

BMJ Open

Childhood obesity is persistent as a predictor of preschoolers' parent-rated health accounting for social inequalities - Lifeways cross-generation cohort study.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-005328
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Mar-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Shrivastava, Aakash; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science Murrin, Celine; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science Kelleher, Cecily; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Paediatrics
Keywords:	Lifecourse, self-rated health, obesity, BMI, waist circumference, preschool children

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title: Childhood obesity is persistent as a predictor of preschoolers' parent-rated health**
4 **accounting for social inequalities - Lifeways cross-generation cohort study**
5
6

7 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

8 Professor Cecily C Kelleher

9 School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science,

10 Woodview House,

11 University College Dublin

12 Belfield,

13 Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland

14 Tel: +3531 7162045

15 Fax: +3531 7163421

16 cecily.kelleher@ucd.ie
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **AUTHORS**

25 Aakash Shrivastava¹ PhD

26 Celine Murrin¹ PhD

27 Cecily C Kelleher¹ MD

28 ¹School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science, University College Dublin,
29 Woodview House, Belfield, Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Running Title: Childhood obesity a persistent predictor of preschoolers' PRH**
36
37

38 **KEYWORDS**

39 Lifecourse, self-rated health, obesity, BMI, waist circumference, preschool children
40
41
42

43 **Word count: 2486**
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT (Words: 244)**Objective**

To examine the relationship between lifecourse factors from preschoolers' micro-ecosystem and their parent-reported (mother-reported) health (PRH), following them prospectively from preconception to age 5-years. To investigate if preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference were associated with preschoolers' PRH when controlled for lifecourse predictors.

Design

Lifeways cross-generation cohort study

Setting

Ireland

Participants

Of 1082 families, 62% mothers responded on a health and lifestyle questionnaire at follow-up. Food frequency, BMI and waist-circumference were measured.

Main outcome measure

Mother-reported children's PRH at age-5. Associations with child's individual and familial exposures from preconception to age 5-years examined using logistic regression.

Results

In univariate analysis, relatively-positive rating of children's PRH were associated with children's lower intake of fats [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], higher intake of fruits/vegetables [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)]; as well as familial socio-economic characteristics {higher household income [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], non-entitlement to means-tested healthcare [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers' higher education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)]}, psycho-

1
2
3 social characteristics {father's participation in study [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers'
4 perceiving better support from partner [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], children
5 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)] or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]}, parents' lifestyle
6 {mothers' lower intake of energy [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], fathers' non-smoking status
7 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]}, and parents' health {mothers' self-rated health relatively-
8 positive [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)], fathers' self-rated health relatively-positive
9 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)]}.

10
11
12 In multivariable analysis ($\chi^2=34.2, df=21, N=303, R^2=0.26, p<0.05$), one of the two strong
13 predictors of children's relatively-positive PRH was child not being obese by International
14 Obesity Task Force classification [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)], observed also using BMI
15 [OR(95%CI)=0.73(0.58-0.93)] or waist-circumference [OR(95%CI)=0.89(0.81-0.98)] as
16 continuous variables. The other significant predictor was mothers' self-rated health
17 relatively-positive [OR(95%CI)=4.2(1.5-12.2)].

32 **Conclusions**

33
34
35 Preschoolers' health is adversely associated with obesity and this is independent of lifecourse
36 social and environmental inequalities. Findings have relevance for developmental health
37 policies.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Nationally representative sample of preschool-age children
- Examines the influence of lifecourse adversities, prospectively measured from preconception to age 5 on children's general health at age 5. The study analyses demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, food and nutrients intake, psycho-social, socio-economic and health-related exposures from both children's individual as well as parental experiences.
- Demonstrates a significant and independent association between preschoolers' measured BMI as well as waist circumference and their general health status.
- The study is limited by a relatively small sample and use of parent-reported health status.

MAIN TEXT

Introduction

The development of children is critical to their adult well-being and across the lifecourse even subjective estimates may be useful to reflect objectively measured health. Bronfenbrenner^[1] emphasised the importance of children's micro-ecosystem in their development. Recently, the World Health Organisation (WHO) presented a model for Early Child Development,^[2] which again illustrates the importance of individual and family spheres of influence on children's health. The relevance of socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle environment in child development and health is widely acknowledged.^[2-4]

According to the lifecourse hypothesis, risk transmission is characterised by critical periods and accumulation of risk models.^[5] Based on this, Hertzman and colleagues^[6] examined self-rated health in adulthood using an integrated lifecourse framework. There are a few other studies also which have examined lifecourse determinants of adult global^[7,8] or specific health status.^[9] On the contrary, the literature on the determinants of child global health status is sparse,^[10,11] particularly for the preschool-age children.^[12] Even rarer are studies whose examination includes early lifecourse determinants of child global health status.

Thus the first objective of our analysis was to prospectively examine the relationship between demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, nutritional, psycho-social, socio-economic and health-related lifecourse exposures taken from the children's individual and family spheres of influence starting from preconception up to age 5-years and their global health status at preschool-age.

In social epidemiology, the construct of "embodiment" refers to biological expression of individuals' materio-social world.^[13,14] Similarly in lifecourse epidemiology, it is

1
2
3 hypothesised that early life experiences get “biologically embedded” during critical or
4
5 sensitive periods of child development leading to gradients in health.^[15,16]
6
7

8 The Foresight report identifies a large array of environmental determinants of obesity, a
9
10 number of which are again related to early child development.^[17] This suggests obesity as
11
12 pivotal risk factor for subsequent health conditions.^[18]
13
14

15 The negative relationship between obesity and self-rated health is now increasingly reported
16
17 in adult populations,^[19,20] some indicating a temporal relationship^[21,22] and suggesting that
18
19 obesity increases health inequalities over time.^[22] However, evidence on the relationship
20
21 between obesity and health is relatively limited in child population studies and those
22
23 available have reported health-related-quality-of-life (HR-QoL)^[23] instead of a generic
24
25 measure such as global self-rated health. Moreover, this association is yet to be established
26
27 for preschool-age children. To our knowledge just two population based studies have
28
29 examined this association in preschool age-group children^[24,25] and neither had nutritional
30
31 information.
32
33
34

35 In the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children, Wake *et al.*^[24] did not find a significant
36
37 difference in global health status of overweight/obese and normal weight 4-5-year-old
38
39 children. Skinner *et al.*,^[25] using data on 3-5-year-olds from the US National Health and
40
41 Nutrition Examination Survey, reported a poorer global health status in obese and severely
42
43 obese preschoolers. Neither of these studies accounted for a number of possibly relevant
44
45 confounders, including parental BMI, parental health and nutritional variables.
46
47
48

49 We thus hypothesised that similar to findings from studies on older age-groups,
50
51 anthropometric markers of child obesity in our preschool-age children study would also
52
53 demonstrate a negative association with their global health status. The next objective of our
54
55 analysis was to examine whether anthropometric markers of child obesity would emerge as
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 strong predictors of global health status when accounted for other socio-economic, psycho-
4 social, and lifestyle environmental factors in a multivariable model.
5
6

7 8 **Methods**

9
10 The Lifeways cross generation cohort study comprises three generations of 1082 Irish
11 families and was established in 2001-03; the recruitment procedure of this nationally
12 representative cohort has been described previously.^[26-28] The a priori purpose was to
13 examine familial and cross-generation influences on early childhood development over the
14 first five years of children's lives. Briefly, would-be mothers were at random recruited from
15 the two regional maternity hospitals in the Republic of Ireland to get a representative sample.
16
17

18
19 At this early pregnancy stage mothers completed a health and lifestyle status questionnaire
20 adapted from a validated instrument developed for national SLÁN (Survey of Lifestyle,
21 Attitudes and Nutrition) surveys in Republic of Ireland.^[29] Mothers reported their pre-
22 pregnancy height and weight and their smoking status during pregnancy. Mothers' and
23 partners' socio-economic status was recorded. Subsequently at birth, the live infants were
24 added to the cohort along-with maternity and birth related hospital information.
25
26

27
28 In 2007-08, when these children averaged five years of age, the cohort follow-up recorded a
29 62% response rate.^[28,30] Mothers at follow-up study did not significantly differ in their
30 baseline BMI from non-responders, suggesting no notable attrition bias.^[28,30] At this 5-year
31 follow-up, mothers repeated the health and lifestyle assessment questionnaire, with additional
32 questions related to her family, including a five-level likert item question "In general, would
33 you say your / your partner's / your Lifeways child's current health is Excellent, Very Good,
34 Good, Fair or Poor". Mothers provided information on family's socio-economic, psycho-
35 social, and lifestyle status. Mothers reported their habitual dietary intake for the previous year
36 on a semi-quantitative food frequency (SQFFQ) instrument developed from the EPIC study
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition) and validated for Irish adult
4 population.^[31] Mothers also gave details for the Lifeways child's habitual diet for the
5 previous year using a different SQFFQ instrument adapted from the UK National Diet and
6 Nutrition Survey of 4.5-year-old children.^[32] The mothers' and children's SQFFQ were
7 validated in the Lifeways study using a 7-day weighed food diary in a sub-sample.^[30] Food
8 items were aggregated by defined shelves of the Irish food pyramid and assessment was made
9 for average servings per day of standard food item portions consumed from the "top" and
10 "fruit and vegetable" shelves. The top shelf comprises of high calorie fat and sugar rich
11 foods. Total energy (kcal) and total fats (g) intake were computed using conversion values
12 from McCance & Widdowson's food composition tables^[33] with a specially developed FFQ
13 software version 1.0 ©.^[34]

14
15
16 Mothers and children, and if available fathers, were offered at 5-year follow-up an
17 anthropometric assessment at their home for height, weight and waist circumference using a
18 standardised protocol,^[28,30] with 80-85% mothers and children participating. Body mass index
19 (BMI) was calculated from weight and height information (kg/m^2).

20
21
22 Thus variables from discrete stages (pre-pregnancy, early pregnancy, at birth, early infancy
23 and 5-year follow-up) of child's early development representing lifecourse exposures from
24 distinct domains (demographic, anthropometric, socio-economic, psycho-social, lifestyle,
25 nutritional and health) of child's individual and family spheres of influence were considered
26 to analyse determinants of child's health status at age-5. These lifecourse variables have been
27 summarised as per time frame in **Table 1**. Additional details on them are provided in **eTable**
28 **1** available in the web only supplement. The independent variables have been arranged as
29 child-related, family-related, mother-related, father-related groups for ease of presentation.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Independent variables examined from lifecourse of 5-yr-old children

Lifecourse	Independent Variables
Pre-pregnancy	Maternal Pre-pregnancy BMI
Early pregnancy	Family stability Maternal smoking in pregnancy, Maternal Education level Paternal Education level
Birth	Child's Birth-weight, Gestational age, Gender Maternal Parity
Infancy	Child's breastfeeding status
When children averaged 5-yr age	Child's Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables shelves, Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake Family household weekly income, Entitlement to means tested healthcare benefits scheme, Family structure (marital status), Support from partner, parents, children & relatives Maternal Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables shelves, Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake, Self-rated health status Paternal Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Self-rated health status

Children's global health status rated in proxy by their mothers, hereafter referred to as parent-rated health (PRH), was the outcome variable of interest. The 5-graded scale response was dichotomised as relatively-positive health (excellent or very good) and relatively-negative health (poor or fair or good), based on similar dichotomisation in other studies on preschool and school children.^[11,12,24] It is reasonable to take a higher cut-off when dichotomising this age dependent variable in this very young age-group as there would be very limited numbers of poor or fair health children.^[11,12,35]

Initially, uni-variate associations were established between the independent predictors and children's PRH using independent t-tests or chi-square tests. Independent categorical variables were dichotomised in a manner that allowed contrasting extreme levels against the others. Thus, using International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) cut-offs, children's BMI was dichotomised as obese versus over-weight or normal-weight. Similarly nutrition variables ordered in quintiles were dichotomised as the extreme quintile (1st or 5th) versus the rest.

1
2
3 From these independent variables principally chosen on the basis of their relevance to the
4 child's development,^[2,3] all those that qualified at significance level 20% ($p < 0.2$)^[36] in
5 univariate analyses were force entered into a multivariable logistic regression model. BMI
6 and waist circumference, the anthropometric markers of obesity, were tested separately in
7 independent multivariable models. Initially BMI was tested as a categorical variable in a
8 model, followed by two additional models substituting it with BMI and then waist
9 circumference as continuous variables. Other independent variables were tested as categorical
10 variables.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Ethical approval for the Lifeways study was obtained respectively from ethical committees of
22 participating hospitals and the University College Dublin, Ireland. Written informed consent
23 was obtained from study participants.
24
25
26
27

28 **Results**

29
30
31 There were 547 family datasets available for analysis of children's PRH. **Table 2** presents the
32 uni-variate associations between children's lifecourse variables and PRH. Within the
33 individual-sphere of influences, children's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary
34 foods and total fats, and higher intake of fruits/vegetables) and their anthropometric measures
35 at age-5 (not being obese, lower BMI, and lower waist circumference) qualified as
36 determinants of children's relatively-positive PRH for further examination in the
37 multivariable model.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Within the family-sphere of influences, socio-economic status (higher household income,
48 non-entitlement to subsidised healthcare, both parents' higher education status, and father's
49 employment status), psycho-social status (father's study participation, mother's perceived
50 social support), mother's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary foods, total energy
51 and total fats), father's lifestyle behaviours (non-smoker), and both parents' health status
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(relatively-positive self-rated health) qualified as determinants of children’s relatively-positive PRH for further examination in the multivariable model.

For peer review only

Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=547)

	N	Relatively Negative PRH (n=42)		Relatively Positive PRH (n=505)		OR	95% CI
		%(n)	Mean (SD)	%(n)	Mean (SD)		
Child's Individual Characteristics							
Birth-weight adjusted for gestational age (g)	487	(34)	3564.1 (616)	(453)	3548.4 (552)	1.00	(0.999-1.001)
Child's Age (Yrs)	547	(42)	5.42 (0.23)	(505)	5.46 (0.25)		
Gender	547						
Male		8.0% (22)		92.0% (242)		Ref	
Female		7.1% (21)		92.9% (262)		1.14	(0.60-2.20)
BMI (kg/m ²)	464	(35)	17.09 (2.5)	(429)	16.59 (1.6)	0.85	(0.71-1.03) [^]
BMI [IOTF]	464						
Obese		16.7% (5)		83.3% (25)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		6.9% (30)		93.1% (404)		2.69	(0.96-7.54) [^]
Waist Circumference (cm)	462	(35)	57.01 (6.8)	(427)	55.88 (4.3)	0.95	(0.88-1.02) ⁺
Height (cm)	464	(35)	111.6 (5.6)	(429)	112.1 (4.8)	1.02	(0.95-1.10)
Breastfeeding	528						
Not breastfed		6.5% (16)		93.5% (229)		Ref	
Breastfed		8.8% (25)		91.2% (258)		0.72	(0.38-1.38)
Energy (Kcal)	547						
Quintile 5 (>1794 kcal)		10% (11)		90.0% (99)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		7.1% (31)		92.9% (406)		1.46	(0.71-3.00)
Fats (g)	547						
Quintile 5 (>62.9 g)		12.8% (14)		87.2% (95)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)		93.6% (410)		2.16	(1.09-4.26) ⁺
Top shelf (servings/day)	547						
Quintile 5 (>6.47 servings)		10.9% (12)		89.1% (98)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (407)		1.66	(0.82-3.36) ⁺
Fruits Veg shelf (servings/d)	547						
Quintile 1 (<2.1 servings)		12.8% (14)		87.2% (95)		Ref	
Quintile 2-5		6.4% (28)		93.6% (410)		2.16	(1.09-4.26) ⁺
Family Characteristics							
Household Weekly Income	509						
Less than 760 Euros/wk		13.3% (26)		86.7% (170)		Ref	
More than 760 Euros/wk		4.8% (15)		95.2% (298)		3.04	(1.57-5.90) ⁺⁺
Entitlement to General Medical Card	532						
Entitled		13% (12)		87.0% (80)		Ref	
Not entitled		6.6% (29)		93.4% (411)		2.13	(1.04-4.34) ⁺
Fathers' Participation	547						
Not		9.7% (31)		90.3% (290)		Ref	
Yes		4.9% (11)		95.1% (215)		2.09	(1.03-4.25) ⁺
Marital Status	542						
Others		11.4% (5)		88.6% (39)		Ref	
Married/Cohabiting		7.2% (36)		92.8% (462)		1.65	(0.61-4.43)
Elder children in family (Parity)	535						
Nullipara		8% (18)		92.0% (207)		Ref	
Multipara		7.7% (24)		92.3% (286)		1.04	(0.55-1.96)
Support from Spouse/Partner	538						
Lesser support		12.9% (17)		87.1% (115)		Ref	
More support		6.2% (25)		93.8% (381)		2.25	(1.18-4.32) ⁺
Support from Parents	487						
Lesser support		12.5% (12)		87.5% (84)		Ref	
More support		6.6% (26)		93.4% (365)		2.01	(0.97-4.14) [^]
Support from Children	532						
Lesser support		10.6% (20)		89.4% (169)		Ref	
More support		5.8% (20)		94.2% (323)		1.91	(1.00-3.65) ⁺
Support from Close Relatives	510						
Lesser support		12.4% (19)		87.6% (134)		Ref	
More support		6.2% (22)		93.8% (335)		2.16	(1.13-4.12) ⁺

Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (continued)

