Obesity and its association with maternal and child health outcomes among women in India

Background: Globally, Obesity has reached epidemic portion and one of the new emerging health problems, which increased risk of pregnancy complication and premature death due to serious chronic health condition. This study explore association between obesity and maternal and child health outcomes among women in India.

Data: Using data from National Family Health Survey (NFHS) conducted in India during 2005-06 successively, was used to estimate obesity and its impact on maternal and child health outcomes using logistic regression and cox proportional hazard model.

Results: The prevalence of obesity was 15.3% among women in India; rate of increase in the level of obesity has much higher than developed countries. However, obesity statistically significantly associated with maternal and child health outcomes. Obese women were high risk of pregnancy complication such as cesarean, prolonged labor, swelling, vaginal bleeding, and have a high risk of fetal death and deliver macrosomic infant.

Conclusion: The findings from this study suggest that obesity and its associated chronic morbidities is more severe problem in India. There is strong need to some national plan of action to address obesity before to reach emergency level.

Keywords: Obesity, Maternal complication, Child health outcomes, Cesarean and Macrosomia etc.

Introduction

Globally, obesity has reached epidemic proportions, with more than 1.4 billion adult people overweight and at least 200 million men and 300 million women, among them are obese (WHO, 2008). In India, about 20 percent of male and 18 percent of female adult are overweight/obese and 5 percent population of the country suffering from this chronic epidemic. According to National Family Health Survey (NFHS) II, 10.5 and NFHS III, 15.3 percent of female in reproductive age are overweight/obese respectively. It is an important emerging public health challenge, because it is foremost risk factor, which contributes to the main diseases leading to global burden of diseases, disability and premature mortality. In addition it has harmful effect on health, especially women's reproductive health. Obese women are more likely to face serious health problems during pregnancy which may lead to complication resulting into cesarean delivery, gestational diabetes, postpartum anemia, menstrual disorder, infertility, miscarriage, poor pregnancy outcomes (Clark *et al.*, 1988).

The causes of increase in prevalence of obesity could be attributed to changes in nutritional transition. This has eventually led to significant increase in body mass index, which hikes the prevalence of obesity over time in developed as well as developing countries. The magnitude of the problem varies between different counties as well as with respect to different socioeconomic conditions within the country (Aekplakorn et al., 2004 and Yoon et al., 2006). The higher prevalence of obesity is seen in urban area and is associated with the changing pattern of life style causing decreased level of physical activity and increased intake of energy dense diet. The level and risk factors of obesity and overweight significantly differ for women and men as is evident from number of studies that have shown that prevalence of obesity is higher among women as compared to men (James et al., 2001). However, it is also associated with higher socioeconomic status (SES) (Ramchandran, 2008; A1-Sendi et al., 2003; Kelishadi et al., 2008 and Vijayalakshmi, 2002). The prevalence of non-communicable diseases, such as cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, certain cancers and also some adverse pregnancy complication are higher among obese mothers (Ramchanderan, 2010; Moura & Claro, 2012). Obesity is associated with comorbidities like menstrual dysfunction, reproductive disorder including infertility, increased rate of abortion and pregnancy complication and adverse pregnancy outcomes (Seidell et al., 1993; Douchi et al., 2002 and lake et al., 1997). It is more likely to have a higher rate of induction of labor infection, internal

bleeding and hence requires assisted delivery (Denison *et al.*, 2008; Ryan, 2007; and Ramchanderan *et al.*, 2008). The evidence from different studies emphasizes that maternal obesity has been associated with increased risk of cesareans delivery and is more common among pregnant women who are obese (Lynch, 2008; Sarkar *et al.*, 2007; Ryan, 2007; Baura *et al.*, 2007; and Jain *et al.*, 2007). Similarly, another pregnancy complication factors like miscarriage, pre-eclampsia, gestational diabetes, bleeding, labor, obstetric complication and fetal macrosomia; has greater chance of having a cesarean delivery (Ryan, 2007; and Kasha & Kenny, 2009). Finally, maternal obesity and excessive weight gain increases the chance of fetal death or infant mortality; and high risk of prenatal death associated with pregnant women is more likely to be twice among obese women (Seligman, 2006).

After doing extensive review of literature, it is found that there is least literature available on obesity and its association with maternal and child health outcomes in India. This study tries to fill this gap by explaining how obesity is associated with maternal and child health outcomes and its variation across the country by understanding the impact of socioeconomic changes that have taken place in Indian society since beginning of this century with the help of objectives mentioned below. First we examine the level and pattern of prevalence of obesity across different states and socio economic strata of the country; secondly, we have tried to explore effect of obesity on selected socioeconomic and demographic characteristics; thirdly, it examine impact of obesity on maternal outcomes such as cesarean delivery, pregnancy complication like vaginal bleeding, labor and swelling; lastly, we explore the impact of obesity on health outcomes of newly born infant such as infant mortality and macrosomia.

Data source:

Data is derived from National Family Health Surveys second and third round (NFHS-II & III), which were conducted in India during 1998-99 and 2005-06 respectively. It is a large scale household survey carried out periodically, which facilitates cross national comparison and representative at regional level. The survey provides information on demographic, socio-economic and health profile of ever married women. This data provide an opportunity to examine the covariates of overweight/obesity and its association with adverse pregnancy and child health outcomes in India, which is undergoing rapid changes in lifestyle, physical activity and diets. So, we have used this

3

data sources for analysis of prevalence of obesity and its association with maternal and child health outcomes among women and children in India.

Response variables used in analysis

Body mass index (BMI) is a key variable measured at the time of the survey, which is used as outcome and an explanatory variable. The procedure used for calculation of BMI in National Family Health Survey, each ever married women with age 15-49 was weighted using a solar powered scale with an accuracy of ± 100 g, their height was measured using an adjustable wooden measuring board, specifically designed to provide accurate measurements (to the nearest \pm 0.1cm) in a developing country field situation (Agrawal and Mishra, 2004). The weight and height data used to calculate the body mass index (BMI). Women who were pregnant at the time of survey or women who had given birth during the two months preceding the survey are excluded from the analysis, as the real BMI is affected due to the pregnancy and pregnancy outcomes. Although, this study is more interested on pre-pregnancy BMI, it is fair to assume that post pregnancy BMI will be strongly associated with pre-pregnancy BMI. The obese women are more likely to gain more weight during pregnancy. The weight gain during pregnancy and pre-pregnancy weight are positively associated with adverse pregnancy outcomes (Jain et al., 2007 and Cedergren, 2006). The BMI is used to estimate the prevalence of underweight, as well as overweight and obesity.

