., Ahmed, T., Patel, J., Khan, M.S., Misbah, S., Simonson, M.T., Riaz, H., and Ahmed, H.M. (2019). Association of Maternal Lactation With Diabetes and Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open* 2**,** e1913401.

Rollins, N.C., Bhandari, N., Hajeebhoy, N., Horton, S., Lutter, C.K., Martines, J.C., Piwoz, E.G., Richter, L.M., Victora, C.G., and Group, T.L.B.S. (2016). Why invest, and what it will take to improve breastfeeding practices? *The lancet* 387**,** 491-504.

Ruiz-Ojeda, F.J., Plaza-Diaz, J., Morales, J., De La Torre, A.I.C., Garcia-Garcia, A., De Prado, C.N., Coronel, C., Crespo, C., Ortega, E., and Martin-Perez, E. (2022). A multicenter, randomized, blinded, controlled clinical trial investigating the effect of a novel infant formula on the body composition of infants: INNOVA 2020 study protocol. *medRxiv*.

Salminen, S., Collado, M.C., Endo, A., Hill, C., Lebeer, S., Quigley, E.M.M., Sanders, M.E., Shamir, R., Swann, J.R., Szajewska, H., and Vinderola, G. (2021). The International Scientific

Association of Probiotics and Prebiotics (ISAPP) consensus statement on the definition and scope of postbiotics. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 18**,** 649-667.

Scott, J.A., Binns, C.W., Oddy, W.H., and Graham, K.I. (2006). Predictors of breastfeeding duration: evidence from a cohort study. *Pediatrics* 117**,** e646-e655.

Silva, A., Gonzalez, N., Terren, A., Garcia, A., Martinez-Blanch, J.F., Illescas, V., Morales, J., Maroto, M., Genoves, S., Ramon, D., Martorell, P., and Chenoll, E. (2020). An Infant Milk Formula Supplemented with Heat-Treated Probiotic Bifidobacterium animalis subsp. lactis CECT 8145, Reduces Fat Deposition in C. elegans and Augments Acetate and Lactate in a Fermented Infant Slurry. *Foods* 9.

Szajewska, H., Canani, R.B., Guarino, A., Hojsak, I., Indrio, F., Kolacek, S., Orel, R., Shamir, R., Vandenplas, Y., Van Goudoever, J.B., Weizman, Z., and Probioticsprebiotics, E.W.G.F. (2016). Probiotics for the Prevention of Antibiotic-Associated Diarrhea in Children. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 62**,** 495-506.

Task Force on Clinical Testing of Infant Formulas Committee on Nutrition. American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Nutrition, L, F., Bell Ef, Cooke Rj, Fomon Sj, Kleinman Re, Pencharz Pb, Reynolds Jw, Schanler Rj, and Al, F. (1988). *Clinical Testing of Infant Formulas With Respect to Nutritional Suitability for Term Infants* [Online]. Available: https://wayback.archive-it.org/7993/20170722090324/https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/InfantFormula/ucm170649.htm [Accessed 2022-06-24].

Thomas, D.W., Greer, F.R., American Academy of Pediatrics Committee On, N., American Academy of Pediatrics Section on Gastroenterology, H., and Nutrition (2010). Probiotics and prebiotics in pediatrics. *Pediatrics* 126**,** 1217-1231.

Timby, N., Domellof, E., Hernell, O., Lonnerdal, B., and Domellof, M. (2014). Neurodevelopment, nutrition, and growth until 12 mo of age in infants fed a low-energy, low-protein formula supplemented with bovine milk fat globule membranes: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 99**,** 860-868.

Timby, N., Hernell, O., Vaarala, O., Melin, M., Lonnerdal, B., and Domellof, M. (2015). Infections in infants fed formula supplemented with bovine milk fat globule membranes. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 60**,** 384-389.

Unicef, U.K. (2022). *OVERWEIGHT AND OBESITY INFANT HEALTH RESEARCH* [Online]. UNICEF. Available: https://www.unicef.org.uk/babyfriendly/news-and-research/baby-friendly-research/infant-health-research/infant-health-research-obesity/ [Accessed 2022-08-31 2022].

Victora, C.G., Bahl, R., Barros, A.J., França, G.V., Horton, S., Krasevec, J., Murch, S., Sankar, M.J., Walker, N., and Rollins, N.C. (2016). Breastfeeding in the 21st century: epidemiology, mechanisms, and lifelong effect. *The lancet* 387**,** 475-490.

Vinderola, G., Sanders, M.E., and Salminen, S. (2022). The Concept of Postbiotics. *Foods* 11.

Walker, A. (2010). Breast milk as the gold standard for protective nutrients. *J Pediatr* 156**,** S3-7.

Wallingford, J.C., and Barber, C. (2019). A review of studies on the growth of infants fed infant formula. *Current Developments in Nutrition* 3**,** nzz095.

World Health Organization (2002). *The optimal duration of exclusive breastfeeding: a systematic review* [Online]. Available: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/67208/WHO_NHD_01.08.pdf [Accessed].

World Health Organization (2022). *World Health Organization breastfeeding recommendations* [Online]. Available: https://www.who.int/health-topics/breastfeeding/ [Accessed 2022-06-12].

Zheng, M., Campbell, K.J., Baur, L., Rissel, C., and Wen, L.M. (2021). Infant feeding and growth trajectories in early childhood: the application and comparison of two longitudinal modelling approaches. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 45**,** 2230-2237.

Zheng, M., Lamb, K.E., Grimes, C., Laws, R., Bolton, K., Ong, K.K., and Campbell, K. (2018). Rapid weight gain during infancy and subsequent adiposity: A systematic review and meta-analysis of evidence. *Obesity Reviews* 19**,** 321-332.

Ziegler, E.E. (2006). Growth of breast-fed and formula-fed infants. *Nestle Nutr Workshop Ser Pediatr Program* 58**,** 51-59; discussion 59-63.