	N	Relatively Negative PRH (n=42)		Relatively Positive PRH (n=505)		OR	95% CI
		%(n)	Mean (SD)	%(n)	Mean (SD)		
Maternal Characteristics							
Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	475	(36)	23.3 (3.3)	(439)	23.8 (3.9)	1.04	(0.94-1.14)
Pre-pregnancy BMI [WHO cut offs]							
Obese		2.6% (1)		97.4% (38)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		8% (35)		92.0% (401)		0.30	(0.04-2.26)
Mother's Age (Yrs)	546	(42)	36.5 (6.3)	(504)	37.1 (5.3)	1.02	(0.96-1.08)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	432		25.6 (3.9)		26.3 (5.0)	1.03	(0.95-1.12)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up [WHO cut offs]	432						
Obese		7.2% (5)		92.8% (64)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		7.4% (27)		92.6% (336)		0.97	(0.36-2.62)
Waist Circumference (cm)	434	(31)	85.3 (10.6)	(403)	87.6 (11.9)	1.02	(0.99-1.05)
Height (cm)	454	(33)	161.9 (6.8)	(421)	162.9 (6.0)	1.03	(0.97-1.09)
Smoking in pregnancy	534						
Smoker		8.1% (8)		91.9% (91)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (33)		92.4% (402)		1.07	(0.48-2.4)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	541						
Smoker		7.6% (9)		92.4% (110)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (32)		92.4% (390)		1.0	(0.46-2.15)
Energy (Kcal)	546						
Quintile 5 (>2570.9 kcal)		13% (14)		87.0% (94)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)		93.6% (410)		2.18	(1.11-4.30)*
Fats (g)	546						
Quintile 5 (>106 g)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (407)		1.68	(0.83-3.40)†
Top shelf (servings/day)	545						
Quintile 5 (>8.35 servings)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (406)		1.67	(0.83-3.39)†
Fruits Veg shelf (servings/day)	546						
Quintile 1 (<4.5 servings)		9.1% (10)		90.9% (100)		Ref	
Quintile 2-5		7.3% (32)		92.7% (404)		1.26	(0.60-2.65)
Education level	534						
Lower		10.4% (25)		89.6% (215)		Ref	
Third Level		5.8% (17)		94.2% (277)		1.90	(1.00-3.60)*
Employment	545						
Not Earning		6.4% (15)		93.6% (221)		Ref	
Employed		9% (22)		91.0% (222)		0.69	(0.35-1.36)
Self employed		7.7% (5)		92.3% (60)		0.81	(0.29-2.33)
Self reported health	546						
Relatively Negative		17.1% (27)		82.9% (131)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		3.9% (15)		96.1% (373)		5.10	(2.64-9.93)**
Paternal Characteristics							
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	66	(4)		(62)		0.97	(0.76-1.23)
Waist Circumference (cm)	65	(3)		(62)		1.01	(0.90-1.13)
Height (cm)	66	(4)		(62)		1.01	(0.88-1.15)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	521						
Smoker		11.5% (16)		88.5% (123)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		5.5% (21)		94.5% (361)		2.24	(1.13-4.42)*
Education level	514						
Lower		11.1% (16)		88.9% (128)		Ref	
Third Level		6.2% (23)		93.8% (347)		1.89	(0.97-3.68)^
Employment	518						
Not Earning		9.2% (8)		90.8% (79)		Ref	
Employed		7.9% (24)		92.1% (279)		1.18	(0.51-2.72)
Self employed		3.9% (5)		96.1% (123)		2.49	(0.79-7.89)†
Self reported health	510						
Relatively Negative		12.6% (20)		87.4% (139)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		4.6% (16)		95.4% (335)		3.01	(1.52-5.99)**

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, ^p<0.1, †p<0.2; Ref=reference category (OR=1)

1
2
3 **Table 3** presents the multivariable model for association between qualifying lifecourse
4 variables and children's relatively-positive PRH at age-5. A significantly strong predictor of
5 children's relatively-positive PRH was child's not being obese by IOTF classification. When
6 BMI was tested as a continuous variable, there was 0.73 times less likelihood of the child
7 being positively rated on health status for every 1 kg/m² increase in their BMI. Similarly in
8 the waist circumference model, for every 1 cm increase there was 0.89 times less likelihood
9 of the child getting a relatively-positive rating on health status. Another significant predictor
10 of children's relatively-positive PRH was mother's having rated her own health as relatively-
11 positive. These predictors maintained the highest strength of association with children's
12 health status when independent variables were standardised (see **eTable 2** in the web only
13 supplement). None of the other variables reached the level of statistical significance. The
14 models explained over 25 percent of variance for children's PRH.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3: Multivariable Logistic Regression model for predictors of children’s relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=303)

	Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH	
	BMI Categorical ¹		BMI Continuous ²		WC Continuous ³	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Child's Individual Characteristics						
BMI [IOTF], Obese ⁺ vs Overweight / Normal	5.48	(1.43-21.03) *				
BMI kg/m ² [Continuous]			0.73	(0.58-0.93) **		
Waist Circumference cm [Continuous]					0.89	(0.81-0.98) *
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.57	(0.42-5.79)	1.49	(0.40-5.53)	1.32	(0.36-4.80)
Top shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.23	(0.33-4.53)	1.30	(0.36-4.63)	1.29	(0.36-4.62)
Fruits Veg shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q1 ⁺ vs Q2-5	2.57	(0.75-8.80)	2.86	(0.83-9.93)	2.73	(0.78-9.49)
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income, Less ⁺ vs High	1.85	(0.63-5.40)	1.76	(0.59-5.21)	1.79	(0.61-5.26)
Entitlement to General Medical, Card Yes ⁺ vs No	0.94	(0.24-3.71)	1.03	(0.26-4.07)	1.04	(0.26-4.10)
Fathers' Participation, Not ⁺ vs Yes	1.88	(0.68-5.21)	1.86	(0.67-5.16)	2.06	(0.74-5.71)
Support from Spouse/Partner, Less ⁺ vs More	0.70	(0.20-2.49)	0.67	(0.19-2.33)	0.74	(0.22-2.52)
Support from Parents, Less ⁺ vs More	1.92	(0.53-6.93)	2.33	(0.64-8.42)	2.37	(0.66-8.53)
Support from Children, Less ⁺ vs More	1.15	(0.38-3.45)	1.29	(0.42-3.91)	1.25	(0.41-3.82)
Support from Close Relatives, Less ⁺ vs More	0.86	(0.23-3.13)	0.84	(0.24-3.02)	0.84	(0.23-3.01)
Maternal Characteristics						
Energy Kcal [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.89	(0.30-11.84)	2.00	(0.31-12.86)	1.57	(0.28-8.84)
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	0.72	(0.09-5.54)	0.59	(0.07-4.77)	0.92	(0.13-6.41)
Top shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.08	(0.29-3.94)	1.30	(0.36-4.65)	1.18	(0.32-4.34)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	1.34	(0.47-3.78)	1.35	(0.48-3.80)	1.48	(0.53-4.13)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	4.20	(1.45-12.20) **	4.42	(1.53-12.79) **	4.17	(1.47-11.87) **
Paternal Characteristics						
Current Smoking status, Yes ⁺ vs No	1.37	(0.48-3.93)	1.31	(0.45-3.83)	1.53	(0.54-4.35)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	0.69	(0.21-2.28)	0.79	(0.24-2.57)	0.83	(0.26-2.67)
Employment, Non-earning ⁺ vs Self employed	1.60	(0.73-3.53)	1.52	(0.69-3.32)	1.57	(0.70-3.53)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	1.48	(0.52-4.20)	1.54	(0.54-4.35)	1.43	(0.51-3.96)

OR=Odds Ratio; ⁺Reference category (OR=1); **p<0.01 (2-tailed), *p<0.05 (2-tailed)

Rel.Negative=Relatively Negative, Rel.Positive=Relatively Positive

¹Child BMI as a categorical variable; Model Chi-sq = 34.2, df = 21, p = 0.034; -2LL = 128.6, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.26

²Child BMI as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 35.9, df = 21, p = 0.022; -2LL = 126.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.27

³Child waist circumference as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 33.8, df = 21, p = 0.038; -2LL = 128.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.25

Discussion

This analysis showed that determinants from both child's individual and family spheres have an influence on child's health at preschool-age. The factors from all three material, psycho-social and lifestyle domains, the major explanations for child health inequalities,^[4] were associated at uni-variate levels. However, in the final model this analysis clearly demonstrated a negative association between child's obesity and health status. Child's not being obese was one of the significantly strong predictors of child's relatively-positive health status, which was also observed with measured BMI and waist circumference analysed as continuous variables.

This negative relationship observed between measured obesity and PRH conforms to published literature on primary school age-group children and adolescents.^[37-39] Most importantly, for the first time to our knowledge, this analysis demonstrates the association having adjusted for food and nutrient intake, along-with a wide range of other explanatory variables.

Self-rated health is a valid measure of morbidity, mortality, longevity and health status,^[40] also in Irish adult^[41,42] and children^[10]. Use of parent proxy for child self-reported health is justified for children too young to have adequate cognitive skills.^[43,44] Systematic reviews report good agreement between ratings by children and their parents on child HRQoL, particularly for physical health domain.^[43,44] Parents tend to be thoughtful when responding to proxy questions and report children's usual health disposition.^[45] Studies on construct validity report positively.^[46-49] Maternal ratings of child's general health status were found sensitive when validated against children's illnesses and other morbidity or healthcare indicators,^[35,50-52] including evidence of a gradient in strength of these associations.^[35] Many national-level studies have accepted parent proxy as an appropriate measure^[11,12,53,54] and successfully used it to longitudinally demonstrate risk and consequences of child health.^[11,53]

1
2
3 Self-rated health, a composite measure, represents all domains of HR-QoL,^[40] but better represents
4 physical health than HR-QoL.^[55] Studies on older age-group children have reported stronger/sole
5 negative associations for general/physical health domain of HR-QoL and obesity,^[38,56] irrespective
6 whether children themselves or parents reported their HRQoL,^[23] and also whether BMI was
7 analysed as a categorical,^[37,38] or continuous variable.^[57,58]

8
9
10
11
12
13
14 Another relevance of this analysis is in demonstrating this association of obesity with general-
15 health in a nationally representative sample of preschool-age children, for which literature is scant.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Another relevance of this analysis is in demonstrating this association of obesity with general-
health in a nationally representative sample of preschool-age children, for which literature is scant.
Though, a few have shown associations with specific paediatric conditions and admission history
in this age-group.^[24,25,59-62] A longitudinal study speculated that pre-school obesity influences a
decline in early-age health, and then both obesity and poor-health tracks into adolescence.^[63] The
WHO recommends high priority for determinants of health inequalities during early
development.^[64]

The Lifeways previously demonstrated longitudinal association between parental socio-economic
and lifestyle characteristics and child's BMI and waist circumference.^[30] In this analysis when
same anthropometric measures are included along-with material, psycho-social, and lifestyle
determinants of child obesity and health, a prominent relationship emerges between children's
anthropometric measures and health status. One possible explanation is that determinants of health
inequalities biologically embed^[15,16] in early life and child obesity is an early phenotypic
expression of this inequality; though the continued influence of environmental factors is not
undermined. Adult^[19,20] and adolescence studies^[38,39] have also shown this association to be
independent of socio-demographic, lifestyle or health-related factors.

The observed association between BMI or waist circumference and PRH in the present analysis
may be temporal, as demonstrated in adults.^[21,22] However, this needs careful interpretation as
both anthropometric and health data were concurrently collected, and this limitation may be
addressed with next sweep of cohort data collection.

1
2
3 This analysis demonstrated that maternal health was strongly predictive of her child's health. One
4 concern is that mother's perception of her own health may bias her perception of her child's
5 health. However, this intergenerational association has been previously reported,^[35,50,51,65-68] and
6 reporting mothers can effectively discriminate between their own and children's
7 health.^[35,50,51,66,67,69] Several mechanisms such as inherited susceptibility, uterine environment and
8 shared environment have been suggested for this familial aggregation pattern.^[50,66,67]
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 Maternal BMI may be related to both maternal self-rated health and child's BMI, so the observed
17 associations in this analysis could possibly be a reflection of an association between maternal BMI
18 and child's PRH. However, this was not observed in our analysis. Maternal BMI at both pre-
19 pregnancy and 5-year follow-up were not associated with child's PRH at univariate level. Also,
20 when maternal BMI was forcibly added into the multivariable model (not reported here), the
21 observed associations did not attenuate.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The study has limitations in use of reported rather than measured health status and small sample
31 size. However, it has advantages in use of lifecourse variables from pre-conception to age of 5-
32 years, with measured BMI and waist circumference data. It also has detailed foods and nutrient
33 data along-with other socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle variables for child and both
34 parents.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 In conclusion, these analyses from the Lifeways cohort show that lifecourse adversities were
43 associated with mother-reported health for preschoolers, suggesting an early life influence.
44 Preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference demonstrated strong negative associations with
45 mother-reported health independent of socio-economic, psycho-social, and lifestyle factors,
46 suggesting early biological expression of lifecourse adversities. The findings have important
47 implications in understanding how early life environment may create inequalities in developmental
48 health.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Footnotes**Acknowledgements**

The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study is overseen by an interdisciplinary scientific steering group chaired by CCK, the principal investigator. The authors greatly appreciate the participation of the Lifeways cohort families.

Contributors

AS undertook all analyses reported in this manuscript, interpreted the findings and drafted the manuscript. CM contributed to data collection at five year follow-up, interpretation of the analysis and critical revision of the manuscript. CCK designed the study, supervised the analyses, interpretation of results and intellectual content of the manuscript. All three authors approved the final version.

Funding

The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study was established as part of European Science Foundation funded 'Social Variations in Health Expectancy in Europe' international research programme and its various sweeps have been funded by the Health Research Board of Ireland. Funding sources had no involvement in design, collection, analysis, interpretation, writing and submission of this manuscript.

Competing interests

None

Ethical approvals

Ethics committees of Coombe University Hospital, Dublin, University College Hospital Galway, University College Dublin, Dublin, and the Irish College of General Practitioners, Ireland.

Data sharing statement

There are no additional data available. The data manager may be contacted at john.obrien@ucd.ie for more details on the Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study.

Appendices

The web only supplement includes eTable 1 regarding details of examined variables and eTable 2 displaying standardised odds ratios for multivariable logistic regression model.

REFERENCES

1. Bronfenbrenner U. Ecological models of human development. In: Postlethwaite TN, Husen T, eds. *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Vol 3. 2nd ed. Oxford, England: Elsevier Sciences, Ltd., 1994: 1643-47.
2. Siddiqi A, Irwin LG, Hertzman C. Total environment assessment model for early child development. Evidence report for the WHO commission on social determinants of health. World Health Organization, 2007.
http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/ecd_kn_evidence_report_2007.pdf
(accessed March 30, 2012).
3. Maggi S, Irwin LJ, Siddiqi A, *et al*. The social determinants of early child development: an overview. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2010;**46**(11):627-35.
4. Hertzman C, Li J, Mattes E, *et al*. Social determinants of child health and well-being [Editorial]. *Health Sociology Review* 2009;**18**(1):3-11.
5. Ben-Shlomo Y, Kuh D. A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology: conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. *Int J Epidemiol* 2002;**31**(2):285-93.
6. Hertzman C, Power C, Matthews S, *et al*. Using an interactive framework of society and lifecourse to explain self-rated health in early adulthood. *Soc Sci Med* 2001;**53**(12):1575-85.

- 1
2
3 7. Mensah FK, Hobcraft J. Childhood deprivation, health and development: associations with
4 adult health in the 1958 and 1970 British prospective birth cohort studies. *J Epidemiol*
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 8. Kestila L, Koskinen S, Martelin T, *et al.* Determinants of health in early adulthood: what is
13 the role of parental education, childhood adversities and own education ? *Eur J Public*
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 9. Pollitt R, Rose K, Kaufman J. Evaluating the evidence for models of life course
22 socioeconomic factors and cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review. *BMC Public*
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 10. Kelleher CC, Tay J, Gabhainn SN. Influence on self-rated health of socio-demographic,
31 lifestyle and affluence factors: an analysis of the Irish and international health behaviours
32 among school-aged children (HBSC) datasets 1998. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 43-6.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 11. Stein RE, Siegel MJ, Bauman LJ. Double jeopardy: what social risk adds to biomedical
40 risk in understanding child health and health care utilization. *Acad Pediatr* 2010;**10**(3):165-
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 12. Stevens GD. Gradients in the health status and developmental risks of young children: the
48 combined influences of multiple social risk factors. *Matern Child Health J* 2006;**10**(2):187-
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 13. Krieger N. Theories for social epidemiology in the 21st century: an ecosocial perspective.
4
5 *Int J Epidemiol* 2001;**30**(4):668-77.
6
7
8
9
10 14. Krieger N. A glossary for social epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
11
12 2001;**55**(10):693-700.
13
14
15
16 15. Hertzman C. The biological embedding of early experience and its effects on health in
17
18 adulthood. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1999;**896**(1):85-95.
19
20
21
22
23 16. Hertzman C, Boyce T. How experience gets under the skin to create gradients in
24
25 developmental health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2010;**31**:329-47 C1-C3.
26
27
28
29 17. Butland B, Jebb S, Kopelman P, *et al.* Foresight. Tackling obesities: future choices —
30
31 Project report. London: Government Office for Science, 2007.
32
33
34 <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/foresight/docs/obesity/17.pdf> (accessed March 30, 2012).
35
36
37
38 18. Aboderin I, Kalache A, Ben-Shlomo Y, *et al.* Life course perspectives on coronary heart
39
40 disease, stroke and diabetes: key issues and implications for policy and research. Geneva:
41
42 World Health Organization, 2002.
43
44
45 http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2002/WHO_NMH_NPH_02.1.pdf (accessed March 30, 2012).
46
47
48
49 19. Molarius A, Berglund K, Eriksson C, *et al.* Socioeconomic conditions, lifestyle factors, and
50
51 self-rated health among men and women in Sweden. *Eur J Public Health* 2007;**17**(2):125-
52
53 33.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
20. Prosper M-H, Moczulski VL, Qureshi A. Obesity as a predictor of self-rated health. *Am J Health Behav* 2009;**33**(3):319-29.
21. Svedberg P, Bardage C, Sandin S, *et al.* A prospective study of health, life-style and psychosocial predictors of self-rated health. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2006;**21**(10):767-76.
22. Zajacova A, Burgard SA. Body weight and health from early to mid-adulthood: a longitudinal analysis. *J Health Soc Behav* 2010;**51**(1):92-107.
23. Tsiros MD, Olds T, Buckley JD, *et al.* Health-related quality of life in obese children and adolescents. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2009;**33**(4):387-400.
24. Wake M, Hardy P, Sawyer MG, *et al.* Comorbidities of overweight/obesity in Australian preschoolers: a cross-sectional population study. *Arch Dis Child* 2008;**93**(6):502-07.
25. Skinner AC, Perrin EM, Steiner MJ. Healthy for now? A cross-sectional study of the comorbidities in obese preschool children in the United States. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2010;**49**(7):648-55.
26. O'Mahony D, Fallon UB, Hannon F, *et al.* The Lifeways Cross-Generation Study: design, recruitment and data management considerations. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 3-6.
27. Niedhammer I, O'Mahony D, Daly S, *et al.* Occupational predictors of pregnancy outcomes in Irish working women in the Lifeways cohort. *BJOG* 2009;**116**(7):943-52.