Definition of obesity used for analysis:

As per the definition given by World Health Organization (WHO, 2003), the BMI is calculated by weight (in kilogram) divided by the square of height (in centimeter). As per this definition BMI is divided into four categories; a BMI of less than 18.5 kg/m2 is defined as underweight, indicating chronic energy deficiency. A BMI in the range of 18.5 and 24.9 kg/m2 is defined normal; 25.0 and 29.9 kg/m2 as overweight; and more than 30 kg/m2 as obese. Based on these cut-offs, we created three category variable of nutritional status of women, indicating thin, normal and women with above 25.0 kg/m2 as obese (Agrawal and Mishra, 2004).

In addition, the second outcome variable asks women if the last birth was cesarean or else normal delivery. The third outcome variable is labor and delivery complication, measured by the women reporting prolonged labor, excessive bleeding and body swelling during past year of birth. The fourth outcome variable is infant mortality, which is measured using the total number of women who have reported that her last birth ended in death of baby in first year of birth. Finally, fourth outcomes variable is fetal Macrosomia, which is measured in term of a newborn with an excessive birth weight.

Definition of macrosomia:

Fetal macrosomia has been defined in several different ways, including birth weight of 4000-4500 g (8 lb 13 oz to 9 lb 15 oz) or greater than (Jazayeri *et al.*, 1999). The study on the macrosomia has found that the macrosomia varies with ethnicity and reportedly associated with neonatal morbidity, neonatal injury, maternal injury, cesarean delivery and maternal BMI level (Spellacy *et al.*, 1999).

Methodology:

The Descriptive analysis is used to estimate prevalence of obesity across country and also inter-state differential in India. Further, bi-variate and tri-variate analysis are used to understand the socioeconomic and demographic differential in the prevalence of obesity in India. The binary logistic regression analysis is used to examine association of selected background characteristics on the prevalence of obesity and its consequences during adverse pregnancy complications such as Vaginal Bleeding, swelling and labor and outcome like Cesarean, Infant Mortality and Macrosomia in India. Further, the cox proportional hazard model has been used for analysis of effect of obesity on child health outcome as infant mortality. The STATA statistical software package is used to perform overall analysis. The result has been presented in the form of odd's ratios (OR), with 95% percent confidence interval (95 % CI). The estimation of confidence intervals takes into account design effects due to clustering at the level of the primary sampling unit.

Results

Table 1, shows prevalence of obesity across India, according to NFHS III, the prevalence of obesity was 15.3% and NHFS II, 10.5%; in just last seven years, nearly fifty percent increase in level of obesity among Indian women. Comparing regions, the highest increases in obesity were observed in northeast about 88.5%, followed by south 57.7%, East 54%, Central 50%, West 41.7% and North 26%. However, comparing states in India over time, it was observed that more than double increase in obesity among women from the northeastern state like Mizoram, Nagaland and Assam and all another state has shown more than half increase in level of obesity. The prevalence of obesity varies by place of residence, urban area 29%, and rural area 9% among women.

Further analysis in this study has been restricted to the only NFHS III data in India.

Table 2, shows prevalence of obesity by socio-economic and demographic characteristics; the women form different age group across place of residence, the higher age groups (35+), has high proportion of obesity than younger age group of 15-24 years. Women who were married, from upper caste, and highly educated have a high prevalence of obesity than their corresponding categories. While, women who have any mass media exposure are found to be more prone to become obese. Mass media exposure and currently not working status of women is associated with physical inactivity level, which is frequently more responsible for increase in level of obesity. Although, obesity is associated with sendarty life style, which is practices more by women from wealthy families and this explains high prevalence of obesity among richest section among society. However, prevalence of obesity differs by socioeconomic status and spatial distribution of population. Women from urban area are more likely to be obese than women from rural area due to socioeconomic differential. Similarly, women from south, north and west region were found to be more likely to become obese than the women from their counterpart regions.

Table 3: The adjusted logistics regression analysis describes many of the same trends as in the bivariate analysis performed above. All the covariates were found to be positively and statistically significantly associated with obesity, except marital status of women. The women of older age group from upper caste and other religion with high wealth status are more likely to be obese than their respective counterpart. However, women belonging to the south region have been found to be at very high risk of obesity than respective reference category women in India.

Table 4: Shows that prevalence of pregnancy complication and outcome during last birth by BMI level and socio-economic and demographic characteristic of women. Obese women are found to be at all time high risk of any type of pregnancy complication than thin and normal women. The obese women from high socioeconomic status with any mass media exposure are found to be more prone to pregnancy complication experienced bleeding such as excessive vaginal, prolonged labor, swelling, and cesarean delivery than women from their corresponding categories.

Table 5: The regression analysis results for the pregnancy complication, shows that obesity leads to an increased risk of complication. The covariate such as obesity in terms of BMI, age, education and wealth status are positively associated with various

pregnancy related problems; while, only one covariate education, is positive for excessive vaginal bleeding. However, the obesity, caste, religion, education, and wealth status is statistically significant and is associated with prolonged labor. In case of swelling, the obese women with higher education from Muslim religion and belonging to urban residence as well as women from northeastern states have high risk of swelling than their counterpart.

The results for cesarean delivery during last birth show that obesity is positively associated with cesarean delivery. It is also statistically significant when measured by high risk of cesarean among obese women. The other covariate such as age, caste, religion, education, working status, mass media exposure and wealth status of women were positively related to the cesarean delivery. The women with 25-34 ages, higher educated, having full mass media exposure, urban residence, belong to affluent family and from South region were more likely to have gone for cesarean delivery than corresponding reference category women.

Table 6: shows that results for prevalence of Macrosomia by selected characteristics of women, In India, prevalence of macrosomia increases with level of BMI; while, obese women nearly (6.3%) have a high proportion than lower BMI level. the diabetic women are more likely to deliver macrosomic fetus than non-diabetic. However, obese women from 15-24 age group with characteristics such as, schedule caste, Muslim religion, non-educated, no mass media exposure, currently not working, poorer wealth status and belonging to Northeastern region have high proportion in delivering macrosomic infant than their counter part women across the level of BMI.

Table 6: also shows results for infant mortality; unfortunately, the descriptive statistics does not give clear picture about obese women with high proportion infant death. It could be because of different countries use different age distribution and definition for infant mortality. The prevalence of infant death by all covariates across level of BMI has not shown any clear picture, that is why this study tires to go for further multivarties analysis using cox proportional hazard model, which will enable us to see indepth effect of covariates on outcome variable.

Table 7: shows that results for macrosomia; obesity has statistically significant relationship with fetal macrosomia. The obese women were more likely to deliver macrosomic infant than lean women. The diabetic women were much more likely to have macrosomic infant as compared to others. The literature from developed countries

found that macrosomia varies with ethnicity (Jazayeri *et al.*, 1999), this study also found the same results in case of India; the schedule tribe women were 1.36 times more likely to deliver macrosomic infant, and also women from Muslim religion have very high risk of delivering macrosmic infant than counterpart women. However, level of education is negatively associated with macrosomia. The women with higher education were less likely to deliver macrosomic infant than non-educated women. The working women from rural residence, and belonging to North and Northeastern region were more likely to deliver macrosomic infant with high level of statistical significance.

