

[Handbook of Anthropometry](#)

2012, pp 1079-1104


Neonatal anthropometry: a tool to evaluate the nutritional status and predict early and late risks

- [Luis Pereira-da-Silva](#)

Purchase on [Springer.com](#) (\$29.95 / €24.95 / £19.95)

Abstract

Neonatal anthropometry is an inexpensive, noninvasive and convenient tool for bedside evaluation, especially in sick and fragile neonates. Anthropometry can be used in neonates as a tool for several purposes: diagnosis of foetal malnutrition and prediction of early postnatal complications; postnatal assessment of growth, body composition and nutritional status; prediction of long-term complications including metabolic syndrome; assessment of dysmorphology; and estimation of body surface. However, in this age group anthropometry has been notorious for its inaccuracy and the main concern is to make validated indices available. Direct measurements, such as body weight, length and body circumferences are the most commonly used measurements for nutritional assessment in clinical practice and in field studies. Body weight is the most reliable anthropometric measurement and therefore is often used alone in the assessment of the nutritional status, despite not reflecting body composition. Derived indices from direct measurements have been proposed to improve the accuracy of anthropometry. Equations based on body weight and length, mid-arm circumference/head circumference ratio, and upper-arm cross-sectional areas are among the most used derived indices to assess nutritional status and body proportionality, even though these indices require further validation for the estimation of body composition in neonates.



Chapter 65 Neonatal Anthropometry: A Tool to Evaluate the Nutritional Status and Predict Early and Late Risks

Luis Pereira-da-Silva

Abstract. Neonatal anthropometry is an inexpensive, noninvasive and convenient tool for bedside evaluation, especially in sick and fragile neonates. Anthropometry can be used in neonates as a tool for several purposes: diagnosis of foetal malnutrition and prediction of early postnatal complications; postnatal assessment of growth, body composition and nutritional status; prediction of long-term complications including metabolic syndrome; assessment of dysmorphology; and estimation of body surface. However, in this age group anthropometry has been notorious for its inaccuracy and the main concern is to make validated indices available.

Direct measurements, such as body weight, length and body circumferences are the most commonly used measurements for nutritional assessment in clinical practice and in field studies. Body weight is the most reliable anthropometric measurement and therefore is often used alone in the assessment of the nutritional status, despite not reflecting body composition.

Derived indices from direct measurements have been proposed to improve the accuracy of anthropometry. Equations based on body weight and length, mid-arm circumference/head circumference ratio, and upper-arm cross-sectional areas are among the most used derived indices to assess nutritional status and body proportionality, even though these indices require further validation for the estimation of body composition in neonates.

Abbreviations

AA	Arm area
AAa	Arm fat area
AGA	Appropriate-for-gestational age
AMA	Apparent muscle area
BS	Body surface
BSF	Body surface fat
BL	Birth weight
CHL	Crown-head length
CT	Cephalic index

L. Pereira-da-Silva (*)
 Faculdade de Ciências Médicas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal
 Hospital de Crianças, Hospital de São Francisco, Centro Hospitalar de Lisboa Central,
 Rua António Bernardino de Almeida, 1649-016 Lisboa, Portugal
 Email: luis.pereira-da-silva@ciencias.unl.pt; luis.pereira-da-silva@chc.lisboa.gov.pt

* To whom all correspondence should be addressed.
 Handbook of Anthropometry, Physical Measures of Human Form in Health and Disease, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4419-1284-1_65,
 © Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 2012

1079

References (45)