- 1
2
3 28. Murrin CM, Kelly GE, Tremblay RE, *et al.* Body mass index and height over three
4 generations: evidence from the Lifeways Cross-Generational Cohort Study. *BMC Public*
5 *Health* 2012;**12**:81 e-pub ahead of print 25 January 2012; doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-1112-
6 1181.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 29. National Nutrition Surveillance Centre. Dietary habits of the Irish population: results from
15 SLÁN, Annual Report 2003. Dublin: National Nutritional Surveillance Centre, Department
16 of Public Health Medicine and Epidemiology, University College Dublin, Dublin and
17 Health Promotion Unit, Department of Health and Children, Dublin, 2003.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 30. Murrin C. Maternal factors during pregnancy contributing to early life risk of childhood
26 obesity [PhD Thesis]. Dublin: University College Dublin, 2011.
27
28
29
30
31
32 31. Harrington J. Validation of a food frequency questionnaire as a tool for assessing nutrient
33 intake [MA Thesis]. Galway: National University of Ireland, 1997.
34
35
36
37
38
39 32. Gregory J, Collins D, Davies P, *et al.* National Diet and Nutrition Survey: children aged
40 1.5 - 4.5 years. Volume 1: Report of the diet and nutrition survey. London: HMSO, 1995.
41
42
43
44
45 33. Food Standards Agency. McCance and Widdowson's The composition of foods, sixth
46 summary edition. Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry, 2002.
47
48
49
50
51
52 34. FFQ_Software version 1.0. Dublin: National Nutrition Surveillance Centre, School of
53 Public Health and Population Science, University College Dublin, 2007.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 35. Monette S, Séguin L, Gauvin L, *et al.* Validation of a measure of maternal perception of
4 the child's health status. *Child Care Health Dev* 2007;**33**(4):472-81.
5
6
7
8
9
10 36. Katz MH. *Multivariable analysis: a practical guide for clinicians and public health*
11 *researchers*. 3rd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
12
13
14
15
16 37. Wake M, Salmon L, Waters E, *et al.* Parent-reported health status of overweight and obese
17 Australian primary school children: a cross-sectional population survey. *Int J Obes Relat*
18 *Metab Disord* 2002;**26**(5): 717-24.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 38. Swallen KC, Reither EN, Haas SA, *et al.* Overweight, obesity, and health-related quality of
26 life among adolescents: the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Pediatrics*
27 2005;**115**(2):340-47.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 39. Vingilis ER, Wade TJ, Seeley JS. Predictors of adolescent self-rated health. Analysis of the
35 National Population Health Survey. *Can J Public Health* 2002;**93**(3):193-97.
36
37
38
39
40 40. Bjorner J, Fayers P, Idler E. Self-rated health. In: Fayers PM, Hays RD, eds. *Assessing*
41 *quality of life in clinical trials: methods and practice*. 2nd edn. New York: Oxford
42 University Press, 2005:309-24.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 41. Kelleher CC, Whelan J, Daly L, *et al.* Socio-demographic, environmental, lifestyle and
50 psychosocial factors predict self rated health in Irish Travellers, a minority nomadic
51 population. *Health Place* 2012;**18**(2):330-38.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 42. Kelleher CC, Friel S, Nic Gabhainn S, *et al.* Socio-demographic predictors of self-rated
4 health in the Republic of Ireland: findings from the National Survey on Lifestyle, Attitudes
5 and Nutrition, SLAN. *Soc Sci Med* 2003;**57**(3):477-86.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 43. Eiser C, Morse R. Can parents rate their child's health-related quality of life? Results of a
13 systematic review. *Qual Life Res* 2001;**10**(4):347-57.
14
15
16
17
18 44. Upton P, Lawford J, Eiser C. Parent-child agreement across child health-related quality of
19 life instruments: a review of the literature. *Qual Life Res* 2008;**17**(6):895-913.
20
21
22
23
24
25 45. Davis E, Nicolas C, Waters E, *et al.* Parent-proxy and child self-reported health-related
26 quality of life: using qualitative methods to explain the discordance. *Qual Life Res*
27 2007;**16**(5):863-71.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 46. Theunissen NC, Vogels TG, Koopman HM, *et al.* The proxy problem: child report versus
35 parent report in health-related quality of life research. *Qual Life Res* 1998;**7**(5):387-97.
36
37
38
39
40
41 47. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Parent proxy-report of their children's health-
42 related quality of life: an analysis of 13,878 parents' reliability and validity across age
43 subgroups using the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*
44 2007;**5**:2.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 48. Spencer NJ, Coe C. The development and validation of a measure of parent-reported child
53 health and morbidity: the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile. *Child Care Health*
54 *Dev* 1996;**22**(6):367-79.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 49. Spencer NJ, Coe C. Validation of the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile in
6 routine child health surveillance. *Child Care Health Dev* 2000;**26**(4):323-36.
7
8
9
10
11 50. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Workman-Daniels K, *et al.* Maternal rating of child
12 health at school age: does the vulnerable child syndrome persist ? *Pediatrics*
13 1993;**92**(3):380-88.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 51. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Shorter T, *et al.* Factors associated with maternal rating
21 of infant health in central Harlem. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 1989;**10**(3):139-44.
22
23
24
25
26
27 52. McCormick MC, Athreya BH, Bernbaum JC, *et al.* Preliminary observations on maternal
28 rating of health of children: data from three subspecialty clinics. *J Clin Epidemiol*
29 1988;**41**(4):323-29.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 53. Lynch JL. Infant health, race/ethnicity, and early educational outcomes using the ECLS-B.
37 *Sociol Inq* 2011;**81**(4):499-526.
38
39
40
41
42 54. Gilman SE, McCormick MC. Insights from life course epidemiology. *Acad Pediatr*
43 2010;**10**(3):159-60.
44
45
46
47
48
49 55. Smith KW, Avis NE, Assmann SF. Distinguishing between quality of life and health status
50 in quality of life research: a meta-analysis. *Qual Life Res* 1999;**8**(5):447-59.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 56. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Singer S, Pilpel N, *et al.* Health-related quality of life among children
4 and adolescents: associations with obesity. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2006;**30**(2):267-72.
5
6
7
8
9
10 57. Williams J, Wake M, Hesketh K, *et al.* Health-related quality of life of overweight and
11 obese children. *JAMA* 2005;**293**(1):70-6.
12
13
14
15
16 58. de Beer M, Hofsteenge GH, Koot HM, *et al.* Health-related-quality-of-life in obese
17 adolescents is decreased and inversely related to BMI. *Acta Paediatr* 2007;**96**(5):710-14.
18
19
20
21
22
23 59. Shibli R, Rubin L, Akons H, *et al.* Morbidity of overweight (≥ 85 th percentile) in the first 2
24 years of life. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**(2):267-72.
25
26
27
28
29
30 60. Suglia SF, Chambers EC, Rosario A, *et al.* Asthma and obesity in three-year-old urban
31 children: role of sex and home environment. *J Pediatr* 2011;**159**(1):14-20.e11.
32
33
34
35
36 61. Tai A, Volkmer R, Burton A. Association between asthma symptoms and obesity in
37 preschool (4-5 year old) children. *J Asthma* 2009;**46**(4):362-65.
38
39
40
41
42
43 62. Slining M, Adair LS, Goldman BD, *et al.* Infant overweight is associated with delayed
44 motor development. *J Pediatr* 2010;**157**(1):20-5.e21.
45
46
47
48
49
50 63. Williams JW, Canterford L, Hesketh KD, *et al.* Changes in body mass index and health
51 related quality of life from childhood to adolescence. *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2011;**6**(2-2):e442-
52 e448.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 64. Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, *et al*. Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through
4 action on the social determinants of health. *Lancet* 2008;**372**(9650):1661-69.
5
6
7
8
9
10 65. Coneus K, Spiess CK. The intergenerational transmission of health in early childhood -
11 evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study. *Econ Hum Biol* 2012;**10**(1):89-
12 97.
13
14
15
16
17
18 66. Case A, Lubotsky D, Paxson C. Economic status and health in childhood: the origins of the
19 gradient. *Am Econ Rev* 2002;**92**(5):1308-34.
20
21
22
23
24
25 67. Silburn SR, Zubrick SR, Garton A, *et al*. Western Australia Child Health Survey: family
26 and community health. Perth, Western Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics and the
27 TVW Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, 1996.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 68. Waters E, Doyle J, Wolfe R, *et al*. Influence of parental gender and self-reported health and
35 illness on parent-reported child health. *Pediatrics* 2000;**106**(6):1422-28.
36
37
38
39
40
41 69. Dadds MR, Stein RE, Silver EJ. The role of maternal psychological adjustment in the
42 measurement of children's functional status. *J Pediatr Psychol* 1995;**20**(4):527-44.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

LICENCE FOR PUBLICATION STATEMENT

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Group and co-owners or contracting owning societies (where published by the BMJ Group on their behalf), and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in any BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

For peer review only

eTable 1: Lifecourse variables examined for relationship with children's parent-rated health, PRH

Independent Variables	Time	Categories
Child's Individual characteristics		
Demographic and Anthropometric		
Birth-weight standardised for gestational age (g)	Measured at birth	continuous measure
Age at 5-year follow-up (years)	At 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Gender		Male, Female
Body Mass Index (BMI) kg/m ²	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using IOTF definitions
Waist Circumference (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Height (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Lifestyle/Nutrition		
Breastfeeding	At infancy	breastfed or not
Top shelf servings per day	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>6.47 servings) versus 1-4 Quintiles.
Fruits & Vegetables shelf servings /day	At 5-yr follow-up	1 st Quintile (<2.1 servings) versus 2-5 Quintiles
Total Energy intake (kilocalories/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>1794 kcal) versus 1-4 Quintiles
Total Fats intake (grams/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>62.9g) versus 1-4 Quintiles
Family characteristics		
Socio-Economic		
Household weekly income	At 5-yr follow-up	composite family income more or less than 760 Euros a week
Entitlement to General Medical Card scheme, a means tested healthcare benefits scheme	At 5-yr follow-up	Families entitled or not to General Medical Card
Psycho-Social		
Fathers' participation (Family stability)	Early pregnancy stage	Families whose fathers participated in the study versus families whose fathers did not
Mother's marital status (Family structure)	At 5-yr follow-up	Married or cohabiting versus single, separated, divorced or widowed.
Elder children in family [Parity was a proxy measure for presence of elder siblings to the Lifeways child]	Early pregnancy stage	nullipara versus one or more para
Support from spouse or partner	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived "a lot" of support from spouse or partners versus perceived receiving "some, so-so, little" support
Support from parents	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived "a lot" of support from parents versus

1			
2			
3			perceived receiving “some,
4			so-so, little” support
5	Support from children, inclusive Lifeways child	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived “a lot” of
6			support from children versus
7			perceived receiving “some,
8			so-so, little” support
9	Support from close relatives	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived “a lot” of
10			support from relatives versus
11			perceived receiving “some,
12			so-so, little” support

Maternal characteristics

Demographic and Anthropometric

15	Age at 5-year follow-up (years)	At 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
16	Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	Pre-pregnancy, Self-reported in early pregnancy	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using WHO definitions
17			
18			
19			
20			
21	BMI at 5-year follow-up (kg/m ²)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using WHO definitions
22			
23			
24			
25	Waist Circumference at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
26			
27	Height at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
28			

Lifestyle/Nutrition

29			
30	Smoking during pregnancy	Early pregnancy stage	Current smoker or not
31			
32	Smoking at 5-year follow-up	At 5-yr follow-up	Current smoker or not
33			
34	Top shelf servings per day	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>8.35 servings) versus 1-4 Quintiles.
35			
36	Fruits & Vegetables shelf servings /day	At 5-yr follow-up	1 st Quintile (<4.5 servings) versus 2-5 Quintiles
37			
38	Total Energy intake (kilocalories/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>2570.9 kcal) versus 1-4 Quintiles
39			
40	Total Fats intake (grams/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>106.0 g) versus 1-4 Quintiles
41			

Socio-Economic

42			
43	Education level	Early pregnancy stage	Third level versus lower levels of education status
44			
45	Employment status	At 5-yr follow-up	Non-earning versus Employed versus Self employed
46			
47			

Health

48			
49	Self-rated health status of mothers	At 5-yr follow-up	Relatively Positive (“Excellent” or “Very Good”) versus Relatively Negative (“Poor” / “Fair” / “Good”) responses
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			

Paternal Characteristics

Anthropometric

55			
56			
57	BMI at 5-year follow-up (kg/m ²)	Measured at	continuous measure
58			
59			
60			

1			
2			
3		5-yr follow-up	
4	Waist Circumference at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at	continuous measure
5		5-yr follow-up	
6	Height at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at	continuous measure
7		5-yr follow-up	
8	Lifestyle		
9	Smoking at 5-year follow-up	At 5-yr follow-up	Current smoker or not
10	Socio-Economic		
11	Education level	Early pregnancy	Third level versus lower
12		stage	levels of education status
13	Employment status	At 5-yr follow-up	Non-earning versus
14			Employed versus Self
15			employed
16			
17	Health		
18	Self-rated health status of fathers (in proxy)	At 5-yr follow-up	Relatively Positive
19			("Excellent" or "Very Good")
20			versus Relatively Negative
21			("Poor"/ "Fair" /"Good")
22			responses
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

eTable 2: Multivariable Logistic Regression model for predictors of children’s relatively positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=303)

	Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH	
	BMI Categorical ¹		BMI Continuous ²		WC Continuous ³	
	Std OR	p-value	Std OR	p-value	Std OR	p-value
Child's Individual Characteristics						
BMI [IOTF], Obese† vs Overweight / Normal	1.53*	0.01				
BMI kg/m ² [Continuous]			0.58**	0.009		
Waist Circumference cm [Continuous]					0.60*	0.02
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5+ vs Q1-4	1.20	0.50	1.18	0.55	1.12	0.68
Top shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q5+ vs Q1-4	1.09	0.76	1.11	0.69	1.11	0.70
Fruits Veg shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q1+ vs Q2-5	1.43	0.13	1.49	0.10	1.46	0.12
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income, Less† vs High	1.34	0.26	1.30	0.31	1.32	0.29
Entitlement to General Medical, Card Yes† vs No	0.98	0.93	1.01	0.97	1.01	0.95
Fathers' Participation, No† vs Yes	1.37	0.23	1.36	0.23	1.43	0.17
Support from Spouse/Partner, Less† vs More	0.86	0.59	0.84	0.53	0.88	0.63
Support from Parents, Less† vs More	1.30	0.32	1.41	0.20	1.42	0.19
Support from Children, Less† vs More	1.07	0.80	1.13	0.65	1.11	0.70
Support from Close Relatives, Less† vs More	0.93	0.81	0.93	0.79	0.92	0.79
Maternal Characteristics						
Energy Kcal [Quintiles], Q5+ vs Q1-4	1.28	0.50	1.31	0.47	1.19	0.61
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5+ vs Q1-4	0.88	0.76	0.82	0.62	0.97	0.93
Top shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q5+ vs Q1-4	1.03	0.91	1.11	0.69	1.07	0.80
Education, Lower† vs Third level	1.15	0.58	1.16	0.56	1.21	0.45
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative† vs Rel.Positive	1.88**	0.008	1.92**	0.006	1.88**	0.007
Paternal Characteristics						
Current Smoking status, Yes† vs No	1.15	0.55	1.13	0.62	1.21	0.42
Education, Lower† vs Third level	0.85	0.55	0.90	0.70	0.92	0.75
Employment, Non-earning † vs Self employed	1.33	0.24	1.29	0.30	1.32	0.27
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative† vs Rel.Positive	1.20	0.46	1.22	0.42	1.18	0.50

Std OR=Standardised Odds Ratio, all variables rescaled to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one; **p<0.01 (2-tailed), *p<0.05 (2-tailed)

†Reference category (Std OR=1); Rel.Negative=Relatively Negative, Rel.Positive=Relatively Positive

¹Child BMI as a categorical variable

²Child BMI as a continuous variable

³Child waist circumference as a continuous variable

STROBE Statement: Childhood obesity is persistent as a predictor of preschoolers' parent-rated health accounting for social inequalities - Lifeways cross-generation cohort study

	Item No	Recommendation	Done
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	✓
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	✓
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	✓
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	✓
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	✓
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	✓
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	✓
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	✓
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	✓
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	✓
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	✓
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	✓
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	✓
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	✓
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	✓
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	✓
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	✓
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	✓
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	✓
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	✓
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	✓
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	✓
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	✓
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted	✓

1		estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear	
2		which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
3		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	✓
4		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute	
5		risk for a meaningful time period	
6			
7	Other analyses	17 Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and	✓
8		sensitivity analyses	
9			
10	Discussion		
11	Key results	18 Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	✓
12	Limitations	19 Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias	✓
13		or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	
14			
15	Interpretation	20 Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives,	✓
16		limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other	
17		relevant evidence	
18			
19	Generalisability	21 Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	✓
20			
21	Other information		
22	Funding	22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study	✓
23		and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.

BMJ Open

Preschoolers' parent rated health disparities are strongly associated with measures of adiposity in the Lifeways cohort study children

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-005328.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Jun-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Shrivastava, Aakash; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science Murrin, Celine; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science Kelleher, Cecily; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Paediatrics
Keywords:	Lifecourse, self-rated health, obesity, BMI, waist circumference, preschool children

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title: Preschoolers' parent rated health disparities are strongly associated with**
4 **measures of adiposity in the Lifeways cohort study children**
5
6

7 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

8 Professor Cecily C Kelleher

9 School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science,

10 Woodview House,

11 University College Dublin

12 Belfield,

13 Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland

14 Tel: +3531 7162045

15 Fax: +3531 7163421

16 cecily.kelleher@ucd.ie
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **AUTHORS**

25 Aakash Shrivastava¹ PhD

26 Celine Murrin¹ PhD

27 Cecily C Kelleher¹ MD

28 ¹School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science, University College Dublin,
29 Woodview House, Belfield, Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Running Title: Childhood obesity a persistent predictor of preschoolers' PRH**
36
37

38 **KEYWORDS**

39 Lifecourse, self-rated health, obesity, BMI, waist circumference, preschool children
40
41
42

43 **Word count: 3340**
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT (Words: 273)**Objective**

To examine the relationship between lifecourse factors from preschoolers' micro-ecosystem and their parent-reported (mother-reported) health (PRH), following them prospectively from preconception to age 5-years. To investigate if preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference were associated with preschoolers' PRH when controlled for lifecourse predictors.

Design

Lifeways cross-generation cohort study

Setting

Ireland

Participants

Of 1082 families, 62% mothers responded on a health and lifestyle questionnaire at follow-up. Food frequency, BMI and waist-circumference were measured.

Main outcome measure

Mother-reported children's PRH at age-5. Associations with child's individual and familial exposures from preconception to age 5-years examined using logistic regression.