Table 8: shows results for Cox Proportional hazard Model, A number of findings for determinant of infant mortality have been expected. The result expected for obese women were to show that infants are more likely to die when born to obese women than other category women; we found higher magnitude of odds for infant death, but does not found statistically significant effect on infant mortality. The reason of the insignificant result for obese women may be because of age distribution of infant mortality and their different definition across countries. The majority of study from developed country found the positive relationship between infant mortality and obesity. The education and wealth status of women has significant effect on infant mortality. The increase in wealth status and level of education is negatively related to infant mortality; which means women with higher education and belonging to affluent families are less likely to have infant mortality.

Discussion:

Obesity has been increasing in India over the last decade and is now at higher level. The rate of increase in the level of obesity in India is much higher as compared to developed world. The study found that considerable proportions of women from many states of India are already overweigh/obese. The problem is more severe in some southern and northern states like Kerala, Punjab and Delhi. The India is a developing country, which is in degenerative phase of the nutritional transition because of the increase in additional burden of under nutrition and related health problem. The increase in prevalence of obesity are double burden of nutritional health problem and its associated non-communicable disease (NCD); and the same time we have to deal with the problem associated with increasing obesity (Prakash S, 2002, Monterio & Popkin, 2004). However, it is found that there is wide variation in the relationship between socioeconomic status and obesity. The changes in socioeconomic inequality and regional variation have been associated with prevalence of obesity. In India, older age

(35 and above) and urban women clearly display the relationship, whereby the rich and highly educated are more likely to be overweigh/obese controlling all other characteristics, while it is contradictory to the research conducted in the developed world, shows that poor is more likely to be obese (Popkin et al, 2002). But, in case of low income country; it is positively related to socioeconomic status (McLaren, 2007). It could be because of lower level of development, the poor are more likely to food scarcity and increased energy expenditure, and that may be the reason of lower prevalence of obesity among group with lower (SES) socio-economic status (Moneterio *et al.*, 2004).

As expected, the place of residence, mass media exposure, age and ethnicity is positively associated with obesity. Previous studies (Moneterio et al., 2004) found that age is an important determinant of obesity; the study also found that increase in prevalence of obesity among older age and urban women. Unfortunately, it is going be the future challenging issue in India. The married are more likely to be obese; it may be because of married women play different role in society and some study also found that gender roles are positively associated with obesity. The sedentary life style in terms of composite physical activity level is the main reason for greater increase in prevalence of obesity among urban women (Vaz et al., 2005). Changes in physical activity and life style are positively associated with an increase in obesity rate in both developed and developing country (James, 2007). The specific role, gender and age defined role may directly impact on activity level; this study found that working women are significantly less likely to be obese, due to their greater likelihood of activity level than that of not working. The full mass media (Daily watch TV/listen Radio/reading Newspaper) exposure are also significantly associated with obesity and also lower level activity. The many studies found that causes behind the prevalence of obesity and its related consequence for both developing and developed world. However, the many factor influencing body weight gain as genes (Small effect), urbanization, rise in the economy, rapid nutrition transition, standard of leaving, prenatal/postnatal influence, life style change, unhealthy diets, too much television watching, and lower level of physical activity. The consequences like heart disease, depression, blood pressure, diabetes, asthma, sleep apnea, gallstone, kidney stone, infertility, stroke and including 11 types of cancer, including leukemia, breast, and colon cancer and also social and emotional effect including discrimination (Popkin et al., 2002; Kim et al., 2006; Ngoc et al., 2006; and Mishra et al., 2005).

This study highlights how the maternal and child health outcome has been associated with obesity; As expected, cesarean section is significantly associated with both maternal and SES of women than their counterpart women and the prevalence of cesarean increases over time. Nevertheless, (Ramchandern et al., 2008) demonstrate maternal obesity is also significantly associated with adverse pregnancy complication, showing that obese mothers are more likely to suffer pregnancy complication. This study also demonstrates that maternal obesity is significantly associated with the pregnancy complication. However, some important problem not analyzed in this study but exiting literature shows that still the obesity is major risk factor in gestational hypertensive disorder, gestational diabetes mellitus and gestational thromboembolic disorder. The obese women are more likely to progress beyond the term (more than 42 week of gestation) as compared to normal BMI and lean women (Castro and Avina, 2002). In this study, the result for infant mortality partially supported finding of the existing literature. The existing literature shows a clear relationship and causal association between maternal obesity and poor infant outcomes; that relationship is associated with preterm delivery due to preeclampsia, difficult delivery due to macrosomia and increased congenital malformation (Andraesen et al., 2004). The lack of relationship between obesity with infant mortality may be due to the large number of studies between obesity and infant health are from developed world where age distribution of infant or definition of infant mortality is different that of from India. In addition, the number of studies from developed world found that the macrosomia is strongly associated with maternal obesity, even after controlling maternal diabetes. Diabetes has an independent and additive effect with maternal obesity and increase in the likelihood of macrosomia (Maouzoni et al., 2006). The association between obesity, diabetes and macrosomia has increased chance that the fetus born to obese women are diabetic one and will suffer shoulder dystocia a dangerous obstetrics condition (Kiran at el., 2005). Nevertheless, this study evidently found a positive association between maternal obesity, diabetes and macrosmia. The obese women with diabetes are more likely to born macrosomic infant.

Conclusions:

This study addresses many questions related to obesity in India, with relatively high obesity and its relationship with maternal and child outcomes. Presently, developing countries are experiencing much faster transition of obesity than developed countries, at much earlier stage of demographic and epidemiological transition. It is Important to understand why Indian women suffer such high prevalence of obesity. Similarly, it is vital to quantify what extent of obesity is associated with poor health outcomes and also identify what group is more likely to suffer poor health outcomes. In India, number of flagship program has addressed reproductive problem and inequality in nutritional status among women but till now, there is no single program to address this growing epidemic in India. The maternal health problems associated with obesity are acute with no time lag to allow health care service to prepare themselves. Now, it time to address this sever epidemic with giving equal importance with other health related issues. Timely intervention of health care services may reduce the chronic co-morbidities related to obesity. A wise is saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

References:

- Aekplakorn, W., M.C. Hogan, V.associted Chongsuvivatwong, P. Tatsanavivat, S. Chariyalertsak, A. Boonthum, S. Tiptaradol, and S.S. Lim. 2007. Trends in obesity and associations with education and urban or rural residence in Thailand. Obesity Silver Spring, Md 15(12):3113-3121.
- Agrawal, P., & Mishra, V. K. (2004). Covariates of overweight and obesity among women in North India.
- Al-Sendi, A. M., Shetty, P., & Musaiger, A. O. (2003). Prevalence of overweight and obesity among Bahraini adolescents: a comparison between three different sets of criteria. European journal of clinical nutrition, 57(3), 471-474.
- Andreasen, R.K., M.L. Andersen and A.L. Scantz. 2004. Obesity and pregnancy. Acta Obstetrica et Gynaecologica Scandinavica 83:1022-1029
- Barau, G., P.Y. Robillard, T.C. Hulsey, F. Dedecker, A. Laffite, P. Gerardin, and E. Kauffmann. 2006. Linear association between maternal pre-pregnancy body mass index and risk of Caesarean section in term deliveries. British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology113 (10):1173-1177.
- Castro, L. C., & Avina, R. L. (2002). Maternal obesity and pregnancy outcomes. Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology, 14(6), 601-606.
- Cedergren, M.I. 2004. Maternal Morbid Obesity and the Risk of Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes. Obstetrics and Gynecology 103(2):219-224.
- Clark, A.M., B. Thornley, L. Tomlinson, C. Galletley, and R.J. Norman. 1998. Weight loss obese infertile women results in improvement, in reproductive outcome for all forms of fertility treatment. Human Reproduction 13 (6):1502–1505.
- Denison, F.C., J. Price, C. Graham, S. Wild, and W.A. Liston. 2008. Maternal obesity, length of gestation, risk of postdates pregnancy and spontaneous onset of labour at term. British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology 115(6):720-725.
- Douchi, T., Kuwahata, R., Yamamoto, S., Oki, T., Yamasaki, H., & Nagata, Y. (2002). Relationship of upper body obesity to menstrual disorders. Acta Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica 81 (2), 147–150.
- Jain, N.J., C.E. Denk, L.K. Kruse, and V. Dandolu. 2007. Maternal obesity: can pregnancy weight gain modify risk of selected adverse pregnancy outcomes? American Journal of Perinatology 24(5):291-299.
- James, W.P.T. 2007. The fundamental drivers of the obesity epidemic. Obesity Reviews 9 (suppl. 1):6-13.
- Jazayeri A, Heffron JA, Phillips R, Spellacy WN. Macrosomia prediction using ultrasound fetal abdominal circumference of 35 centimeters or more. Obstet Gynecol.Apr 1999; 93(4):523-6.
- Kasha, A. S., & Kenny, L. C. (2009). The effects of maternal body mass index on pregnancy outcome. European journal of epidemiology, 24(11), 697-705.
- Kelishadi, R., Ardalan, G., Gheiratmand, R., Majdzadeh, R., Hosseini, M., Gouya, M. M. Lock, K. (2008). Thinness, overweight and obesity in a national sample of Iranian children and adolescents: CASPIAN Study. Child: Care, Health and Development, 34(1), 44-54.

- Kim, S.A., K.M. Yount, U. Ramakrishnan, and R. Martorell. 2007. The relationship between parity and overweight varies with household wealth and national development. International Journal of Epidemiology. 36(1):93-101.
- Kiran, T.S.U., S. Hemmadi, J. Bethel, and J. Evans. 2005. Outcome of pregnancy in a woman with an increased body mass index. British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology 112:768-772.
- Lake, J. K., Power, C., & Cole, T. J. (1997). Women's reproductive health: the role of body mass index in early and adult life. International Journal of Obesity & Related Metabolic Disorders, 21(6).
- Lynch, C.M., S.J. Sexton, M. Hession, J.J. Morrison. 2008. Obesity and mode of delivery in primigravid and multigravid women. American Journal of Perinatology 25:163-167.
- Mazouni, C., G. Porcu, E. Cohen-Solal, H. Heckenroth, B. Guidicelli, P. Bonnier, and M.Gamerre. 2006. Maternal and anthropomorphic risk factors for shoulder dystocia. ActaObstetrica et Gynaecologica 85:567-570.
- McLaren, L. (2007). Socioeconomic status and obesity. Epidemiologic reviews, 29(1), 29-48.
- Misra, D.P., N. Astone, and C. D. Lynch. 2005. Maternal smoking and birth weight: interaction with parity and mother's own in utero exposure to smoking. Epidemiology 16(3): 288-293.
- Monteiro, C.A., E.C. Moura, W.L. Conde, and B.M. Popkin. 2004. Socioeconomic status and obesity in adult populations of developing countries: a review. Bulletin of the World Health Organization 82(12):940-946.
- Monteiro, C.A., W.L. Conde, B. Lu, and B.M. Popkin. 2004. Obesity and inequities in health in the developing world. International Journal of Obesity and Related Metabolic Disorders 28(9):1181-1186.
- Moura, E. C., & Claro, R. M. (2012). Estimates of obesity trends in Brazil, 2006 2009. International journal of public health, 57(1), 127-133.
- Ngoc, N.T.N., M. Merialdi, H. Abdel-Aleem, G. Carroli, M. Purwar, N. Zavaleta, L. Campódonico, M. M. Ali, G. J. Hofmeyr, M. Mathai, O. Lincetto, J. Villar. 2006. Causes of stillbirths and early neonatal deaths: data from 7993 pregnancies in six developing countries. Bulletin of the World Health Organization 84(9):699-705.
- Popkin, B.M. 2002. The Shift in Stages of the Nutrition Transition in the Developing World Differs from Past Experiences. Malaysian Journal of Nutrition 8(1):109-124.
- Ramachandran, P. (2010). Nutrition and child survival in India. The Indian Journal of Pediatrics, 77(3), 301-305.
- Ramachenderan, J., J. Bradford and M. McLean. 2008. Maternal obesity and pregnancy complications: A review. Australia and New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology 48:228-235.
- Ryan, D. 2007. Obesity in women: a life cycle of medical risk. International Journal of Obesity 31:S3-S7.
- Sarkar, R.K., S.M. Cooley, J.C. Donnelly, T. Walsh, C. Collins, and M.P. Geary. 2007. The incidence and impact of increased body mass index on maternal and fetal morbidity in the low-risk primigravid population. Journal of Maternal-Fetal and Neonatal

Medicine 20(12):879-883.