1. Ananth CV, Vintzileos AM, Shen-Schwarz S, Smulian JC, Lai YL *Obstet Gynecol.* 1998;91:917–24. [CrossRef](#)
2. Beattie RB, Johnson P Br J *Obstet Gynaecol.* 1994;101:842–6. [CrossRef](#)
3. Current JD. *Internet J Anesthesiol.* 1998;2(2).
4. Dangerfield PH, Taylor CJ *Early Hum Dev.* 1983;8:225–33. [CrossRef](#)
5. De Bruin NC, Van Velthoven KAM, Stijnen T, Juttman RE, Degenhart HJ, Visser HKA *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1995;61:1195–205.
6. Ehrenkranz RA, Younes N, Lemons JA, Fanaroff AA, Donovan EF, Wright LL, Katsikiotis V, Tyson JE, Oh W, Shankaran S, Bauer CR, Korones SB, Stoll BJ, Stevenson DK, Papile LA *Pediatrics.* 1999;104:280–9. [CrossRef](#)
7. Engstrom E, Wallgren K, Hellstrom A, Niklasson A *Acta Paediatr.* 2003;92:211–5. [CrossRef](#)
8. Fenton TR. *BMC Pediatr.* 2003;3:13. [CrossRef](#)
9. Fletcher MA. In: Fletcher MA, editor. *Physical diagnosis in neonatology.* Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott-Raven; 1998; pp. 29–54.
10. Gibson AT, Carney S, Wright NP, Wales JKN *Horm Res.* 2003;59 (suppl 1):119–28. [CrossRef](#)
11. Jaquet D, Deghmoun S, Chevenne D, Collin D, Czernichow P, Levy-Marchal C *Diabetologia.* 2005;48:849–55. [CrossRef](#)
12. Jelliffe EFP, Jelliffe DB. The arm circumference as a public health index of protein-calorie malnutrition of early childhood. *J Trop Pediatr.* 1969;32:1527–30. [CrossRef](#)
13. Johnson TS, Engstrom JL, Gelhar DK *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* 1997;24:497–505. [CrossRef](#)
14. Koo WW, Walters JC, Hockman EM *J Nutr.* 2000;130:2188–94.
15. Koo WW, Walters JC, Hockman EM *Pediatr Res.* 2004;56:694–700. [CrossRef](#)
16. Lubchenco LO, Hansman C, Boyd E *Pediatrics.* 1966;37:403–8.
17. Meban C. *J Anat.* 1983;137:271–8.
18. Olhager E, Forsum E *Acta Paediatr.* 2006;95:21–8. [CrossRef](#)
19. Olsen IE, Richardson DK, Schmid CH, Ausman LM, Dwyer JT *Pediatrics.* 2002;110:1125–32. [CrossRef](#)
20. Olsen IE, Lawson ML, Mainzen-Derr J, Sapsford AL *J Pediatr.* 2009;154:486–91. [CrossRef](#)
21. Olsen IE, Groveman SA, Lawson ML, Clark RH, Zemel BS *Pediatrics.* 2010;125:e214–e24. [CrossRef](#)
22. Owen P. *Clin Exp Obstet Gynecol.* 1997;24:8–10.
23. Patterson RM, Pouliot MR *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 1987;157:691–3.
24. Patterson RM, Pouliot MR. Neonatal morphometrics and perinatal outcome: who is growth retarded? *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1987;157:691–3.
25. Paulsson L, Bondemark L *Angle Orthod.* 2009;79:276–83. [CrossRef](#)
26. Pereira-da-Silva L, Gomes JV, Clington A, Videira Amaral JM, Bustamante SA *Early Hum Dev.* 1999;54:117–28. [CrossRef](#)
27. Pereira-da-Silva L, Bergmans KIM, van Kerkhoven LAS, Leal F, Virella D, Videira-Amaral JM *Acta Paediatr.* 2006;95:742–6. [CrossRef](#)
28. Pereira-da-Silva L, Virella D, Amaral JMV, Guerra A *Anthropometry in the newborn: revisited and updated.* Lisbon: Nestlé Nutrition Institute (edited in Portuguese); 2007.
29. Pereira-da-Silva L, Abecasis F, Virella D, Videira-Amaral JM *Neonatology.* 2009;95:74–9. [CrossRef](#)
30. Prins I. *Pediatric Rev Commun.* 1995;8:157–70.

31. Rodríguez G, Samper MP, Ventura P, Moreno LA, Olivares JL, Pérez-González JM Eur J Pediatr. 2004;163:457–61. [CrossRef](#)
32. Rolland-Cachera MF, Brambilla P, Manzoni P, Akrouf M, Sironi S, Del Maschio A, Chiumello G Am J Clin Nutr. 1997;65:1709–13.
33. Rubin LP. Postnatal growth in preterm infants: too small, too big, or just right? J Pediatr 2009;154:473-5.
34. Sann L, Durand M, Picard J, Lasne Y, Bethenod M Arch Dis Child. 1988;63:256–60. [CrossRef](#)
35. Sasanow SR, Georgieff MK, Pereira G J Pediatr. 1986;109:311–5. [CrossRef](#)
36. Schmelzle HR, Fusch C. Am J Clin Nutr. 2002;76:1096–100.
37. Shinwell ES, Shlomo M. Measured length of normal term infants changes over the first two days of life. J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab. 2003;16:537-40. [CrossRef](#)
38. Shinwell ES, Shlomo M J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab. 2003;16:537–40. [CrossRef](#)
39. Tamim H, Beydoun H, Itani M, Khogali M, Chokr I, Yunis KA; National Collaborative Perinatal Neonatal Network. J Perinat Med. 2004;32:509–13. [CrossRef](#)
40. Thornton CJ, Shannon DL, Hunter MA, Brans YW Pediatr Res. 1982;16:989–94. [CrossRef](#)
41. Uhing MR, Das UG Clin Perinatol. 2009;36:165–76. [CrossRef](#)
42. Uthaya S, Thomas EL, Hamilton G, Dore CJ, Bell J, Modi N Pediatr Res. 2005;57:211–5. [CrossRef](#)
43. Wilcox MA, Johnson IR, Maynard PV, Smith SJ, Chilvers CE Br J Obstet Gynaecol. 1993;100:342–7. [CrossRef](#)
44. Yau KI, Chang MH Acta Paediatr. 1993;82:427–9. [CrossRef](#)
45. Zankl A. Pediatrics. 2004;114:e333–6. [CrossRef](#)

About this Chapter

Title: Neonatal Anthropometry: A Tool to Evaluate the Nutritional Status and Predict Early and Late Risks

Book Title: [Handbook of Anthropometry](#)

Book Subtitle: Physical Measures of Human Form in Health and Disease

Pages: pp 1079-1104

Copyright: 2012

DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-1788-1_65


Print ISBN: 978-1-4419-1787-4

Online ISBN: 978-1-4419-1788-1

Publisher: Springer New York

Copyright Holder: Springer Science+Business Media, LLC

Topics: [Health Informatics](#), [Maternal and Child Health](#), [Health Promotion and Disease Prevention](#), [Clinical Nutrition](#)

Editors: [Victor R. Preedy](#) ^(ID1)

Editor Affiliations: ID1. Dept. Nutrition & Dietetics, King's College

Authors: [Luis Pereira-da-Silva](#) ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾

Author Affiliations: 1. Faculdade de Ciências Médicas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal; 2. Neonatal Division, Hospital Dona Estefânia, Centro Hospitalar de Lisboa Central, Rua Jacinta Marto, 1169-045, Lisbon, Portugal