Results

In univariate analysis, relatively-positive rating of children's PRH were associated with children's lower intake of fats [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], higher intake of fruits/vegetables [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)]; as well as familial socio-economic characteristics {higher household income [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], non-entitlement to means-tested healthcare [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers' higher education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)]}, psycho-

1
2
3 social characteristics {father's participation in study [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers'
4 perceiving better support from partner [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], children
5 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)] or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]}, parents' lifestyle
6 {mothers' lower intake of energy [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], fathers' non-smoking status
7 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]}, and parents' health {mothers' self-rated health relatively-
8 positive [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)], fathers' self-rated health relatively-positive
9 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)]}.

10
11
12 In multivariable analysis ($\chi^2=34.2, df=21, N=303, R^2=0.26, p<0.05$), one of the two strong
13 predictors of children's relatively-positive PRH was child not being obese by International
14 Obesity Task Force classification [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)], observed also using BMI
15 (kg/m^2) [OR(95%CI)=0.73(0.58-0.93)] or waist-circumference (cm) [OR(95%CI)=0.89(0.81-
16 0.98)] as continuous variables. The other significant predictor was mothers' self-rated health
17 relatively-positive [OR(95%CI)=4.2(1.5-12.2)].

32 **Conclusions**

33
34
35 Preschoolers' health is adversely associated with obesity and this is independent of lifecourse
36 social and environmental inequalities. The findings suggest that lifecourse adversities during
37 the early developmental stage may get embedded and expressed as anthropometric measures
38 of adiposity, suggesting that public health interventions should begin as early as possible.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Nationally representative sample of preschool-age children
- Examines the influence of lifecourse adversities, prospectively measured from preconception to age 5 on children's general health at age 5. The study analyses demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, food and nutrients intake, psycho-social, socio-economic and health-related exposures from both children's individual as well as parental experiences.
- Demonstrates a significant and independent association between preschoolers' measured BMI as well as waist circumference and their general health status.
- The study is limited by a relatively small sample and use of parent-reported health status.

MAIN TEXT

Introduction

The development of children is critical to their adult well-being^[1,2] and across the lifecourse even subjective estimates may be useful to reflect objectively measured health^[3,4]. Bronfenbrenner^[5] emphasised the importance of children's micro-ecosystem in their development. Recently, the World Health Organisation's (WHO) Commission on Social Determinants of Health (CSDH) presented a Total Environment Assessment Model for Early Child Development (TEAM-ECD),^[6] which again illustrates the importance of individual and family spheres of influence on children's health. The relevance of socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle environment in child development and health is widely acknowledged.^[6-8]

According to the lifecourse hypothesis, risk transmission is characterised by critical periods and accumulation of risk models.^[9] Life Course Health Development (LCHD) framework^[10] suggests that health is a consequence of multiple determinants that change in context of time and circumstances as an individual develops; these experiences are programmed into bio-behavioural regulatory systems during certain critical and sensitive periods of individual's lifetime to decide their health trajectory. The lifecourse framework on childhood disadvantage and adult health^[11] suggests that parental and childhood circumstances from the point of conception influences individual's health in later life, and the individual's childhood health and later life circumstances may further add to this foundation. Based on this, Hertzman and colleagues^[12] examined self-rated health in adulthood using an integrated lifecourse framework. There are a few other studies also which have examined lifecourse determinants of adult global^[13,14] or specific health status.^[15] On the contrary, the literature on the determinants of child global health status is sparse,^[16,17] particularly for the preschool-age children.^[18] Even rarer are studies whose examination includes early lifecourse determinants of child global health status.

1
2
3 Thus the first objective of our analysis was to prospectively examine the relationship between
4 demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, nutritional, psycho-social, socio-economic and
5 health-related lifecourse exposures taken from the children's individual and family spheres of
6 influence starting from preconception up to age 5-years and their global health status at
7 preschool-age.
8
9

10
11
12 In social epidemiology, the construct of “embodiment” refers to biological expression of
13 individuals' materio-social world.^[19,20] Similarly in lifecourse epidemiology, it is
14 hypothesised that early life experiences get “biologically embedded” during critical or
15 sensitive periods of child development leading to gradients in health.^[21,22]
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 The Foresight report identifies a large array of environmental determinants of obesity, a
25 number of which are again related to early child development.^[23] This suggests obesity as
26 pivotal risk factor for subsequent health conditions.^[24]
27
28
29
30

31 The negative relationship between obesity and self-rated health is now increasingly reported
32 in adult populations,^[25,26] some indicating a temporal relationship^[27,28] and suggesting that
33 obesity increases health inequalities over time.^[28] However, evidence on the relationship
34 between obesity and health is relatively limited in child population studies and those
35 available have reported health-related-quality-of-life (HR-QoL)^[29] instead of a generic
36 measure such as global self-rated health. Moreover, this association is yet to be established
37 for preschool-age children. To our knowledge just two population based studies have
38 examined this association in preschool age-group children^[30,31] and neither had nutritional
39 information.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children, Wake *et al.*^[30] did not find a significant
52 difference in global health status of overweight/obese and normal weight 4-5-year-old
53 children. Skinner *et al.*,^[31] using data on 3-5-year-olds from the US National Health and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Nutrition Examination Survey, reported a poorer global health status in obese and severely
4 obese preschoolers. Neither of these studies accounted for a number of possibly relevant
5 confounders, including parental BMI, parental health and nutritional variables.
6
7

8
9
10 We thus hypothesised that similar to findings from studies on older age-groups,
11 anthropometric markers of child obesity in our preschool-age children study would also
12 demonstrate a negative association with their global health status. The next objective of our
13 analysis was to examine whether anthropometric markers of child obesity would emerge as
14 strong predictors of global health status when accounted for other socio-economic, psycho-
15 social, and lifestyle environmental factors in a multivariable model.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Methods**

24
25
26 The Lifeways cross generation cohort study comprises three generations of 1082 Irish
27 families and was established in 2001-03; the recruitment procedure of this nationally
28 representative cohort has been described previously.^[32-34] The a priori purpose was to
29 examine familial and cross-generation influences on early childhood development over the
30 first five years of children's lives. Briefly, would-be mothers were at random recruited from
31 the two regional maternity hospitals in the Republic of Ireland to get a representative sample.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
A comparison between the Lifeways mothers and a nationally representative sample of
women of the same age group from the SLÁN (Survey of Lifestyle, Attitudes and Nutrition)
surveys of Republic of Ireland^[35] confirmed that the Lifeways mothers were satisfactorily
representative of the Irish general women on socio-demographic characteristics.^[33]

At this early pregnancy stage mothers completed a health and lifestyle status questionnaire
adapted from a validated instrument developed for Irish national SLÁN surveys.^[35] Mothers
reported their pre-pregnancy height (cm) and weight (kg) and their smoking status during
pregnancy. Mothers' and partners' socio-economic status was recorded. Subsequently at

1
2
3 birth, the live infants were added to the cohort along-with maternity and birth related hospital
4
5 information.
6

7
8 In 2007-08, when these children averaged five years of age, the cohort follow-up recorded a
9
10 62% response rate.^[34,36] Though mothers who responded to the follow-up were more likely to
11
12 be of higher socioeconomic status, these mothers did not significantly differ in their baseline
13
14 anthropometric characteristics (including BMI) from non-responders.^[34,36] At this 5-year
15
16 follow-up, mothers repeated the health and lifestyle assessment questionnaire, with additional
17
18 questions related to her family, including a five-level likert item question “In general, would
19
20 you say your / your partner’s / your Lifeways child’s current health is Excellent, Very Good,
21
22 Good, Fair or Poor”. Mothers provided information on family’s socio-economic, psycho-
23
24 social, and lifestyle status. Mothers reported their habitual dietary intake for the previous year
25
26 on a semi-quantitative food frequency (SQFFQ) instrument developed from the EPIC study
27
28 (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition) and validated for Irish adult
29
30 population.^[37] Mothers also gave details for the Lifeways child’s habitual diet for the
31
32 previous year using a different SQFFQ instrument adapted from the UK National Diet and
33
34 Nutrition Survey of 4.5-year-old children.^[38] The mothers’ and children’s SQFFQ were
35
36 validated in the Lifeways study using a 7-day weighed food diary in a sub-sample.^[36] Food
37
38 items were aggregated by defined shelves (food groups) of the Irish food pyramid and
39
40 assessment was made for average servings per day of standard food item portions consumed
41
42 from the “top” and “fruit and vegetable” food groups (shelves of Irish food pyramid). The
43
44 “top” food group comprises of high calorie fat and sugar rich foods. Total energy (kcal) and
45
46 total fats (g) intake were computed using conversion values from McCance & Widdowson’s
47
48 food composition tables^[39] with a specially developed FFQ software version 1.0 ©.^[40]
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Mothers and children, and if available fathers, were offered at 5-year follow-up an
56
57 anthropometric assessment at their home for height (cm), weight (kg) and waist
58
59
60

1
2
3 circumference (cm) using a standardised protocol,^[34,36] with 80-85% mothers and children
4
5 participating. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated from weight and height information
6
7 (kg/m²).
8

9
10 Thus variables from discrete stages (pre-pregnancy, early pregnancy, at birth, early infancy
11
12 and 5-year follow-up) of child's early development representing lifecourse exposures from
13
14 distinct domains (demographic, anthropometric, socio-economic, psycho-social, lifestyle,
15
16 nutritional and health) of child's individual and family spheres of influence^[6-8] were
17
18 considered to analyse determinants of child's health status at age-5. The selection of
19
20 variables, domains and spheres of influence are based on the CSDH constructed TEAM-
21
22 ECD, a model of early child development.^[6-8] These lifecourse variables have been
23
24 summarised as per time frame in **Table 1**. This lifecourse time frame highlights the stages
25
26 and transition points relevant from perspective of child's health development.^[10] Additional
27
28 details on these variables are provided in **eTable 1** available in the web only supplement. The
29
30 independent variables have been arranged as child-related, family-related, mother-related,
31
32 father-related groups for ease of presentation.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Independent variables examined from lifecourse of 5-yr-old children

Lifecourse	Independent Variables
Pre-pregnancy	Maternal Pre-pregnancy BMI
Early pregnancy	Family stability Maternal smoking in pregnancy, Maternal Education level Paternal Education level
Birth	Child's Birth-weight, Gestational age, Gender Maternal Parity
Infancy	Child's breastfeeding status
When children averaged 5-yr age	Child's Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables food groups, Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake Family household weekly income, Entitlement to means tested healthcare benefits scheme, Family structure (marital status), Support from partner, parents, children & relatives Maternal Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables food groups, Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake, Self-rated health status Paternal Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Self-rated health status

Children's global health status rated in proxy by their mothers, hereafter referred to as parent-rated health (PRH), was the outcome variable of interest. The 5-graded scale response was dichotomised as relatively-positive health (excellent or very good) and relatively-negative health (poor or fair or good), based on similar dichotomisation in other studies on preschool and school children.^[17,18,30] It is reasonable to take a higher cut-off when dichotomising this age dependent variable in this very young age-group as there would be very limited numbers of poor or fair health children.^[17,18,41]

Initially, uni-variate associations were established between the independent predictors and children's PRH using independent t-tests or chi-square tests. Independent categorical variables were dichotomised in a manner that allowed contrasting extreme levels against the others. Thus, using International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) cut-offs, children's BMI was dichotomised as obese versus over-weight or normal-weight. Similarly nutrition variables ordered in quintiles were dichotomised as the extreme quintile (1st or 5th) versus the rest.

1
2
3 From these independent variables principally chosen on the basis of their relevance to the
4 child's development,¹⁶⁻⁸¹ all those that qualified at significance level 20% ($p<0.2$)¹⁴²¹ in
5 univariate analyses were force entered into a multivariable logistic regression model. BMI
6 (kg/m^2) and waist circumference (cm), the anthropometric markers of obesity, were tested
7 separately in independent multivariable models. Initially BMI was tested as a categorical
8 variable in a model, followed by two additional models substituting it with BMI and then
9 waist circumference as continuous variables. Other independent variables were tested as
10 categorical variables.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Ethical approval for the Lifeways study was obtained respectively from ethical committees of
22 participating hospitals and the University College Dublin, Ireland. Written informed consent
23 was obtained from study participants.
24
25
26
27

28 **Results**

29
30 There were 547 family datasets available for analysis of children's PRH. **Table 2** presents the
31 uni-variate associations between children's lifecourse variables and PRH. Within the
32 individual-sphere of influences, children's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary
33 foods and total fats, and higher intake of fruits/vegetables) and their anthropometric measures
34 at age-5 (not being obese, lower BMI, and lower waist circumference) qualified as
35 determinants of children's relatively-positive PRH for further examination in the
36 multivariable model.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 In other words, retaining $p<0.2$ as the criterion for significance, the children's healthy food
48 and nutrient intake habits – such as decreased intake of unhealthy fat- and sugar- rich foods
49 (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)] or total fats (g) in their meals
50 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] and increased intake of healthy fruits and vegetables
51 (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] were positively associated with their favourable
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 rating for health by their mothers. Conversely, children's increased BMI (kg/m²)
4 [OR(95%CI)=0.85(0.71-1.03)] and waist circumference (cm) [OR(95%CI)=0.95(0.88-1.02)]
5
6
7 were inversely associated with a positive parental-rated health status.
8
9

10 Within the family-sphere of influences, socio-economic status (higher household income,
11 non-entitlement to subsidised healthcare, both parents' higher education status, and father's
12 employment status), psycho-social status (father's study participation, mother's perceived
13 social support), mother's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary foods, total energy
14 and total fats), father's lifestyle behaviours (non-smoker), and both parents' health status
15 (relatively-positive self-rated health) qualified as determinants of children's relatively-
16 positive PRH for further examination in the multivariable model.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 In other words, by maintaining $p < 0.2$ as the criterion for significance, several indicators of a
27 family's better socio-economic status— such as increased household income (Euros/week)
28 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], not requiring subsidised healthcare [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)],
29 mother having a third level education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], father having a third level
30 education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], father being self-employed [OR(95%CI)=2.5(0.8-
31 7.9)]; family's better psycho-social status— such as father's involvement in family affairs
32 [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mother's perceiving a positive social support from spouse
33 [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], parents [OR(95%CI)=2.0(1.0-4.1)], children
34 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)], or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]; family's better lifestyle
35 and food and nutrient intake habits— such as mother's decreased intake of unhealthy fat- and
36 sugar- rich foods (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)], total energy (kcal)
37 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] and total fats (g) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)] in her meals, father's
38 not being a smoker [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]; and family's better health status— such as
39 mother [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)] and father [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)] having a positively
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

rated health status were positively associated with children’s favourable rating for health by their mothers.

For peer review only

Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=547)

	Relatively Negative PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		OR	95% CI
	N	(n=42) %(n) Mean (SD)	(n=505) %(n) Mean (SD)			
Child's Individual Characteristics						
Birth-weight adjusted for gestational age (g)	487	(34) 3564.1 (616)	(453) 3548.4 (552)	1.00	(0.999-1.001)	
Child's Age (Yrs)	547	(42) 5.42 (0.23)	(505) 5.46 (0.25)			
Gender	547					
Male		8.0% (22)	92.0% (242)	Ref		
Female		7.1% (21)	92.9% (262)	1.14	(0.60-2.20)	
BMI (kg/m ²)	464	(35) 17.09 (2.5)	(429) 16.59 (1.6)	0.85	(0.71-1.03) [^]	
BMI [IOTF]	464					
Obese		16.7% (5)	83.3% (25)	Ref		
Overweight / Normal		6.9% (30)	93.1% (404)	2.69	(0.96-7.54) [^]	
Waist Circumference (cm)	462	(35) 57.01 (6.8)	(427) 55.88 (4.3)	0.95	(0.88-1.02) [†]	
Height (cm)	464	(35) 111.6 (5.6)	(429) 112.1 (4.8)	1.02	(0.95-1.10)	
Breastfeeding	528					
Not breastfed		6.5% (16)	93.5% (229)	Ref		
Breastfed		8.8% (25)	91.2% (258)	0.72	(0.38-1.38)	
Energy (Kcal)	547					
Quintile 5 (>1794 kcal)		10% (11)	90.0% (99)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		7.1% (31)	92.9% (406)	1.46	(0.71-3.00)	
Fats (g)	547					
Quintile 5 (>62.9 g)		12.8% (14)	87.2% (95)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)	93.6% (410)	2.16	(1.09-4.26) [*]	
Top food group (servings/day)	547					
Quintile 5 (>6.47 servings)		10.9% (12)	89.1% (98)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)	93.1% (407)	1.66	(0.82-3.36) [†]	
Fruits Veg food group (servings/d)	547					
Quintile 1 (<2.1 servings)		12.8% (14)	87.2% (95)	Ref		
Quintile 2-5		6.4% (28)	93.6% (410)	2.16	(1.09-4.26) [*]	
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income	509					
Less than 760 Euros/wk		13.3% (26)	86.7% (170)	Ref		
More than 760 Euros/wk		4.8% (15)	95.2% (298)	3.04	(1.57-5.90) ^{**}	
Entitlement to General Medical Card	532					
Entitled		13% (12)	87.0% (80)	Ref		
Not entitled		6.6% (29)	93.4% (411)	2.13	(1.04-4.34) [*]	
Fathers' Participation	547					
Not		9.7% (31)	90.3% (290)	Ref		
Yes		4.9% (11)	95.1% (215)	2.09	(1.03-4.25) [*]	
Marital Status	542					
Others		11.4% (5)	88.6% (39)	Ref		
Married/Cohabiting		7.2% (36)	92.8% (462)	1.65	(0.61-4.43)	
Elder children in family (Parity)	535					
Nullipara		8% (18)	92.0% (207)	Ref		
Multipara		7.7% (24)	92.3% (286)	1.04	(0.55-1.96)	
Support from Spouse/Partner	538					
Lesser support		12.9% (17)	87.1% (115)	Ref		
More support		6.2% (25)	93.8% (381)	2.25	(1.18-4.32) [*]	
Support from Parents	487					
Lesser support		12.5% (12)	87.5% (84)	Ref		
More support		6.6% (26)	93.4% (365)	2.01	(0.97-4.14) [^]	
Support from Children	532					
Lesser support		10.6% (20)	89.4% (169)	Ref		
More support		5.8% (20)	94.2% (323)	1.91	(1.00-3.65) [*]	
Support from Close Relatives	510					
Lesser support		12.4% (19)	87.6% (134)	Ref		
More support		6.2% (22)	93.8% (335)	2.16	(1.13-4.12) [*]	

Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (continued)