- Seidell, J.C. (1997). Time trends in obesity: an epidemiological perspective. Hormone and Metabolic Research 29 (4), 155–158.
- Seligman, L.C., B.B. Duncan, L. Branchtein, D.S.M. Gaio, S.S. Mengue, and M.I. Schmidt. 2006. Obesity and gestation weight gain: cesarean delivery and labor complications. Rev Sauda Publica 40(3):457-463.
- Spellacy WN, Miller S, Winegar A, Peterson PQ. Macrosomia--maternal characteristics and infant complications. Obstet Gynecol. Aug 1985; 66(2):158-61.
- Vaz, M., Yusuf, S., Bharathi, A. V., Kurpad, A. V., & Swaminathan, S. (2005). The nutrition transition in India. South African Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 18(2), p-198.
- Vijayalakshmi, K., Reddy, GA., Krishna, TP. & Krishnaswamy K. (2002) Obesity in adolescents of different socio-economic groups: prevalence in Andhra Pradesh, India. Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition 11 (supplement), S740–S743.
- World Health Organization (2008) Global Burden of Disease 2004 Update Geneva.
- Yoon, K. H., Lee, J. H., Kim, J. W., Cho, J. H., Choi, Y. H., Ko, S. H., ... & Son, H. Y. (2006). Epidemic obesity and type 2 diabetes in Asia. The Lancet, 368(9548), 1681-1688.

| residence in India, NFHS III | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
| State | NFHS II | | | | | |
| State | | Total | Urban | Rural | | |
| North | 16.1 | 20.4 | 32.7 | 14.2 | | |
| Jammu and Kashmir | 13.8 | 21.9 | 39.4 | 15 | | |
| Himachal Pradesh | 13.4 | 18 | 38.3 | 15.7 | | |
| Punjab | 29.4 | 38.8 | 47.2 | 33.9 | | |
| Uttaranchal | 10.4 | 16.9 | 32 | 11.5 | | |
| Haryana | 16.6 | 21.2 | 34.1 | 15.4 | | |
| Delhi | 34.5 | 32.9 | 33.7 | 23 | | |
| Rajasthan | 6.7 | 10.4 | 21.9 | 5.9 | | |
| Central | 6.8 | 10.2 | 24.4 | 5.7 | | |
| Uttar Pradesh | 7.4 | 11.3 | 25 | 7.1 | | |
| Chhattisgarh | 4.2 | 7.1 | 23.6 | 2.5 | | |
| Madhya Pradesh | 6.8 | 8.9 | 23.6 | 3.7 | | |
| East | 5.7 | 8.8 | 24.6 | 4.5 | | |
| Bihar | 3.8 | 5.5 | 17.5 | 3.5 | | |
| West Bengal | 8.5 | 12.4 | 28.9 | 5.9 | | |
| Jharkhand | 3 | 6.6 | 20.5 | 1.9 | | |
| Orissa | 4.5 | 8.1 | 23.3 | 5.1 | | |
| Northeast | 5.2 | 9.8 | 21.5 | 6.9 | | |
| Sikkim | 15.6 | 19.2 | 31.9 | 16.2 | | |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 5.3 | 11.3 | 14.5 | 10 | | |
| Nagaland | 7.3 | 9.5 | 18.5 | 6 | | |
| Manipur | 10.4 | 17.8 | 27.5 | 13.5 | | |
| Mizoram | 5 | 11.8 | 18.1 | 4.1 | | |
| Tripura | 8.2 | 7.6 | 17.7 | 5.5 | | |
| Meghalaya | 5.3 | 7.3 | 11.7 | 6 | | |
| Assam | 4.1 | 9.5 | 23.2 | 6.6 | | |
| West | 13.2 | 18.7 | 29.6 | 9.7 | | |
| Gujarat | 15.6 | 21.1 | 33.6 | 12 | | |
| Maharashtra | 13.6 | 17.4 | 27.6 | 8.3 | | |
| Goa | 20.6 | 28.6 | 34.1 | 21.1 | | |
| South | 13.2 | 22.4 | 34.7 | 15.1 | | |
| Andhra Pradesh | 11.6 | 18.4 | 32.1 | 12 | | |
| Karnataka | 13.6 | 19.3 | 33 | 11 | | |
| Kerala | 20.9 | 34.4 | 41.6 | 30.8 | | |
| Tamil Nadu | 14.7 | 25 | 36.1 | 15.6 | | |
| India | 10.5 | 15.3 | 29.6 | 8.9 | | |

| Table 1: Percentage of overweight/obese women in age group 15-49 by state and place of | |
|--|--|
| residence in India. NFHS III | |

| NFHS III | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------|----------|--|--|--|
| characteristics | NFHS II | NFHS III | | | |
| Age | | | | | |
| 15-24 | 2.7 | 4.2 | | | |
| 25-34 | 9.4 | 12.5 | | | |
| 35+ | 16.9 | 22.1 | | | |
| Marital status | | | | | |
| Single | - | 12.6 | | | |
| Married | 10.6 | 15.4 | | | |
| W/D/S | 10.3 | 14.2 | | | |
| Caste | | | | | |
| Schedule Caste | 5.9 | 10.6 | | | |
| Schedule Tribe | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | |
| Other Backward Class | 9.4 | 14.4 | | | |
| Other | 15.3 | 22.7 | | | |
| Religion | | | | | |
| Hindu | 9.6 | 14.2 | | | |
| Muslim | 12.5 | 17.5 | | | |
| Other | 19.9 | 26.3 | | | |
| Level of education | | | | | |
| No education | 4.9 | 7.9 | | | |
| Primary | 10.9 | 14.6 | | | |
| Secondary | 17.2 | 23.5 | | | |
| Higher | 28.6 | 39.1 | | | |
| Mass media | | | | | |
| Not exposure | 3.4 | 4.5 | | | |
| Partially exposure | 15.4 | 32.9 | | | |
| Working Status | | | | | |
| No | 13.1 | 19.7 | | | |
| Yes | 6.7 | 10.1 | | | |
| Standard of living | | | | | |
| Low | 2.8 | 3.3 | | | |
| Middle | 8.7 | 8.8 | | | |
| High | 27 | 28.6 | | | |
| Type of Place of Residence | | | | | |
| Urban | 23.2 | 29.6 | | | |
| Rural | 6 | 8.9 | | | |
| Region residence | | | | | |
| North | 16 | 20.4 | | | |
| Central | 6.8 | 10.2 | | | |
| East | 5.6 | 8.8 | | | |
| Northeast | 5.2 | 9.8 | | | |
| West | 13.1 | 18.7 | | | |
| South | 14.2 | 22.4 | | | |
| India | 10.5 | 15.3 | | | |

Table 2: Percentage of obese women (15-49) by background characteristics in India, NFHS III

| Covariates | Model I | SE | Model II | SE | Model III | SE |
|-----------------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Age | | | | | | |
| 15-24® | | | | | | |
| 25-34 | 3.314*** | 0.048 | 3.095*** | 0.049 | 2.811*** | 0.051 |
| 35+ | 6.497*** | 0.047 | 7.247*** | 0.048 | 5.865*** | 0.051 |
| Marital status | | | | | | |
| Single® | | | | | | |
| Married | | | 2.537 | 0.534 | 1.356 | 0.539 |
| Other | | | 1.921 | 0.535 | 1.241 | 0.541 |
| Level of education | | | | | | |
| No education® | | | | | | |
| Primary | | | 1.710*** | 0.034 | 1.163*** | 0.038 |
| Secondary | | | 2.841*** | 0.027 | 1.305*** | 0.034 |
| Higher | | | 4.204*** | 0.038 | 1.514*** | 0.047 |
| Place of residence | | | | | | |
| Rural® | | | | | | |
| Urban | | | 2.642*** | 0.023 | 1.535*** | 0.027 |
| Caste | | | | | | |
| Schedule Caste® | | | | | | |
| Schedule Tribe | | | | | 0.506*** | 0.051 |
| Other Backward Class | | | | | 0.963 | 0.036 |
| Other | | | | | 1.135*** | 0.036 |
| Religion | | | | | 1.155 | 0.050 |
| Hindu® | | | | | | |
| Muslim | | | | | 1.362*** | 0.037 |
| Other | | | | | 1.411*** | 0.037 |
| Mass media | | | | | 1.411 | 0.059 |
| | | | | | | |
| Not exposure® | | | | | 1.095** | 0.03 |
| Partially exposure | | | | | 1.220*** | 0.03 |
| fully exposure | | | | | 1.220*** | 0.040 |
| Working Status No® | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 0 704*** | 0.020 |
| Yes | | | | | 0.794*** | 0.026 |
| Wealth Status | | | | | | |
| Poorest® | | | | | 1 706*** | 0.000 |
| Poorer | | | | | 1.796*** | 0.092 |
| Middle | | | | | 3.038*** | 0.085 |
| Richer | | | | | 5.637*** | 0.084 |
| Richest | | | | | 11.072*** | 0.086 |
| Region residence | | | | | | |
| North® | | | | | | 0 |
| Central | | | | | 0.851*** | 0.039 |
| East | | | | | 0.796*** | 0.043 |
| Northeast | | | | | 0.778*** | 0.046 |
| West | | | | | 0.810*** | 0.039 |
| South | | | | | 1.519*** | 0.036 |

| Table 3: Odds Ratio showing the effect of selected covariates on the prevalence of | |
|--|--|
| obesity among women in India: Results from Logistic Regression analysis, NFHS III | |

Note: Significance: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, and *p<0.05. Dependent Variable: obesity: 1=Yes 0=No ®: Reference category.

| | Table 4: Percentage of women experienced pregnancy complication during last birth in one year preceding the survey by BMI and background ch Vaginal Bleeding Prolonged Labor Swelling | | | | | | | Cesarean | | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------|------------|------|--------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| Characteristics | Thin | Normal | Obese | Thin | Normal | Obese | Thin | Normal | Obese | Thin | Normal | Obes |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 18.1 | 18.9 | 26.4 | 24.1 | 25.7 | 32.2 | 5.0 | 9.5 | 29.1 |
| 25-34 | 3.9 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 15.7 | 20.9 | 34.8 | 24.1 | 30.3 | 32.7 | 4.7 | 10.9 | 34.6 |
| 35+ | 4.3 | 4.3 | 0.3 | 9.9 | 15.5 | 48.3 | 33.0 | 28.4 | 42.3 | 3.3 | 5.7 | 28.4 |
| Caste | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Schedule caste | 2.9 | 3.9 | 7.6 | 15.0 | 15.9 | 17.1 | 23.6 | 25.7 | 29.6 | 4.5 | 7.9 | 19.0 |
| Schedule Tribe | 5.3 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 13.2 | 25.3 | 27.7 | 30.1 | 51.3 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 22.2 |
| Other backward class | 3.5 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 16.9 | 19.6 | 31.7 | 25.3 | 26.4 | 29.8 | 4.5 | 9.0 | 33.1 |
| Other | 4.9 | 5.0 | 6.6 | 22.4 | 24.0 | 37.6 | 23.4 | 28.9 | 36.5 | 8.1 | 15.4 | 35.7 |
| Religion | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 22.4 | 24.0 | 57.0 | 23.4 | 20.7 | 50.5 | 0.1 | 15.4 | 55.7 |
| Hindu | 3.5 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 17.2 | 19.3 | 32.5 | 23.5 | 26.1 | 33.2 | 5.2 | 10.6 | 33.4 |
| Muslim | 5.4 | 3.6 | 6.2 | 17.2 | 19.5 | 32.5 | 23.3 | 34.1 | 34.6 | 2.7 | 5.6 | 29.4 |
| Other | 4.4 | 8.8 | 0.2 9.8 | 19.3 | 26.1 | 30.7 | 28.4 | 27.6 | 26.3 | 2.7 9.7 | 5.0 11.8 | 29.4 30.7 |
| Level of education | 4.4 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 19.5 | 20.1 | 30.7 | 22.1 | 27.0 | 20.5 | 9.7 | 11.0 | 50.7 |
| No education | 3.3 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 23.7 | 25.3 | 26.8 | 25.5 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 10.0 |
| | 5.5 4.9 | 5.5 4.8 | 0.7 7.1 | 11.9 | 17.2 | 23.7 | 25.5 25.6 | 28.9 | 23.5 38.5 | 3.9 | 2.4 6.9 | 10.0 |
| Primary | 4.9 | | | | | 18.1 29.9 | 25.0 22.0 | | | 3.9 9.5 | 6.9 17.5 | 37.8 |
| Secondary | | 4.8 | 5.5 | 23.4 | 24.5 | | | 26.6 | 32.9 | | | |
| Higher | 6.0 | 8.4 | 5.5 | 21.6 | 37.5 | 42.7 | 31.3 | 36.8 | 37.1 | 25.0 | 32.0 | 38.2 |
| Mass media | 2.6 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 11.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 262 | 27.7 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 17.5 |
| Not exposure | 3.6 | 3.5 | 9.5 | 9.1 | 11.9 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 26.2 | 37.7 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 17.5 |
| Partially exposure | 3.8 | 4.1 | 7.6 | 16.8 | 16.7 | 34.5 | 25.0 | 29.7 | 32.6 | 3.4 | 5.3 | 23.2 |
| fully exposure | 4.1 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 23.7 | 24.7 | 32.1 | 22.2 | 27.2 | 32.7 | 11.3 | 18.5 | 35.8 |
| Working Status | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.7 | 18.6 | 20.7 | 32.7 | 23.7 | 26.4 | 32.6 | 6.1 | 11.6 | 32.7 |
| Yes | 3.4 | 5.0 | 7.7 | 12.9 | 15.8 | 28.0 | 26.5 | 30.3 | 36.6 | 2.4 | 5.3 | 36.7 |
| Wealth index | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poorest | 3.0 | 3.7 | 12.9 | 11.1 | 11.7 | 0.0 | 25.5 | 29.4 | 16.0 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 13.0 |
| Poorer | 4.3 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 16.4 | 15.4 | 22.8 | 25.6 | 25.3 | 24.2 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 16.7 |
| Middle | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 18.1 | 20.4 | 25.4 | 35.0 | 5.5 | 8.1 | 19.1 |
| Richer | 4.3 | 4.4 | 7.2 | 21.7 | 22.9 | 27.7 | 24.9 | 28.8 | 31.1 | 9.2 | 16.2 | 26.4 |
| Richest | 5.2 | 7.0 | 5.4 | 27.3 | 31.1 | 38.5 | 26.3 | 29.6 | 35.8 | 18.0 | 26.1 | 40.6 |
| Place of Residence | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Urban | 5.2 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 20.3 | 24.9 | 36.4 | 24.0 | 31.9 | 33.5 | 8.6 | 17.8 | 36.7 |
| Rural | 3.6 | 3.8 | 6.8 | 16.2 | 17.4 | 25.6 | 24.6 | 26.2 | 32.5 | 4.1 | 7.3 | 26.2 |
| Region | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| North | 4.5 | 5.8 | 8.1 | 15.7 | 20.5 | 39.6 | 21.7 | 26.7 | 36.2 | 4.6 | 7.3 | 27.8 |
| Central | 3.9 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 11.4 | 12.0 | 37.1 | 25.5 | 27.5 | 32.8 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 22.2 |
| East | 3.4 | 3.3 | 1.5 | 21.7 | 22.6 | 26.5 | 28.9 | 29.6 | 27.8 | 3.4 | 7.1 | 36.7 |
| Northeast | 8.5 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 11.0 | 20.7 | 34.6 | 25.4 | 35.0 | 53.3 | 3.4 | 6.4 | 27.5 |
| West | 4.5 | 4.6 | 5.7 | 15.1 | 19.8 | 35.3 | 22.6 | 25.6 | 39.5 | 5.6 | 11.6 | 35.5 |
| South | 2.3 | 4.0 | 5.4 | 23.6 | 26.5 | 26.7 | 16.0 | 24.6 | 29.0 | 12.9 | 27.3 | 37.3 |
| Total | 3.9 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 17.0 | 19.5 | 32.2 | 24.5 | 27.6 | 33.1 | 4.9 | 9.8 | 32.4 |