	N	Relatively Negative PRH (n=42)		Relatively Positive PRH (n=505)		OR	95% CI
		%(n)	Mean (SD)	%(n)	Mean (SD)		
Maternal Characteristics							
Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	475	(36)	23.3 (3.3)	(439)	23.8 (3.9)	1.04	(0.94-1.14)
Pre-pregnancy BMI [WHO cut offs]							
Obese		2.6% (1)		97.4% (38)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		8% (35)		92.0% (401)		0.30	(0.04-2.26)
Mother's Age (Yrs)	546	(42)	36.5 (6.3)	(504)	37.1 (5.3)	1.02	(0.96-1.08)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	432		25.6 (3.9)		26.3 (5.0)	1.03	(0.95-1.12)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up [WHO cut offs]	432						
Obese		7.2% (5)		92.8% (64)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		7.4% (27)		92.6% (336)		0.97	(0.36-2.62)
Waist Circumference (cm)	434	(31)	85.3 (10.6)	(403)	87.6 (11.9)	1.02	(0.99-1.05)
Height (cm)	454	(33)	161.9 (6.8)	(421)	162.9 (6.0)	1.03	(0.97-1.09)
Smoking in pregnancy	534						
Smoker		8.1% (8)		91.9% (91)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (33)		92.4% (402)		1.07	(0.48-2.4)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	541						
Smoker		7.6% (9)		92.4% (110)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (32)		92.4% (390)		1.0	(0.46-2.15)
Energy (Kcal)	546						
Quintile 5 (>2570.9 kcal)		13% (14)		87.0% (94)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)		93.6% (410)		2.18	(1.11-4.30)*
Fats (g)	546						
Quintile 5 (>106 g)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (407)		1.68	(0.83-3.40)†
Top food group (servings/day)	545						
Quintile 5 (>8.35 servings)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (406)		1.67	(0.83-3.39)†
Fruits Veg food group (servings/day)	546						
Quintile 1 (<4.5 servings)		9.1% (10)		90.9% (100)		Ref	
Quintile 2-5		7.3% (32)		92.7% (404)		1.26	(0.60-2.65)
Education level	534						
Lower		10.4% (25)		89.6% (215)		Ref	
Third Level		5.8% (17)		94.2% (277)		1.90	(1.00-3.60)*
Employment	545						
Not Earning		6.4% (15)		93.6% (221)		Ref	
Employed		9% (22)		91.0% (222)		0.69	(0.35-1.36)
Self employed		7.7% (5)		92.3% (60)		0.81	(0.29-2.33)
Self reported health	546						
Relatively Negative		17.1% (27)		82.9% (131)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		3.9% (15)		96.1% (373)		5.10	(2.64-9.93)**
Paternal Characteristics							
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	66	(4)		(62)		0.97	(0.76-1.23)
Waist Circumference (cm)	65	(3)		(62)		1.01	(0.90-1.13)
Height (cm)	66	(4)		(62)		1.01	(0.88-1.15)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	521						
Smoker		11.5% (16)		88.5% (123)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		5.5% (21)		94.5% (361)		2.24	(1.13-4.42)*
Education level	514						
Lower		11.1% (16)		88.9% (128)		Ref	
Third Level		6.2% (23)		93.8% (347)		1.89	(0.97-3.68)^
Employment	518						
Not Earning		9.2% (8)		90.8% (79)		Ref	
Employed		7.9% (24)		92.1% (279)		1.18	(0.51-2.72)
Self employed		3.9% (5)		96.1% (123)		2.49	(0.79-7.89)†
Self reported health	510						
Relatively Negative		12.6% (20)		87.4% (139)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		4.6% (16)		95.4% (335)		3.01	(1.52-5.99)**

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, ^p<0.1, †p<0.2; Ref=reference category (OR=1)

1
2
3 **Table 3** presents the multivariable model for association between qualifying lifecourse
4 variables and children's relatively-positive PRH at age-5. A significantly strong predictor of
5 children's relatively-positive PRH was child's not being obese by IOTF classification
6 [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)]. When BMI was tested as a continuous variable, there was 0.73
7 (95%CI=0.58-0.93) times decreased odds of the child being positively rated on health status
8 for every 1 kg/m² increase in their BMI. Similarly in the waist circumference model, for
9 every 1 cm increase there was 0.89 (95%CI=0.81-0.98) times decreased odds of the child
10 getting a relatively-positive rating on health status. Thus the association between children's
11 BMI or waist circumference and their PRH only strengthened following adjustments in this
12 multivariate model, irrespective of being analysed as a categorical or continuous variable.
13 Another significant predictor of children's relatively-positive PRH was mother's having rated
14 her own health as relatively-positive. These predictors maintained the highest strength of
15 association with children's health status when independent variables were standardised (not
16 reported here). None of the other variables reached the level of statistical significance. The
17 models explained over 25 percent of variance for children's PRH.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3: Multivariable Logistic Regression model for predictors of children’s relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=303)

	Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH	
	BMI Categorical ¹		BMI Continuous ²		WC Continuous ³	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Child's Individual Characteristics						
BMI [IOTF], Obese ⁺ vs Overweight / Normal	5.48	(1.43-21.03) *				
BMI kg/m ² [Continuous]			0.73	(0.58-0.93) **		
Waist Circumference cm [Continuous]					0.89	(0.81-0.98) *
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.57	(0.42-5.79)	1.49	(0.40-5.53)	1.32	(0.36-4.80)
Top food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.23	(0.33-4.53)	1.30	(0.36-4.63)	1.29	(0.36-4.62)
Fruits Veg food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q1 ⁺ vs Q2-5	2.57	(0.75-8.80)	2.86	(0.83-9.93)	2.73	(0.78-9.49)
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income, Less ⁺ vs High	1.85	(0.63-5.40)	1.76	(0.59-5.21)	1.79	(0.61-5.26)
Entitlement to General Medical, Card Yes ⁺ vs No	0.94	(0.24-3.71)	1.03	(0.26-4.07)	1.04	(0.26-4.10)
Fathers' Participation, Not ⁺ vs Yes	1.88	(0.68-5.21)	1.86	(0.67-5.16)	2.06	(0.74-5.71)
Support from Spouse/Partner, Less ⁺ vs More	0.70	(0.20-2.49)	0.67	(0.19-2.33)	0.74	(0.22-2.52)
Support from Parents, Less ⁺ vs More	1.92	(0.53-6.93)	2.33	(0.64-8.42)	2.37	(0.66-8.53)
Support from Children, Less ⁺ vs More	1.15	(0.38-3.45)	1.29	(0.42-3.91)	1.25	(0.41-3.82)
Support from Close Relatives, Less ⁺ vs More	0.86	(0.23-3.13)	0.84	(0.24-3.02)	0.84	(0.23-3.01)
Maternal Characteristics						
Energy Kcal [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.89	(0.30-11.84)	2.00	(0.31-12.86)	1.57	(0.28-8.84)
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	0.72	(0.09-5.54)	0.59	(0.07-4.77)	0.92	(0.13-6.41)
Top food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.08	(0.29-3.94)	1.30	(0.36-4.65)	1.18	(0.32-4.34)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	1.34	(0.47-3.78)	1.35	(0.48-3.80)	1.48	(0.53-4.13)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	4.20	(1.45-12.20) **	4.42	(1.53-12.79) **	4.17	(1.47-11.87) **
Paternal Characteristics						
Current Smoking status, Yes ⁺ vs No	1.37	(0.48-3.93)	1.31	(0.45-3.83)	1.53	(0.54-4.35)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	0.69	(0.21-2.28)	0.79	(0.24-2.57)	0.83	(0.26-2.67)
Employment, Non-earning ⁺ vs Self employed	1.60	(0.73-3.53)	1.52	(0.69-3.32)	1.57	(0.70-3.53)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	1.48	(0.52-4.20)	1.54	(0.54-4.35)	1.43	(0.51-3.96)

OR=Odds Ratio; ⁺Reference category (OR=1); **p<0.01 (2-tailed), *p<0.05 (2-tailed)

Rel.Negative=Relatively Negative, Rel.Positive=Relatively Positive

¹Child BMI as a categorical variable; Model Chi-sq = 34.2, df = 21, p = 0.034; -2LL = 128.6, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.26

²Child BMI as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 35.9, df = 21, p = 0.022; -2LL = 126.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.27

³Child waist circumference as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 33.8, df = 21, p = 0.038; -2LL = 128.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.25

Discussion

This analysis showed that determinants from both child's individual and family spheres have an influence on child's health at preschool-age. The factors from all three material, psycho-social and lifestyle domains, the major explanations for child health inequalities,^[8] were associated at uni-variate levels. However, in the final model this analysis clearly demonstrated a negative association between child's obesity and health status. Child's not being obese was one of the significantly strong predictors of child's relatively-positive health status, which was also observed with measured BMI and waist circumference analysed as continuous variables.

This negative relationship observed between measured obesity and PRH conforms to published literature on primary school age-group children and adolescents.^[43-45] Most importantly, for the first time to our knowledge, this analysis demonstrates the association having adjusted for food and nutrient intake, along-with a wide range of other explanatory variables.

Self-rated health is an important and valid measure of morbidity, mortality, longevity and health status,^[3,4] also in Irish adult^[46,47] and children.^[16] It is believed to be a more inclusive measure of health than the objective measurements, with a capacity to comprehensively evaluate health dynamics, behaviours and psycho-physiological states that are not otherwise easy to measure.^[3]

This holistic measure better accommodates the WHO defined concept of health as opposed to a diagnosed specific disease.^[3] Use of parent proxy for child self-reported health is justified for children too young to have adequate cognitive skills.^[48,49] Systematic reviews report good agreement between ratings by children and their parents on child HRQoL, particularly for physical health domain.^[48-50] Parents tend to be thoughtful when responding to proxy questions and report children's usual health disposition.^[51] Studies on construct validity report positively.^[52-55] Maternal ratings of child's general health status were found sensitive when validated against children's illnesses and other morbidity or healthcare indicators,^[41,56-58] including evidence of a gradient in strength of these associations.^[41] Many national-level studies have accepted parent proxy as an

1
2
3 appropriate measure^[17,18,59,60] and successfully used it to longitudinally demonstrate risk and
4
5 consequences of child health.^[17,59]
6

7
8 Self-rated health, a composite measure, represents all domains of HR-QoL,^[4] but better represents
9
10 physical health than HR-QoL.^[61] Studies on older age-group children have reported stronger/sole
11
12 negative associations for general/physical health domain of HR-QoL and obesity,^[44,62] irrespective
13
14 whether children themselves or parents reported their HRQoL,^[29] and also whether BMI was
15
16 analysed as a categorical,^[43,44] or continuous variable.^[63,64]
17

18
19 Another relevance of this analysis is in demonstrating this association of obesity with general-
20
21 health in a nationally representative sample of preschool-age children, for which literature is scant.
22
23 Though, a few have shown similar association of obesity with specific paediatric conditions or
24
25 admission history in this age-group.^[30,31,65-68] A longitudinal study speculated that pre-school
26
27 obesity influences a decline in early-age health, and then both obesity and poor-health tracks into
28
29 adolescence.^[69] The WHO recommends high priority for determinants of health inequalities during
30
31 early development.^[70]
32
33

34
35 The Lifeways previously demonstrated longitudinal association between parental socio-economic
36
37 and lifestyle characteristics and child's BMI and waist circumference.^[36] In this analysis when
38
39 same anthropometric measures are included along-with material, psycho-social, and lifestyle
40
41 determinants of child obesity and health, a prominent relationship emerges between children's
42
43 anthropometric measures and health status. One possible explanation is that determinants of health
44
45 inequalities biologically embed^[21,22] in early life and child obesity is an early phenotypic
46
47 expression of this inequality; though the continued influence of environmental factors is not
48
49 undermined. Adult^[25,26] and adolescence studies^[44,45] have also shown this association to be
50
51 independent of socio-demographic, lifestyle or health-related factors.
52
53
54

55
56 The observed association between BMI or waist circumference and PRH in the present analysis
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may be temporal, as demonstrated in adults.^[27,28] Though a number of large scale cross sectional
4
5 studies have shown an association between anthropometric measures of obesity and self rated
6
7 health,^[71] only recently a few nationally representative prospective studies have established the
8
9 temporality of this association in adults.^[27,28] Though this relationship maybe bi-directional to an
10
11 extent,^[72,73] the mounting evidence from longitudinal birth cohort studies regarding a sequential
12
13 relationship between lifetime growth trajectories and adult disease, disability and deaths^[2]
14
15 primarily rules out reverse causality in this association and suggests that the association observed
16
17 in our birth cohort is also more likely to be temporal. Moreover, the available findings from a few
18
19 longitudinal studies on primary school age children suggest that at least in the childhood this
20
21 inverse association found between BMI and HRQoL is predominantly in the given direction and
22
23 not the reverse.^[74,75] However, this needs careful interpretation as both anthropometric and health
24
25 data were concurrently collected, and this limitation may be addressed with next sweep of cohort
26
27 data collection.
28
29
30

31
32 This analysis demonstrated that maternal health was strongly predictive of her child's health. One
33
34 concern is that mother's perception of her own health may bias her perception of her child's
35
36 health. However, this intergenerational association has been previously reported,^[41,56,57,76-79] and
37
38 reporting mothers can effectively discriminate between their own and children's
39
40 health.^[41,56,57,77,78,80] Several mechanisms such as inherited susceptibility, uterine environment and
41
42 shared environment have been suggested for this familial aggregation pattern.^[56,77,78]
43
44
45

46
47 Maternal BMI may be related to both maternal self-rated health and child's BMI, so the observed
48
49 associations in this analysis could possibly be a reflection of an association between maternal BMI
50
51 and child's PRH. However, this was not observed in our analysis. Maternal BMI at both pre-
52
53 pregnancy and 5-year follow-up were not associated with child's PRH at univariate level. Also,
54
55 when maternal BMI was forcibly added into the multivariable model (not reported here), the
56
57 observed associations did not attenuate.
58
59
60

1
2
3 The study has limitations in use of reported rather than measured health status and a relatively
4 small sample size. Though the study was able to detect the major explanatory domains for child
5 health inequalities documented in the literature^[8], the relatively small sample size of this study
6 may possibly have underpowered it to detect variables with lesser effect sizes. The complete case
7 approach to analysis reduced the sample size of the final multivariate model. However, this
8 missing data was not systematic but rather on account of accumulation of missing completely at
9 random data across a number of variables. It may be argued that the reduced sample size possibly
10 influenced the odds ratio estimate for the association between children's relatively-positive PRH
11 and the child's not being obese (using a categorical IOTF classification). Nonetheless this
12 association between children's anthropometric measures and their parent-rated health variable is
13 likely to be coherent, because these associations remain statistically significant even when BMI
14 and WC are analysed as continuous variables.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 As in most birth cohort studies,^[81,82] the Lifeways birth cohort also experienced the attrition of
31 mothers belonging to lower socio-economic status in the early stages of the study. Though this
32 may underestimate some socioeconomic inequalities^[83], it does not negate the exposure-outcome
33 associations detected through regression models of such longitudinal studies^[84,85].
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Nevertheless, this study has advantages in use of lifecourse variables from pre-conception to age
41 of 5-years, with measured BMI and waist circumference data. It also has detailed foods and
42 nutrient data along-with other socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle variables for child and
43 both parents.
44
45
46
47
48

49 In conclusion, these analyses from the Lifeways cohort show that lifecourse adversities were
50 associated with mother-reported health for preschoolers, suggesting an early life influence.
51 Preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference demonstrated strong negative associations with
52 mother-reported health independent of socio-economic, psycho-social, and lifestyle factors,
53 suggesting early biological expression of lifecourse adversities. The findings have important
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 implications in understanding how early life environment may create inequalities in developmental
4
5 health.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Footnotes**Acknowledgements**

The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study is overseen by an interdisciplinary scientific steering group chaired by CCK, the principal investigator. The authors greatly appreciate the participation of the Lifeways cohort families.

Contributors

AS undertook all analyses reported in this manuscript, interpreted the findings and drafted the manuscript. CM contributed to data collection at five year follow-up, interpretation of the analysis and critical revision of the manuscript. CCK designed the study, supervised the analyses, interpretation of results and intellectual content of the manuscript. All three authors approved the final version.

Funding

The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study was established as part of European Science Foundation funded 'Social Variations in Health Expectancy in Europe' international research programme and its various sweeps have been funded by the Health Research Board of Ireland. Funding sources had no involvement in design, collection, analysis, interpretation, writing and submission of this manuscript.

Competing interests

None

Ethical approvals

Ethics committees of Coombe University Hospital, Dublin, University College Hospital Galway, University College Dublin, Dublin, and the Irish College of General Practitioners, Ireland.

Data sharing statement

There are no additional data available. The data manager may be contacted at john.obrien@ucd.ie for more details on the Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study.

Appendices

The web only supplement includes eTable 1 regarding details of examined variables and eTable 2 displaying standardised odds ratios for multivariable logistic regression model.

REFERENCES

1. Barker DJ. Sir Richard Doll Lecture. Developmental origins of chronic disease. *Public Health* 2012;**126**(3):185-9.
2. Power C1, Kuh D, Morton S. From developmental origins of adult disease to life course research on adult disease and aging: insights from birth cohort studies. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2013;**34**:7-28.
3. Benyamini Y. Self-ratings of health and longevity: a health psychologist's viewpoint on epidemiological findings. *The European Health Psychologist* 2008;**10**:10–13.
4. Bjorner J, Fayers P, Idler E. Self-rated health. In: Fayers PM, Hays RD, eds. *Assessing quality of life in clinical trials: methods and practice*. 2nd edn. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005:309-24.
5. Bronfenbrenner U. Ecological models of human development. In: Postlethwaite TN, Husen T, eds. *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Vol 3. 2nd ed. Oxford, England: Elsevier Sciences, Ltd., 1994: 1643-47.
6. Siddiqi A, Irwin LG, Hertzman C. Total environment assessment model for early child development. Evidence report for the WHO commission on social determinants of health. World Health Organization, 2007.
http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/ecd_kn_evidence_report_2007.pdf
(accessed March 30, 2012).