| | | III | | |
|---|------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Vaginal Bleeding | Labor | Swelling | Cesarean |
| | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| BMI Level | | | | |
| Thin [®] | | | | |
| Normal | 0.91 | 1.01 | 1.217*** | 1.428*** |
| Overweight/obese | 1.108 | 1.144* | 1.570*** | 2.432*** |
| Age Group 15-24 [®] | | | | |
| 25-34 | 1.118 | 1.003 | 1.038 | 1.157* |
| 35+ | 1.021 | 0.885 | 1.033 | 1.134 |
| Caste | | | | |
| Schedule caste [®] | | | | |
| Schedule Tribe | 0.758 | 1.074 | 1.118 | 0.584*** |
| Other backward class | 0.887 | 1.082 | 1.012 | 0.881 |
| Other | 0.896 | 1.202* | 1.005 | 1.186 |
| Religion Hindu [®] | | | | |
| Muslim | 1.283 | 1.016 | 1.368*** | 0.616*** |
| Other | 1.175 | 1.279** | 0.926 | 0.907 |
| Education | | | | |
| No education [®] | | | | |
| Primary | 1.454* | 1.137 | 1.283*** | 1.595*** |
| Secondary | 1.341* | 1.364*** | 1.061 | 2.293*** |
| Higher | 1.601* | 1.638*** | 1.295** | 3.824*** |
| Media Exposure | | | | |
| Not exposure® | | | | |
| Partially exposure | 1.009 | 1.253* | 1.048 | 1.374* |
| fully exposure | 1.019 | 1.474*** | 0.977 | 2.047*** |
| Working Status No® | | | | |
| Yes | 1.126 | 0.878 | 1.220*** | 0.975 |
| Wealth Status | 1.120 | 0.070 | 1.220 | 0.975 |
| Poorest [®] | 0.707 | 1 205 | 0.022 | 1 707** |
| Poorer | 0.797 | 1.205 | 0.932 | 1.797** |
| Middle | 0.95 | 1.287* | 0.924 | 2.360*** |
| Richer | 1.283 | 1.475*** | 0.998 | 3.542*** |
| Richest | 1.222 | 2.069*** | 1.179 | 4.920*** |
| Place of residence Rural [®] | | | | |
| Urban | 1.03 | 0.995 | 1.178*** | 1.283*** |
| Region residence North [®] | | | | |
| Central | 0.712* | 0.676*** | 1.035 | 1.225 |
| East | 0.746** | 0.988 | 1.179 | 1.602*** |
| Northeast | 0.694* | 0.923 | 1.384*** | 1.155 |
| West | 0.954 | 0.923 | 1.111 | 1.353*** |
| South | 0.497 | 1.003 | 0.758*** | 3.276*** |

Table 5: Odds Ratio showing the effect of selected covariate on prevalence of pregnancy complication among women during last birth in one year preceding survey: India, Results from logistic analysis, NFHS III

> Note: Significance: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, and *p<0.05. ®: Reference category. Source: Computed from NFHS III Kids data file.