- 1
2
3 7. Maggi S, Irwin LJ, Siddiqi A, *et al.* The social determinants of early child development: an
4
5 overview. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2010;**46**(11):627-35.
6
7
- 8
9
10 8. Hertzman C, Li J, Mattes E, *et al.* Social determinants of child health and well-being
11
12 [Editorial]. *Health Sociology Review* 2009;**18**(1):3-11.
13
- 14
15
16 9. Ben-Shlomo Y, Kuh D. A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology:
17
18 conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. *Int J Epidemiol*
19
20 2002;**31**(2):285-93.
21
22
- 23
24
25 10. Halfon N, Hochstein M. Life course health development: an integrated framework for
26
27 developing health, policy, and research. *Milbank Q* 2002; **80**(3):433-79, iii.
28
29
- 30
31
32 11. Graham H, and Power Chris. *Childhood disadvantage and adult health: a lifecourse*
33
34 *framework*. London: NHS Health Development Agency, 2004.
35
36 http://www.gserve.nice.org.uk/niceMedia/pdf/childhood_disadvantage_health.pdf
37
38 (accessed May 24, 2014).
39
40
- 41
42
43 12. Hertzman C, Power C, Matthews S, *et al.* Using an interactive framework of society and
44
45 lifecourse to explain self-rated health in early adulthood. *Soc Sci Med* 2001;**53**(12):1575-
46
47 85.
48
49
- 50
51
52 13. Mensah FK, Hobcraft J. Childhood deprivation, health and development: associations with
53
54 adult health in the 1958 and 1970 British prospective birth cohort studies. *J Epidemiol*
55
56 *Community Health* 2008;**62**(7):599-606.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 14. Kestila L, Koskinen S, Martelin T, *et al*. Determinants of health in early adulthood: what is
6 the role of parental education, childhood adversities and own education ? *Eur J Public*
7 *Health* 2006;**16**(3):305-14.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 15. Pollitt R, Rose K, Kaufman J. Evaluating the evidence for models of life course
15 socioeconomic factors and cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review. *BMC Public*
16 *Health* 2005;**5**(1):7.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 16. Kelleher CC, Tay J, Gabhainn SN. Influence on self-rated health of socio-demographic,
24 lifestyle and affluence factors: an analysis of the Irish and international health behaviours
25 among school-aged children (HBSC) datasets 1998. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 43-6.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 17. Stein RE, Siegel MJ, Bauman LJ. Double jeopardy: what social risk adds to biomedical
33 risk in understanding child health and health care utilization. *Acad Pediatr* 2010;**10**(3):165-
34 71.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 18. Stevens GD. Gradients in the health status and developmental risks of young children: the
42 combined influences of multiple social risk factors. *Matern Child Health J* 2006;**10**(2):187-
43 99.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 19. Krieger N. Theories for social epidemiology in the 21st century: an ecosocial perspective.
51 *Int J Epidemiol* 2001;**30**(4):668-77.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
20. Krieger N. A glossary for social epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2001;**55**(10):693-700.
21. Hertzman C. The biological embedding of early experience and its effects on health in adulthood. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1999;**896**(1):85-95.
22. Hertzman C, Boyce T. How experience gets under the skin to create gradients in developmental health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2010;**31**:329-47 C1-C3.
23. Butland B, Jebb S, Kopelman P, *et al.* Foresight. Tackling obesities: future choices — Project report. London: Government Office for Science, 2007.
<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/foresight/docs/obesity/17.pdf> (accessed March 30, 2012).
24. Aboderin I, Kalache A, Ben-Shlomo Y, *et al.* Life course perspectives on coronary heart disease, stroke and diabetes: key issues and implications for policy and research. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2002.
http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2002/WHO_NMH_NPH_02.1.pdf (accessed March 30, 2012).
25. Molarius A, Berglund K, Eriksson C, *et al.* Socioeconomic conditions, lifestyle factors, and self-rated health among men and women in Sweden. *Eur J Public Health* 2007;**17**(2):125-33.
26. Prosper M-H, Moczulski VL, Qureshi A. Obesity as a predictor of self-rated health. *Am J Health Behav* 2009;**33**(3):319-29.

- 1
2
3 27. Svedberg P, Bardage C, Sandin S, *et al.* A prospective study of health, life-style and
4 psychosocial predictors of self-rated health. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2006;**21**(10):767-76.
5
6
7
8
9
10 28. Zajacova A, Burgard SA. Body weight and health from early to mid-adulthood: a
11 longitudinal analysis. *J Health Soc Behav* 2010;**51**(1):92-107.
12
13
14
15
16 29. Tsiros MD, Olds T, Buckley JD, *et al.* Health-related quality of life in obese children and
17 adolescents. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2009;**33**(4):387-400.
18
19
20
21
22
23 30. Wake M, Hardy P, Sawyer MG, *et al.* Comorbidities of overweight/obesity in Australian
24 preschoolers: a cross-sectional population study. *Arch Dis Child* 2008;**93**(6):502-07.
25
26
27
28
29
30 31. Skinner AC, Perrin EM, Steiner MJ. Healthy for now? A cross-sectional study of the
31 comorbidities in obese preschool children in the United States. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*
32 2010;**49**(7):648-55.
33
34
35
36
37
38 32. O'Mahony D, Fallon UB, Hannon F, *et al.* The Lifeways Cross-Generation Study: design,
39 recruitment and data management considerations. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 3-6.
40
41
42
43
44
45 33. Niedhammer I, O'Mahony D, Daly S, *et al.* Occupational predictors of pregnancy outcomes
46 in Irish working women in the Lifeways cohort. *BJOG* 2009;**116**(7):943-52.
47
48
49
50
51
52 34. Murrin CM, Kelly GE, Tremblay RE, *et al.* Body mass index and height over three
53 generations: evidence from the Lifeways Cross-Generational Cohort Study. *BMC Public*
54 *Health* 2012;**12**:81.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
35. National Nutrition Surveillance Centre. Dietary habits of the Irish population: results from SLÁN, Annual Report 2003. Dublin: National Nutritional Surveillance Centre, Department of Public Health Medicine and Epidemiology, University College Dublin, Dublin and Health Promotion Unit, Department of Health and Children, Dublin, 2003.
 36. Murrin C. Maternal factors during pregnancy contributing to early life risk of childhood obesity [PhD Thesis]. Dublin: University College Dublin, 2011.
 37. Harrington J. Validation of a food frequency questionnaire as a tool for assessing nutrient intake [MA Thesis]. Galway: National University of Ireland, 1997.
 38. Gregory J, Collins D, Davies P, *et al.* National Diet and Nutrition Survey: children aged 1.5 - 4.5 years. Volume 1: Report of the diet and nutrition survey. London: HMSO, 1995.
 39. Food Standards Agency. McCance and Widdowson's The composition of foods, sixth summary edition. Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry, 2002.
 40. FFQ_Software version 1.0. Dublin: National Nutrition Surveillance Centre, School of Public Health and Population Science, University College Dublin, 2007.
 41. Monette S, Séguin L, Gauvin L, *et al.* Validation of a measure of maternal perception of the child's health status. *Child Care Health Dev* 2007;**33**(4):472-81.

- 1
2
3 42. Katz MH. *Multivariable analysis: a practical guide for clinicians and public health*
4 *researchers*. 3rd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
5
6
7
8
9
10 43. Wake M, Salmon L, Waters E, *et al*. Parent-reported health status of overweight and obese
11 Australian primary school children: a cross-sectional population survey. *Int J Obes Relat*
12 *Metab Disord* 2002;**26**(5): 717-24.
13
14
15
16
17
18 44. Swallen KC, Reither EN, Haas SA, *et al*. Overweight, obesity, and health-related quality of
19 life among adolescents: the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Pediatrics*
20 2005;**115**(2):340-47.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 45. Vingilis ER, Wade TJ, Seeley JS. Predictors of adolescent self-rated health. Analysis of the
28 National Population Health Survey. *Can J Public Health* 2002;**93**(3):193-97.
29
30
31
32
33
34 46. Kelleher CC, Whelan J, Daly L, *et al*. Socio-demographic, environmental, lifestyle and
35 psychosocial factors predict self rated health in Irish Travellers, a minority nomadic
36 population. *Health Place* 2012;**18**(2):330-38.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 47. Kelleher CC, Friel S, Nic Gabhainn S, *et al*. Socio-demographic predictors of self-rated
44 health in the Republic of Ireland: findings from the National Survey on Lifestyle, Attitudes
45 and Nutrition, SLAN. *Soc Sci Med* 2003;**57**(3):477-86.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 48. Eiser C, Morse R. Can parents rate their child's health-related quality of life? Results of a
53 systematic review. *Qual Life Res* 2001;**10**(4):347-57.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 49. Upton P, Lawford J, Eiser C. Parent-child agreement across child health-related quality of
4
5 life instruments: a review of the literature. *Qual Life Res* 2008;**17**(6):895-913.
6
7
8
9
10 50. Norrby U, Nordholm L, Fasth A. Reliability and validity of the swedish version of child
11
12 health questionnaire. *Scand J Rheumatol* 2003;**32**(2):101-7.
13
14
15
16 51. Davis E, Nicolas C, Waters E, *et al*. Parent-proxy and child self-reported health-related
17
18 quality of life: using qualitative methods to explain the discordance. *Qual Life Res*
19
20 2007;**16**(5):863-71.
21
22
23
24
25 52. Theunissen NC, Vogels TG, Koopman HM, *et al*. The proxy problem: child report versus
26
27 parent report in health-related quality of life research. *Qual Life Res* 1998;**7**(5):387-97.
28
29
30
31
32 53. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Parent proxy-report of their children's health-
33
34 related quality of life: an analysis of 13,878 parents' reliability and validity across age
35
36 subgroups using the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*
37
38 2007;**5**:2.
39
40
41
42
43 54. Spencer NJ, Coe C. The development and validation of a measure of parent-reported child
44
45 health and morbidity: the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile. *Child Care Health*
46
47 *Dev* 1996;**22**(6):367-79.
48
49
50
51
52 55. Spencer NJ, Coe C. Validation of the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile in
53
54 routine child health surveillance. *Child Care Health Dev* 2000;**26**(4):323-36.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 56. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Workman-Daniels K, *et al.* Maternal rating of child
4 health at school age: does the vulnerable child syndrome persist ? *Pediatrics*
5 1993;**92**(3):380-88.
6
7
8
9
10
11 57. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Shorter T, *et al.* Factors associated with maternal rating
12 of infant health in central Harlem. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 1989;**10**(3):139-44.
13
14
15
16
17 58. McCormick MC, Athreya BH, Bernbaum JC, *et al.* Preliminary observations on maternal
18 rating of health of children: data from three subspecialty clinics. *J Clin Epidemiol*
19 1988;**41**(4):323-29.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 59. Lynch JL. Infant health, race/ethnicity, and early educational outcomes using the ECLS-B.
28 *Sociol Inq* 2011;**81**(4):499-526.
29
30
31
32
33
34 60. Gilman SE, McCormick MC. Insights from life course epidemiology. *Acad Pediatr*
35 2010;**10**(3):159-60.
36
37
38
39
40
41 61. Smith KW, Avis NE, Assmann SF. Distinguishing between quality of life and health status
42 in quality of life research: a meta-analysis. *Qual Life Res* 1999;**8**(5):447-59.
43
44
45
46
47 62. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Singer S, Pilpel N, *et al.* Health-related quality of life among children
48 and adolescents: associations with obesity. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2006;**30**(2):267-72.
49
50
51
52
53
54 63. Williams J, Wake M, Hesketh K, *et al.* Health-related quality of life of overweight and
55 obese children. *JAMA* 2005;**293**(1):70-6.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 64. de Beer M, Hofsteenge GH, Koot HM, *et al.* Health-related-quality-of-life in obese
6 adolescents is decreased and inversely related to BMI. *Acta Paediatr* 2007;**96**(5):710-14.
7
8
9
10
11 65. Shibli R, Rubin L, Akons H, *et al.* Morbidity of overweight (≥ 85 th percentile) in the first 2
12 years of life. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**(2):267-72.
13
14
15
16
17 66. Suglia SF, Chambers EC, Rosario A, *et al.* Asthma and obesity in three-year-old urban
18 children: role of sex and home environment. *J Pediatr* 2011;**159**(1):14-20.e11.
19
20
21
22
23 67. Tai A, Volkmer R, Burton A. Association between asthma symptoms and obesity in
24 preschool (4-5 year old) children. *J Asthma* 2009;**46**(4):362-65.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 68. Slining M, Adair LS, Goldman BD, *et al.* Infant overweight is associated with delayed
32 motor development. *J Pediatr* 2010;**157**(1):20-5.e21.
33
34
35
36
37 69. Williams JW, Canterford L, Hesketh KD, *et al.* Changes in body mass index and health
38 related quality of life from childhood to adolescence. *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2011;**6**(2-2):e442-
39 e448.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 70. Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, *et al.* Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through
48 action on the social determinants of health. *Lancet* 2008;**372**(9650):1661-69.
49
50
51
52
53 71. Imai K, Gregg EW, Chen YJ, Zhang P, *et al.* The association of BMI with functional status
54 and self-rated health in US adults. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2008;**16**(2):402-8.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 72. Simonsen MK, Hundrup YA, Grønbaek M, *et al.* A prospective study of the association
6 between weight changes and self-rated health. *BMC Womens Health* 2008;**8**:13.
7
8
9
10
11
12 73. Cameron AJ, Magliano DJ, Dunstan DW, *et al.* A bi-directional relationship between
13 obesity and health-related quality of life: evidence from the longitudinal AusDiab study. *Int*
14 *J Obes (Lond)* 2012;**36**(2):295-303.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 74. Sawyer MG, Harchak T, Wake M, *et al.* Four-year prospective study of BMI and mental
22 health problems in young children. *Pediatrics* 2011;**128**(4):677-84.
23
24
25
26
27
28 75. Jansen PW, Mensah FK, Clifford S, *et al.* Bidirectional associations between overweight
29 and health-related quality of life from 4-11 years: Longitudinal Study of Australian
30 Children. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2013;**37**(10):1307-13.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 76. Coneus K, Spiess CK. The intergenerational transmission of health in early childhood -
38 evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study. *Econ Hum Biol* 2012;**10**(1):89-
39 97.
40
41
42
43
44
45 77. Case A, Lubotsky D, Paxson C. Economic status and health in childhood: the origins of the
46 gradient. *Am Econ Rev* 2002;**92**(5):1308-34.
47
48
49
50
51
52 78. Silburn SR, Zubrick SR, Garton A, *et al.* Western Australia Child Health Survey: family
53 and community health. Perth, Western Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics and the
54 TVW Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, 1996.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 79. Waters E, Doyle J, Wolfe R, *et al.* Influence of parental gender and self-reported health and
6 illness on parent-reported child health. *Pediatrics* 2000;**106**(6):1422-28.
7
8
9
10
11
12 80. Dadds MR, Stein RE, Silver EJ. The role of maternal psychological adjustment in the
13 measurement of children's functional status. *J Pediatr Psychol* 1995;**20**(4):527-44.
14
15
16
17
18 81. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, *et al.* Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index
19 offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol*
20 2013;**42**(1):111-27.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 82. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, *et al.* Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal
28 Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. *Int J Epidemiol* 2013;**42**(1):97-
29 110.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 83. Howe L, Galobardes B, Tilling K, *et al.* Does drop-out from cohort studies bias estimates
37 of socioeconomic inequalities in health? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2011;**65**:A31.
38
39
40
41
42
43 84. Wolke D, Waylen A, Samara M, *et al.* Selective drop-out in longitudinal studies and non-
44 biased prediction of behaviour disorders. *Br J Psychiatry* 2009;**195**(3):249-56.
45
46
47
48
49 85. Nilsen RM, Vollset SE, Gjessing HK, *et al.* Self-selection and bias in a large prospective
50 pregnancy cohort in Norway. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 2009;**23**(6):597-608.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

LICENCE FOR PUBLICATION STATEMENT

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Group and co-owners or contracting owning societies (where published by the BMJ Group on their behalf), and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in any BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

For peer review only

1
2
3 **Title: Preschoolers' parent rated health disparities are strongly associated with**
4 **measures of adiposity in the Lifeways cohort study children**
5
6

7 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

8 Professor Cecily C Kelleher
9 School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science,
10 Woodview House,
11 University College Dublin
12 Belfield,
13 Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland
14 Tel: +3531 7162045
15 Fax: +3531 7163421
16 cecily.kelleher@ucd.ie
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **AUTHORS**

25 Aakash Shrivastava¹ PhD
26 Celine Murrin¹ PhD
27 Cecily C Kelleher¹ MD

28 ¹School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science, University College Dublin,
29 Woodview House, Belfield, Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Running Title: Childhood obesity a persistent predictor of preschoolers' PRH**
36
37

38 **KEYWORDS**

39 Lifecourse, self-rated health, obesity, BMI, waist circumference, preschool children
40
41
42

43 **Word count: 3340**
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT (Words: 273)**Objective**

To examine the relationship between lifecourse factors from preschoolers' micro-ecosystem and their parent-reported (mother-reported) health (PRH), following them prospectively from preconception to age 5-years. To investigate if preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference were associated with preschoolers' PRH when controlled for lifecourse predictors.

Design

Lifeways cross-generation cohort study

Setting

Ireland

Participants

Of 1082 families, 62% mothers responded on a health and lifestyle questionnaire at follow-up. Food frequency, BMI and waist-circumference were measured.

Main outcome measure

Mother-reported children's PRH at age-5. Associations with child's individual and familial exposures from preconception to age 5-years examined using logistic regression.

Results

In univariate analysis, relatively-positive rating of children's PRH were associated with children's lower intake of fats [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], higher intake of fruits/vegetables [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)]; as well as familial socio-economic characteristics {higher household income [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], non-entitlement to means-tested healthcare [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers' higher education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)]}, psycho-

1
2
3 social characteristics {father's participation in study [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers'
4 perceiving better support from partner [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], children
5 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)] or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]}, parents' lifestyle
6 {mothers' lower intake of energy [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], fathers' non-smoking status
7 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]}, and parents' health {mothers' self-rated health relatively-
8 positive [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)], fathers' self-rated health relatively-positive
9 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)]}.

10
11
12 In multivariable analysis ($\chi^2=34.2, df=21, N=303, R^2=0.26, p<0.05$), one of the two strong
13 predictors of children's relatively-positive PRH was child not being obese by International
14 Obesity Task Force classification [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)], observed also using BMI
15 (kg/m^2) [OR(95%CI)=0.73(0.58-0.93)] or waist-circumference (cm) [OR(95%CI)=0.89(0.81-
16 0.98)] as continuous variables. The other significant predictor was mothers' self-rated health
17 relatively-positive [OR(95%CI)=4.2(1.5-12.2)].

32 **Conclusions**

33
34
35 Preschoolers' health is adversely associated with obesity and this is independent of lifecourse
36 social and environmental inequalities. **The findings suggest that lifecourse adversities during**
37 **the early developmental stage may get embedded and expressed as anthropometric measures**
38 **of adiposity, suggesting that public health interventions should begin as early as possible.**
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Nationally representative sample of preschool-age children
- Examines the influence of lifecourse adversities, prospectively measured from preconception to age 5 on children's general health at age 5. The study analyses demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, food and nutrients intake, psycho-social, socio-economic and health-related exposures from both children's individual as well as parental experiences.
- Demonstrates a significant and independent association between preschoolers' measured BMI as well as waist circumference and their general health status.
- The study is limited by a relatively small sample and use of parent-reported health status.

MAIN TEXT

Introduction

The development of children is critical to their adult well-being^[1,2] and across the lifecourse even subjective estimates may be useful to reflect objectively measured health^[3,4]. Bronfenbrenner^[5] emphasised the importance of children's micro-ecosystem in their development. Recently, the World Health Organisation's (WHO) **Commission on Social Determinants of Health (CSDH)** presented a **Total Environment Assessment Model for Early Child Development (TEAM-ECD)**,^[6] which again illustrates the importance of individual and family spheres of influence on children's health. The relevance of socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle environment in child development and health is widely acknowledged.^[6-8] According to the lifecourse hypothesis, risk transmission is characterised by critical periods and accumulation of risk models.^[9] **Life Course Health Development (LCHD) framework^[10] suggests that health is a consequence of multiple determinants that change in context of time and circumstances as an individual develops; these experiences are programmed into bio-behavioural regulatory systems during certain critical and sensitive periods of individual's lifetime to decide their health trajectory. The lifecourse framework on childhood disadvantage and adult health^[11] suggests that parental and childhood circumstances from the point of conception influences individual's health in later life, and the individual's childhood health and later life circumstances may further add to this foundation.** Based on this, Hertzman and colleagues^[12] examined self-rated health in adulthood using an integrated lifecourse framework. There are a few other studies also which have examined lifecourse determinants of adult global^[13,14] or specific health status.^[15] On the contrary, the literature on the determinants of child global health status is sparse,^[16,17] particularly for the preschool-age children.^[18] Even rarer are studies whose examination includes early lifecourse determinants of child global health status.

1
2
3 Thus the first objective of our analysis was to prospectively examine the relationship between
4 demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, nutritional, psycho-social, socio-economic and
5 health-related lifecourse exposures taken from the children's individual and family spheres of
6 influence starting from preconception up to age 5-years and their global health status at
7 preschool-age.
8
9

10
11
12 In social epidemiology, the construct of "embodiment" refers to biological expression of
13 individuals' materio-social world.^[19,20] Similarly in lifecourse epidemiology, it is
14 hypothesised that early life experiences get "biologically embedded" during critical or
15 sensitive periods of child development leading to gradients in health.^[21,22]
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 The Foresight report identifies a large array of environmental determinants of obesity, a
25 number of which are again related to early child development.^[23] This suggests obesity as
26 pivotal risk factor for subsequent health conditions.^[24]
27
28
29
30

31 The negative relationship between obesity and self-rated health is now increasingly reported
32 in adult populations,^[25,26] some indicating a temporal relationship^[27,28] and suggesting that
33 obesity increases health inequalities over time.^[28] However, evidence on the relationship
34 between obesity and health is relatively limited in child population studies and those
35 available have reported health-related-quality-of-life (HR-QoL)^[29] instead of a generic
36 measure such as global self-rated health. Moreover, this association is yet to be established
37 for preschool-age children. To our knowledge just two population based studies have
38 examined this association in preschool age-group children^[30,31] and neither had nutritional
39 information.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children, Wake *et al.*^[30] did not find a significant
52 difference in global health status of overweight/obese and normal weight 4-5-year-old
53 children. Skinner *et al.*,^[31] using data on 3-5-year-olds from the US National Health and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Nutrition Examination Survey, reported a poorer global health status in obese and severely
4 obese preschoolers. Neither of these studies accounted for a number of possibly relevant
5 confounders, including parental BMI, parental health and nutritional variables.
6
7
8

9
10 We thus hypothesised that similar to findings from studies on older age-groups,
11 anthropometric markers of child obesity in our preschool-age children study would also
12 demonstrate a negative association with their global health status. The next objective of our
13 analysis was to examine whether anthropometric markers of child obesity would emerge as
14 strong predictors of global health status when accounted for other socio-economic, psycho-
15 social, and lifestyle environmental factors in a multivariable model.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Methods**

24
25 The Lifeways cross generation cohort study comprises three generations of 1082 Irish
26 families and was established in 2001-03; the recruitment procedure of this nationally
27 representative cohort has been described previously.^[32-34] The a priori purpose was to
28 examine familial and cross-generation influences on early childhood development over the
29 first five years of children's lives. Briefly, would-be mothers were at random recruited from
30 the two regional maternity hospitals in the Republic of Ireland to get a representative sample.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *A comparison between the Lifeways mothers and a nationally representative sample of*
41 *women of the same age group from the SLÁN (Survey of Lifestyle, Attitudes and Nutrition)*
42 *surveys of Republic of Ireland^[35] confirmed that the Lifeways mothers were satisfactorily*
43 *representative of the Irish general women on socio-demographic characteristics.^[33]*
44
45
46
47
48

49 At this early pregnancy stage mothers completed a health and lifestyle status questionnaire
50 adapted from a validated instrument developed for Irish national SLÁN surveys.^[35] Mothers
51 reported their pre-pregnancy height (cm) and weight (kg) and their smoking status during
52 pregnancy. Mothers' and partners' socio-economic status was recorded. Subsequently at
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 birth, the live infants were added to the cohort along-with maternity and birth related hospital
4 information.
5

6
7
8 In 2007-08, when these children averaged five years of age, the cohort follow-up recorded a
9 62% response rate.^[34,36] **Though mothers who responded to the follow-up were more likely to**
10 **be of higher socioeconomic status, these mothers** did not significantly differ in their baseline
11 **anthropometric characteristics (including BMI)** from non-responders.^[34,36] At this 5-year
12 follow-up, mothers repeated the health and lifestyle assessment questionnaire, with additional
13 questions related to her family, including a five-level likert item question “In general, would
14 you say your / your partner’s / your Lifeways child’s current health is Excellent, Very Good,
15 Good, Fair or Poor”. Mothers provided information on family’s socio-economic, psycho-
16 social, and lifestyle status. Mothers reported their habitual dietary intake for the previous year
17 on a semi-quantitative food frequency (SQFFQ) instrument developed from the EPIC study
18 (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition) and validated for Irish adult
19 population.^[37] Mothers also gave details for the Lifeways child’s habitual diet for the
20 previous year using a different SQFFQ instrument adapted from the UK National Diet and
21 Nutrition Survey of 4.5-year-old children.^[38] The mothers’ and children’s SQFFQ were
22 validated in the Lifeways study using a 7-day weighed food diary in a sub-sample.^[36] Food
23 items were aggregated by defined shelves (**food groups**) of the Irish food pyramid and
24 assessment was made for average servings per day of standard food item portions consumed
25 from the “top” and “fruit and vegetable” **food groups** (shelves of **Irish food pyramid**). The
26 “top” **food group** comprises of high calorie fat and sugar rich foods. Total energy (kcal) and
27 total fats (g) intake were computed using conversion values from McCance & Widdowson’s
28 food composition tables^[39] with a specially developed FFQ software version 1.0 ©.^[40]
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Mothers and children, and if available fathers, were offered at 5-year follow-up an
56 anthropometric assessment at their home for height (**cm**), weight (**kg**) and waist
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 circumference (cm) using a standardised protocol,^[34,36] with 80-85% mothers and children
4
5 participating. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated from weight and height information
6
7 (kg/m²).
8

9
10 Thus variables from discrete stages (pre-pregnancy, early pregnancy, at birth, early infancy
11
12 and 5-year follow-up) of child's early development representing lifecourse exposures from
13
14 distinct domains (demographic, anthropometric, socio-economic, psycho-social, lifestyle,
15
16 nutritional and health) of child's individual and family spheres of influence^[6-8] were
17
18 considered to analyse determinants of child's health status at age-5. The selection of
19
20 variables, domains and spheres of influence are based on the CSDH constructed TEAM-
21
22 ECD, a model of early child development.^[6-8] These lifecourse variables have been
23
24 summarised as per time frame in **Table 1**. This lifecourse time frame highlights the stages
25
26 and transition points relevant from perspective of child's health development.^[10] Additional
27
28 details on these variables are provided in **eTable 1** available in the web only supplement. The
29
30 independent variables have been arranged as child-related, family-related, mother-related,
31
32 father-related groups for ease of presentation.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Independent variables examined from lifecourse of 5-yr-old children

Lifecourse	Independent Variables
Pre-pregnancy	Maternal Pre-pregnancy BMI
Early pregnancy	Family stability Maternal smoking in pregnancy, Maternal Education level Paternal Education level
Birth	Child's Birth-weight, Gestational age, Gender Maternal Parity
Infancy	Child's breastfeeding status
When children averaged 5-yr age	Child's Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables food groups , Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake Family household weekly income, Entitlement to means tested healthcare benefits scheme, Family structure (marital status), Support from partner, parents, children & relatives Maternal Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables food groups , Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake, Self-rated health status Paternal Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Self-rated health status

Children's global health status rated in proxy by their mothers, hereafter referred to as parent-rated health (PRH), was the outcome variable of interest. The 5-graded scale response was dichotomised as relatively-positive health (excellent or very good) and relatively-negative health (poor or fair or good), based on similar dichotomisation in other studies on preschool and school children.^[17,18,30] It is reasonable to take a higher cut-off when dichotomising this age dependent variable in this very young age-group as there would be very limited numbers of poor or fair health children.^[17,18,41]

Initially, uni-variate associations were established between the independent predictors and children's PRH using independent t-tests or chi-square tests. Independent categorical variables were dichotomised in a manner that allowed contrasting extreme levels against the others. Thus, using International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) cut-offs, children's BMI was dichotomised as obese versus over-weight or normal-weight. Similarly nutrition variables ordered in quintiles were dichotomised as the extreme quintile (1st or 5th) versus the rest.

1
2
3 From these independent variables principally chosen on the basis of their relevance to the
4 child's development,^[6-8] all those that qualified at significance level 20% ($p < 0.2$)^[42] in
5 univariate analyses were force entered into a multivariable logistic regression model. BMI
6 (kg/m^2) and waist circumference (cm), the anthropometric markers of obesity, were tested
7 separately in independent multivariable models. Initially BMI was tested as a categorical
8 variable in a model, followed by two additional models substituting it with BMI and then
9 waist circumference as continuous variables. Other independent variables were tested as
10 categorical variables.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Ethical approval for the Lifeways study was obtained respectively from ethical committees of
22 participating hospitals and the University College Dublin, Ireland. Written informed consent
23 was obtained from study participants.
24
25
26
27

28 Results

29
30
31 There were 547 family datasets available for analysis of children's PRH. **Table 2** presents the
32 uni-variate associations between children's lifecourse variables and PRH. Within the
33 individual-sphere of influences, children's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary
34 foods and total fats, and higher intake of fruits/vegetables) and their anthropometric measures
35 at age-5 (not being obese, lower BMI, and lower waist circumference) qualified as
36 determinants of children's relatively-positive PRH for further examination in the
37 multivariable model.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In other words, retaining $p < 0.2$ as the criterion for significance, the children's healthy food
48 and nutrient intake habits – such as decreased intake of unhealthy fat- and sugar- rich foods
49 (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)] or total fats (g) in their meals
50 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] and increased intake of healthy fruits and vegetables
51 (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] were positively associated with their favourable
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 rating for health by their mothers. Conversely, children's increased BMI (kg/m²)
4 [OR(95%CI)=0.85(0.71-1.03)] and waist circumference (cm) [OR(95%CI)=0.95(0.88-1.02)]
5
6
7 were inversely associated with a positive parental-rated health status.
8
9

10 Within the family-sphere of influences, socio-economic status (higher household income,
11 non-entitlement to subsidised healthcare, both parents' higher education status, and father's
12 employment status), psycho-social status (father's study participation, mother's perceived
13 social support), mother's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary foods, total energy
14 and total fats), father's lifestyle behaviours (non-smoker), and both parents' health status
15 (relatively-positive self-rated health) qualified as determinants of children's relatively-
16 positive PRH for further examination in the multivariable model.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 In other words, by maintaining $p < 0.2$ as the criterion for significance, several indicators of a
27 family's better socio-economic status— such as increased household income (Euros/week)
28 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], not requiring subsidised healthcare [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)],
29 mother having a third level education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], father having a third level
30 education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], father being self-employed [OR(95%CI)=2.5(0.8-
31 7.9)]; family's better psycho-social status— such as father's involvement in family affairs
32 [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mother's perceiving a positive social support from spouse
33 [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], parents [OR(95%CI)=2.0(1.0-4.1)], children
34 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)], or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]; family's better lifestyle
35 and food and nutrient intake habits— such as mother's decreased intake of unhealthy fat- and
36 sugar- rich foods (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)], total energy (kcal)
37 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] and total fats (g) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)] in her meals, father's
38 not being a smoker [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]; and family's better health status— such as
39 mother [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)] and father [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)] having a positively
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 rated health status were positively associated with children's favourable rating for health by
4
5 their mothers.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=547)

	Relatively Negative PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		OR	95% CI
	N	(n=42) %(n) Mean (SD)	(n=505) %(n) Mean (SD)			
Child's Individual Characteristics						
Birth-weight adjusted for gestational age (g)	487	(34) 3564.1 (616)	(453) 3548.4 (552)	1.00	(0.999-1.001)	
Child's Age (Yrs)	547	(42) 5.42 (0.23)	(505) 5.46 (0.25)			
Gender	547					
Male		8.0% (22)	92.0% (242)	Ref		
Female		7.1% (21)	92.9% (262)	1.14	(0.60-2.20)	
BMI (kg/m ²)	464	(35) 17.09 (2.5)	(429) 16.59 (1.6)	0.85	(0.71-1.03) [^]	
BMI [IOTF]	464					
Obese		16.7% (5)	83.3% (25)	Ref		
Overweight / Normal		6.9% (30)	93.1% (404)	2.69	(0.96-7.54) [^]	
Waist Circumference (cm)	462	(35) 57.01 (6.8)	(427) 55.88 (4.3)	0.95	(0.88-1.02) [†]	
Height (cm)	464	(35) 111.6 (5.6)	(429) 112.1 (4.8)	1.02	(0.95-1.10)	
Breastfeeding	528					
Not breastfed		6.5% (16)	93.5% (229)	Ref		
Breastfed		8.8% (25)	91.2% (258)	0.72	(0.38-1.38)	
Energy (Kcal)	547					
Quintile 5 (>1794 kcal)		10% (11)	90.0% (99)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		7.1% (31)	92.9% (406)	1.46	(0.71-3.00)	
Fats (g)	547					
Quintile 5 (>62.9 g)		12.8% (14)	87.2% (95)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)	93.6% (410)	2.16	(1.09-4.26) [*]	
Top food group (servings/day)	547					
Quintile 5 (>6.47 servings)		10.9% (12)	89.1% (98)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)	93.1% (407)	1.66	(0.82-3.36) [†]	
Fruits Veg food group (servings/d)	547					
Quintile 1 (<2.1 servings)		12.8% (14)	87.2% (95)	Ref		
Quintile 2-5		6.4% (28)	93.6% (410)	2.16	(1.09-4.26) [*]	
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income	509					
Less than 760 Euros/wk		13.3% (26)	86.7% (170)	Ref		
More than 760 Euros/wk		4.8% (15)	95.2% (298)	3.04	(1.57-5.90) ^{**}	
Entitlement to General Medical Card	532					
Entitled		13% (12)	87.0% (80)	Ref		
Not entitled		6.6% (29)	93.4% (411)	2.13	(1.04-4.34) [*]	
Fathers' Participation	547					
Not		9.7% (31)	90.3% (290)	Ref		
Yes		4.9% (11)	95.1% (215)	2.09	(1.03-4.25) [*]	
Marital Status	542					
Others		11.4% (5)	88.6% (39)	Ref		
Married/Cohabiting		7.2% (36)	92.8% (462)	1.65	(0.61-4.43)	
Elder children in family (Parity)	535					
Nullipara		8% (18)	92.0% (207)	Ref		
Multipara		7.7% (24)	92.3% (286)	1.04	(0.55-1.96)	
Support from Spouse/Partner	538					
Lesser support		12.9% (17)	87.1% (115)	Ref		
More support		6.2% (25)	93.8% (381)	2.25	(1.18-4.32) [*]	
Support from Parents	487					
Lesser support		12.5% (12)	87.5% (84)	Ref		
More support		6.6% (26)	93.4% (365)	2.01	(0.97-4.14) [^]	
Support from Children	532					
Lesser support		10.6% (20)	89.4% (169)	Ref		
More support		5.8% (20)	94.2% (323)	1.91	(1.00-3.65) [*]	
Support from Close Relatives	510					
Lesser support		12.4% (19)	87.6% (134)	Ref		
More support		6.2% (22)	93.8% (335)	2.16	(1.13-4.12) [*]	

Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (continued)