| | T | India, NFHS | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Characteristics | Infant I Normal | | Thin | <u>Macrosomia</u> Normal | a Obese |
| Ago | normal | Obese | 1 1111 | normai | Obese |
| Age 15-24 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 7.6 |
| | 4.5 | | | | |
| 25-34 | | 4.4 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 5.9 |
| 35+ | 4.7 | 2.8 | 7.1 | 8.4 | 5.9 |
| Caste | () | ~ ~ | | | |
| SC | 6.2 | 5.5 | 4 | 5.7 | 7.6 |
| ST | 6.8 | 0.8 | 6.2 | 9.2 | 8.6 |
| OBC | 5 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 6 | 4.6 |
| Other | 4.7 | 3.4 | 5 | 5.5 | 7.4 |
| Religion | | | | | |
| Hindu | 5.5 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 6.2 |
| Muslim | 4.8 | 4.3 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 8.4 |
| Other | 5.4 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 5.7 | 3.4 |
| Level of education | | | | | |
| No education | 6.8 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 9.5 | 14.4 |
| Primary | 5.6 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 6.5 | 8.4 |
| Secondary | 3.7 | 4.6 | 4 | 4.8 | 6.1 |
| Higher | 1.4 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 3.6 |
| Mass media | | | | | |
| Not exposure | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 6.7 |
| Partially exposure | 3.5 | 3.1 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 6.6 |
| fully exposure | 2.2 | 1 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 1.6 |
| Working Status | | - | 011 | 110 | 110 |
| No | 4.8 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 6.5 |
| Yes | 6.2 | 4.9 | 6.3 | 7.2 | 5.5 |
| Wealth index | 0.2 | 7.2 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 5.5 |
| Poorest | 7.1 | 5.9 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 9.8 |
| Poorer | 6.5 | 9.5 | 4.8 | 7.2 | 9.8 17.1 |
| Middle | 5.5 | 9.3 4.7 | 4.8 6.5 | 7.2 6.6 | 5.9 |
| Richer | 5.5 3.6 | 4.7 6.6 | 6.5 3.4 | 5.3 | 5.9 6.9 |
| Richest | 3.6 2.9 | 0.0 2.7 | 5.4 4.2 | | |
| | 2.9 | 2.1 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 5.3 |
| Place of Residence | 2.0 | А | 1 1 | F | () |
| Urban | 3.9 | 4 | 4.4 | 5 | 6.3 |
| Rural | 5.9 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 6.6 | 6.2 |
| Region residence | | <i></i> | - | | |
| North | 5.3 | 5.1 | 5 | 4.4 | 5.2 |
| Central | 6.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 8.8 | 7.8 |
| East | 5.6 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 5 | 6.6 |
| Northeast | 5.4 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 7.6 | 9.4 |
| West | 3.8 | 3 | 4.4 | 6.8 | 11.6 |
| South | 3.9 | 3.3 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 3.5 |
| Total | 5.4 | 4.6 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 6.3 |

| Table 6: Prevalence of pregnancy outcome among women by BMI level and background characteristics, | |
|---|--|
| India NFHS III | |

Source: Computed from NFHS III Kids data file

| I | ndia, NFHS III | · |
|--|----------------|-------------|
| Covariate | OR | 95 % CI |
| Thin (BMI< 18.5) [®] | | |
| Normal (BMI: 18.5-25) | 1.266** | 1.082-1.481 |
| Overweight/obese(BMI>25) | 1.750*** | 1.421-2.154 |
| Diabetes | | |
| No | | |
| Yes | 1.804* | 1.002-3.248 |
| Age Group 15-24 [®] | | |
| 25-34 | 1.111 | 0.969-1.274 |
| 35+ | 1.205 | 0.954-1.523 |
| Caste | | |
| SC® | | |
| ST | 1.361** | 1.051-1.762 |
| OBC | 1.102 | 0.900-1.348 |
| Other | 1.011 | 0.822-1.244 |
| Religion | | |
| Hindu [®] | | |
| Muslim | 1.656*** | 1.356-1.952 |
| Other | 0.984 | 0.791-1.225 |
| Education | | |
| No education [®] | | |
| Primary | 0.702*** | 0.566-0.871 |
| Secondary | 0.659*** | 0.549-0.792 |
| Higher | 0.613*** | 0.472-0.798 |
| Media Exposure | | |
| Not exposure® | | |
| Partially exposure | 0.92 | 0.787-1.074 |
| fully exposure | 0.617 | 0.434-0.876 |
| Working Status | | |
| No® | | |
| Yes | 1.265*** | 1.101-1.453 |
| Wealth Status | | |
| Poorest [®] | | |
| Poorer | 0.925 | 0.677-1.262 |
| Middle | 0.996 | 0.742-1.336 |
| Richer | 0.914 | 0.676-1.238 |
| Richest | 0.868 | 0.626-1.203 |
| Place of residence | | |
| Urban® | 1 100* | 0.070 1.200 |
| Rural | 1.128* | 0.979-1.300 |
| Region residence North [®] | | |
| | 1 227** | 1 027 1 605 |
| Central | 1.326** | 1.037-1.695 |
| East | 0.952 | 0.735-1.232 |
| Northeast | 1.660*** | 1.310-2.103 |
| West | 1.019 | 0.808-1.284 |
| South | 0.732** | 0.582-0.922 |

 Table 7: Logistic Regression Analysis, Odds Ratio showing the probability of Macrosomia by Covariates:

 ...

Note: Significance: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, and *p<0.05. Dependent Variable: Macrosomia: 1=Yes 0=No ®: Reference category. Source: Computed from NFHS III Kids data file.

| Covariates | Infant Death | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| covariates | OR | 95 % CI | | | |
| BMI Level | | | | | |
| Thin [®] | | | | | |
| Normal | 0.906* | 0.822-1.000 | | | |
| Obese | 1.044 | 0.861-1.266 | | | |
| Age Group 15-24 [®] | | | | | |
| 25-34 | 0.537*** | 0.487-0.593 | | | |
| 35+ | 0.502*** | 0.427-0.593 | | | |
| Caste | 0.502 | 0.427 0.391 | | | |
| SC [®] | | | | | |
| ST | 0.962 | 0.815-1.134 | | | |
| OBC | 0.946 | 0.834-1.072 | | | |
| Other | 1.032 | 0.893-1.191 | | | |
| Religion | 1.032 | 0.895-1.191 | | | |
| Hindu [®] | | | | | |
| Muslim | 0.842* | 0.729-0.973 | | | |
| Other | 1.066 | 0.880-1.290 | | | |
| Education | 1.000 | 0.000 1.290 | | | |
| No education [®] | | | | | |
| Primary | 0.902* | 0.789-1.032 | | | |
| Secondary | 0.747*** | 0.652-0.856 | | | |
| Higher | 0.533*** | 0.382-0.743 | | | |
| Media Exposure | | | | | |
| Not exposure® | | | | | |
| Partially exposure | 0.948 | 0.801-1.121 | | | |
| fully exposure | 1.084 | 0.731-1.607 | | | |
| Working Status | | | | | |
| No® | | | | | |
| Yes | 0.906* | 0.820-1.002 | | | |
| Wealth Status | | | | | |
| Poorest [®] | | | | | |
| Poorer | 1.061 | 0.929-1.213 | | | |
| Middle | 0.873* | 0.751-1.014 | | | |
| Richer | 0.731*** | 0.614-0.870 | | | |
| Richest | 0.607*** | 0.484-0.760 | | | |
| Place of residence | | | | | |
| Urban® | | | | | |
| Rural | 0.922 | 0.820-1.037 | | | |
| Region residence | | | | | |
| North [®] | | | | | |
| Central | 1.373*** | 1.187-1.589 | | | |
| East | 1.058 | 0.900-1.244 | | | |
| Northeast | 0.939 | 0.777-1.134 | | | |
| West | 0.892 | 0.732-1.087 | | | |
| South | 0.733 | 0.605-0.887 | | | |

 Table 7: Cox proportional hazard model showing effect of covariates on the prevalence of pregnancy outcomes in India, NFHS III

Note: Significance: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, and *p<0.05. ®: Reference category. Source: Computed from NFHS III Kids data file.