	N	Relatively Negative PRH (n=42)		Relatively Positive PRH (n=505)		OR	95% CI
		%(n)	Mean (SD)	%(n)	Mean (SD)		
Maternal Characteristics							
Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	475	(36)	23.3 (3.3)	(439)	23.8 (3.9)	1.04	(0.94-1.14)
Pre-pregnancy BMI [WHO cut offs]							
Obese		2.6% (1)		97.4% (38)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		8% (35)		92.0% (401)		0.30	(0.04-2.26)
Mother's Age (Yrs)	546	(42)	36.5 (6.3)	(504)	37.1 (5.3)	1.02	(0.96-1.08)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	432		25.6 (3.9)		26.3 (5.0)	1.03	(0.95-1.12)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up [WHO cut offs]	432						
Obese		7.2% (5)		92.8% (64)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		7.4% (27)		92.6% (336)		0.97	(0.36-2.62)
Waist Circumference (cm)	434	(31)	85.3 (10.6)	(403)	87.6 (11.9)	1.02	(0.99-1.05)
Height (cm)	454	(33)	161.9 (6.8)	(421)	162.9 (6.0)	1.03	(0.97-1.09)
Smoking in pregnancy	534						
Smoker		8.1% (8)		91.9% (91)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (33)		92.4% (402)		1.07	(0.48-2.4)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	541						
Smoker		7.6% (9)		92.4% (110)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (32)		92.4% (390)		1.0	(0.46-2.15)
Energy (Kcal)	546						
Quintile 5 (>2570.9 kcal)		13% (14)		87.0% (94)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)		93.6% (410)		2.18	(1.11-4.30)*
Fats (g)	546						
Quintile 5 (>106 g)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (407)		1.68	(0.83-3.40)†
Top food group (servings/day)	545						
Quintile 5 (>8.35 servings)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (406)		1.67	(0.83-3.39)†
Fruits Veg food group (servings/day)	546						
Quintile 1 (<4.5 servings)		9.1% (10)		90.9% (100)		Ref	
Quintile 2-5		7.3% (32)		92.7% (404)		1.26	(0.60-2.65)
Education level	534						
Lower		10.4% (25)		89.6% (215)		Ref	
Third Level		5.8% (17)		94.2% (277)		1.90	(1.00-3.60)*
Employment	545						
Not Earning		6.4% (15)		93.6% (221)		Ref	
Employed		9% (22)		91.0% (222)		0.69	(0.35-1.36)
Self employed		7.7% (5)		92.3% (60)		0.81	(0.29-2.33)
Self reported health	546						
Relatively Negative		17.1% (27)		82.9% (131)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		3.9% (15)		96.1% (373)		5.10	(2.64-9.93)**
Paternal Characteristics							
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	66	(4)		(62)		0.97	(0.76-1.23)
Waist Circumference (cm)	65	(3)		(62)		1.01	(0.90-1.13)
Height (cm)	66	(4)		(62)		1.01	(0.88-1.15)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	521						
Smoker		11.5% (16)		88.5% (123)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		5.5% (21)		94.5% (361)		2.24	(1.13-4.42)*
Education level	514						
Lower		11.1% (16)		88.9% (128)		Ref	
Third Level		6.2% (23)		93.8% (347)		1.89	(0.97-3.68)^
Employment	518						
Not Earning		9.2% (8)		90.8% (79)		Ref	
Employed		7.9% (24)		92.1% (279)		1.18	(0.51-2.72)
Self employed		3.9% (5)		96.1% (123)		2.49	(0.79-7.89)†
Self reported health	510						
Relatively Negative		12.6% (20)		87.4% (139)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		4.6% (16)		95.4% (335)		3.01	(1.52-5.99)**

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, ^p<0.1, †p<0.2; Ref=reference category (OR=1)

1
2
3 **Table 3** presents the multivariable model for association between qualifying lifecourse
4 variables and children's relatively-positive PRH at age-5. A significantly strong predictor of
5 children's relatively-positive PRH was child's not being obese by IOTF classification
6 [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)]. When BMI was tested as a continuous variable, there was 0.73
7 (95%CI=0.58-0.93) times **decreased odds** of the child being positively rated on health status
8 for every 1 kg/m² increase in their BMI. Similarly in the waist circumference model, for
9 every 1 cm increase there was 0.89 (95%CI=0.81-0.98) times **decreased odds** of the child
10 getting a relatively-positive rating on health status. **Thus the association between children's**
11 **BMI or waist circumference and their PRH only strengthened following adjustments in this**
12 **multivariate model, irrespective of being analysed as a categorical or continuous variable.**
13 Another significant predictor of children's relatively-positive PRH was mother's having rated
14 her own health as relatively-positive. These predictors maintained the highest strength of
15 association with children's health status when independent variables were standardised (**not**
16 **reported here**). None of the other variables reached the level of statistical significance. The
17 models explained over 25 percent of variance for children's PRH.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3: Multivariable Logistic Regression model for predictors of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=303)

	Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH	
	BMI Categorical ¹		BMI Continuous ²		WC Continuous ³	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Child's Individual Characteristics						
BMI [IOTF], Obese ⁺ vs Overweight / Normal	5.48	(1.43-21.03) *				
BMI kg/m ² [Continuous]			0.73	(0.58-0.93) **		
Waist Circumference cm [Continuous]					0.89	(0.81-0.98) *
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.57	(0.42-5.79)	1.49	(0.40-5.53)	1.32	(0.36-4.80)
Top food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.23	(0.33-4.53)	1.30	(0.36-4.63)	1.29	(0.36-4.62)
Fruits Veg food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q1 ⁺ vs Q2-5	2.57	(0.75-8.80)	2.86	(0.83-9.93)	2.73	(0.78-9.49)
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income, Less ⁺ vs High	1.85	(0.63-5.40)	1.76	(0.59-5.21)	1.79	(0.61-5.26)
Entitlement to General Medical, Card Yes ⁺ vs No	0.94	(0.24-3.71)	1.03	(0.26-4.07)	1.04	(0.26-4.10)
Fathers' Participation, Not ⁺ vs Yes	1.88	(0.68-5.21)	1.86	(0.67-5.16)	2.06	(0.74-5.71)
Support from Spouse/Partner, Less ⁺ vs More	0.70	(0.20-2.49)	0.67	(0.19-2.33)	0.74	(0.22-2.52)
Support from Parents, Less ⁺ vs More	1.92	(0.53-6.93)	2.33	(0.64-8.42)	2.37	(0.66-8.53)
Support from Children, Less ⁺ vs More	1.15	(0.38-3.45)	1.29	(0.42-3.91)	1.25	(0.41-3.82)
Support from Close Relatives, Less ⁺ vs More	0.86	(0.23-3.13)	0.84	(0.24-3.02)	0.84	(0.23-3.01)
Maternal Characteristics						
Energy Kcal [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.89	(0.30-11.84)	2.00	(0.31-12.86)	1.57	(0.28-8.84)
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	0.72	(0.09-5.54)	0.59	(0.07-4.77)	0.92	(0.13-6.41)
Top food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.08	(0.29-3.94)	1.30	(0.36-4.65)	1.18	(0.32-4.34)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	1.34	(0.47-3.78)	1.35	(0.48-3.80)	1.48	(0.53-4.13)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	4.20	(1.45-12.20) **	4.42	(1.53-12.79) **	4.17	(1.47-11.87) **
Paternal Characteristics						
Current Smoking status, Yes ⁺ vs No	1.37	(0.48-3.93)	1.31	(0.45-3.83)	1.53	(0.54-4.35)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	0.69	(0.21-2.28)	0.79	(0.24-2.57)	0.83	(0.26-2.67)
Employment, Non-earning ⁺ vs Self employed	1.60	(0.73-3.53)	1.52	(0.69-3.32)	1.57	(0.70-3.53)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	1.48	(0.52-4.20)	1.54	(0.54-4.35)	1.43	(0.51-3.96)

OR=Odds Ratio; ⁺Reference category (OR=1); **p<0.01 (2-tailed), *p<0.05 (2-tailed)

Rel.Negative=Relatively Negative, Rel.Positive=Relatively Positive

¹Child BMI as a categorical variable; Model Chi-sq = 34.2, df = 21, p = 0.034; -2LL = 128.6, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.26

²Child BMI as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 35.9, df = 21, p = 0.022; -2LL = 126.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.27

³Child waist circumference as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 33.8, df = 21, p = 0.038; -2LL = 128.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.25

Discussion

This analysis showed that determinants from both child's individual and family spheres have an influence on child's health at preschool-age. The factors from all three material, psycho-social and lifestyle domains, the major explanations for child health inequalities,^[8] were associated at uni-variate levels. However, in the final model this analysis clearly demonstrated a negative association between child's obesity and health status. Child's not being obese was one of the significantly strong predictors of child's relatively-positive health status, which was also observed with measured BMI and waist circumference analysed as continuous variables.

This negative relationship observed between measured obesity and PRH conforms to published literature on primary school age-group children and adolescents.^[43-45] Most importantly, for the first time to our knowledge, this analysis demonstrates the association having adjusted for food and nutrient intake, along-with a wide range of other explanatory variables.

Self-rated health is an important and valid measure of morbidity, mortality, longevity and health status,^[3,4] also in Irish adult^[46,47] and children.^[16] It is believed to be a more inclusive measure of health than the objective measurements, with a capacity to comprehensively evaluate health dynamics, behaviours and psycho-physiological states that are not otherwise easy to measure.^[3] This holistic measure better accommodates the WHO defined concept of health as opposed to a diagnosed specific disease.^[3] Use of parent proxy for child self-reported health is justified for children too young to have adequate cognitive skills.^[48,49] Systematic reviews report good agreement between ratings by children and their parents on child HRQoL, particularly for physical health domain.^[48-50] Parents tend to be thoughtful when responding to proxy questions and report children's usual health disposition.^[51] Studies on construct validity report positively.^[52-55] Maternal ratings of child's general health status were found sensitive when validated against children's illnesses and other morbidity or healthcare indicators,^[41,56-58] including evidence of a gradient in strength of these associations.^[41] Many national-level studies have accepted parent proxy as an

1
2
3 appropriate measure^[17,18,59,60] and successfully used it to longitudinally demonstrate risk and
4
5 consequences of child health.^[17,59]
6

7
8 Self-rated health, a composite measure, represents all domains of HR-QoL,^[4] but better represents
9
10 physical health than HR-QoL.^[61] Studies on older age-group children have reported stronger/sole
11
12 negative associations for general/physical health domain of HR-QoL and obesity,^[44,62] irrespective
13
14 whether children themselves or parents reported their HRQoL,^[29] and also whether BMI was
15
16 analysed as a categorical,^[43,44] or continuous variable.^[63,64]
17

18
19 Another relevance of this analysis is in demonstrating this association of obesity with general-
20
21 health in a nationally representative sample of preschool-age children, for which literature is scant.
22
23 Though, a few have shown similar association of obesity with specific paediatric conditions or
24
25 admission history in this age-group.^[30,31,65-68] A longitudinal study speculated that pre-school
26
27 obesity influences a decline in early-age health, and then both obesity and poor-health tracks into
28
29 adolescence.^[69] The WHO recommends high priority for determinants of health inequalities during
30
31 early development.^[70]
32
33

34
35 The Lifeways previously demonstrated longitudinal association between parental socio-economic
36
37 and lifestyle characteristics and child's BMI and waist circumference.^[36] In this analysis when
38
39 same anthropometric measures are included along-with material, psycho-social, and lifestyle
40
41 determinants of child obesity and health, a prominent relationship emerges between children's
42
43 anthropometric measures and health status. One possible explanation is that determinants of health
44
45 inequalities biologically embed^[21,22] in early life and child obesity is an early phenotypic
46
47 expression of this inequality; though the continued influence of environmental factors is not
48
49 undermined. Adult^[25,26] and adolescence studies^[44,45] have also shown this association to be
50
51 independent of socio-demographic, lifestyle or health-related factors.
52
53
54

55
56 The observed association between BMI or waist circumference and PRH in the present analysis
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may be temporal, as demonstrated in adults.^[27,28] Though a number of large scale cross sectional
4
5 studies have shown an association between anthropometric measures of obesity and self rated
6
7 health,^[71] only recently a few nationally representative prospective studies have established the
8
9 temporality of this association in adults.^[27,28] Though this relationship maybe bi-directional to an
10
11 extent,^[72,73] the mounting evidence from longitudinal birth cohort studies regarding a sequential
12
13 relationship between lifetime growth trajectories and adult disease, disability and deaths^[2]
14
15 primarily rules out reverse causality in this association and suggests that the association observed
16
17 in our birth cohort is also more likely to be temporal. Moreover, the available findings from a few
18
19 longitudinal studies on primary school age children suggest that at least in the childhood this
20
21 inverse association found between BMI and HRQoL is predominantly in the given direction and
22
23 not the reverse.^[74,75] However, this needs careful interpretation as both anthropometric and health
24
25 data were concurrently collected, and this limitation may be addressed with next sweep of cohort
26
27 data collection.
28
29
30

31
32 This analysis demonstrated that maternal health was strongly predictive of her child's health. One
33
34 concern is that mother's perception of her own health may bias her perception of her child's
35
36 health. However, this intergenerational association has been previously reported,^[41,56,57,76-79] and
37
38 reporting mothers can effectively discriminate between their own and children's
39
40 health.^[41,56,57,77,78,80] Several mechanisms such as inherited susceptibility, uterine environment and
41
42 shared environment have been suggested for this familial aggregation pattern.^[56,77,78]
43
44
45

46
47 Maternal BMI may be related to both maternal self-rated health and child's BMI, so the observed
48
49 associations in this analysis could possibly be a reflection of an association between maternal BMI
50
51 and child's PRH. However, this was not observed in our analysis. Maternal BMI at both pre-
52
53 pregnancy and 5-year follow-up were not associated with child's PRH at univariate level. Also,
54
55 when maternal BMI was forcibly added into the multivariable model (not reported here), the
56
57 observed associations did not attenuate.
58
59
60

1
2
3 The study has limitations in use of reported rather than measured health status and a relatively
4 small sample size. Though the study was able to detect the major explanatory domains for child
5 health inequalities documented in the literature^[8], the relatively small sample size of this study
6 may possibly have underpowered it to detect variables with lesser effect sizes. The complete case
7 approach to analysis reduced the sample size of the final multivariate model. However, this
8 missing data was not systematic but rather on account of accumulation of missing completely at
9 random data across a number of variables. It may be argued that the reduced sample size possibly
10 influenced the odds ratio estimate for the association between children's relatively-positive PRH
11 and the child's not being obese (using a categorical IOTF classification). Nonetheless this
12 association between children's anthropometric measures and their parent-rated health variable is
13 likely to be coherent, because these associations remain statistically significant even when BMI
14 and WC are analysed as continuous variables.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 As in most birth cohort studies,^[81,82] the Lifeways birth cohort also experienced the attrition of
31 mothers belonging to lower socio-economic status in the early stages of the study. Though this
32 may underestimate some socioeconomic inequalities^[83], it does not negate the exposure-outcome
33 associations detected through regression models of such longitudinal studies^[84,85].

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Nevertheless, this study has advantages in use of lifecourse variables from pre-conception to age
of 5-years, with measured BMI and waist circumference data. It also has detailed foods and
nutrient data along-with other socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle variables for child and
both parents.

In conclusion, these analyses from the Lifeways cohort show that lifecourse adversities were
associated with mother-reported health for preschoolers, suggesting an early life influence.
Preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference demonstrated strong negative associations with
mother-reported health independent of socio-economic, psycho-social, and lifestyle factors,
suggesting early biological expression of lifecourse adversities. The findings have important

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

implications in understanding how early life environment may create inequalities in developmental health.

For peer review only

Footnotes

Acknowledgements

The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study is overseen by an interdisciplinary scientific steering group chaired by CCK, the principal investigator. The authors greatly appreciate the participation of the Lifeways cohort families.

Contributors

AS undertook all analyses reported in this manuscript, interpreted the findings and drafted the manuscript. CM contributed to data collection at five year follow-up, interpretation of the analysis and critical revision of the manuscript. CCK designed the study, supervised the analyses, interpretation of results and intellectual content of the manuscript. All three authors approved the final version.

Funding

The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study was established as part of European Science Foundation funded 'Social Variations in Health Expectancy in Europe' international research programme and its various sweeps have been funded by the Health Research Board of Ireland. Funding sources had no involvement in design, collection, analysis, interpretation, writing and submission of this manuscript.

Competing interests

None

Ethical approvals

Ethics committees of Coombe University Hospital, Dublin, University College Hospital Galway, University College Dublin, Dublin, and the Irish College of General Practitioners, Ireland.

Data sharing statement

There are no additional data available. The data manager may be contacted at john.obrien@ucd.ie for more details on the Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study.

Appendices

The web only supplement includes eTable 1 regarding details of examined variables and eTable 2 displaying standardised odds ratios for multivariable logistic regression model.

REFERENCES

1. Barker DJ. Sir Richard Doll Lecture. Developmental origins of chronic disease. *Public Health* 2012;**126**(3):185-9.
2. Power CI, Kuh D, Morton S. From developmental origins of adult disease to life course research on adult disease and aging: insights from birth cohort studies. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2013;**34**:7-28.
3. Benyamini Y. Self-ratings of health and longevity: a health psychologist's viewpoint on epidemiological findings. *The European Health Psychologist* 2008;**10**:10–13.
4. Bjorner J, Fayers P, Idler E. Self-rated health. In: Fayers PM, Hays RD, eds. *Assessing quality of life in clinical trials: methods and practice*. 2nd edn. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005:309-24.
5. Bronfenbrenner U. Ecological models of human development. In: Postlethwaite TN, Husen T, eds. *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Vol 3. 2nd ed. Oxford, England: Elsevier Sciences, Ltd., 1994: 1643-47.
6. Siddiqi A, Irwin LG, Hertzman C. Total environment assessment model for early child development. Evidence report for the WHO commission on social determinants of health. World Health Organization, 2007.
http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/ecd_kn_evidence_report_2007.pdf
(accessed March 30, 2012).

- 1
2
3 7. Maggi S, Irwin LJ, Siddiqi A, *et al.* The social determinants of early child development: an
4
5 overview. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2010;**46**(11):627-35.
6
7
- 8
9
10 8. Hertzman C, Li J, Mattes E, *et al.* Social determinants of child health and well-being
11
12 [Editorial]. *Health Sociology Review* 2009;**18**(1):3-11.
13
- 14
15
16 9. Ben-Shlomo Y, Kuh D. A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology:
17
18 conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. *Int J Epidemiol*
19
20 2002;**31**(2):285-93.
21
22
- 23
24
25 10. Halfon N, Hochstein M. Life course health development: an integrated framework for
26
27 developing health, policy, and research. *Milbank Q* 2002; **80**(3):433-79, iii.
28
29
- 30
31
32 11. Graham H, and Power Chris. *Childhood disadvantage and adult health: a lifecourse*
33
34 *framework*. London: NHS Health Development Agency, 2004.
35
36 http://www.gserve.nice.org.uk/niceMedia/pdf/childhood_disadvantage_health.pdf
37
38 (accessed May 24, 2014).
39
40
- 41
42
43 12. Hertzman C, Power C, Matthews S, *et al.* Using an interactive framework of society and
44
45 lifecourse to explain self-rated health in early adulthood. *Soc Sci Med* 2001;**53**(12):1575-
46
47 85.
48
49
- 50
51
52 13. Mensah FK, Hobcraft J. Childhood deprivation, health and development: associations with
53
54 adult health in the 1958 and 1970 British prospective birth cohort studies. *J Epidemiol*
55
56 *Community Health* 2008;**62**(7):599-606.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 14. Kestila L, Koskinen S, Martelin T, *et al*. Determinants of health in early adulthood: what is
6 the role of parental education, childhood adversities and own education ? *Eur J Public*
7
8 *Health* 2006;**16**(3):305-14.
9
10
11
12
13
14 15. Pollitt R, Rose K, Kaufman J. Evaluating the evidence for models of life course
15 socioeconomic factors and cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review. *BMC Public*
16 *Health* 2005;**5**(1):7.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 16. Kelleher CC, Tay J, Gabhainn SN. Influence on self-rated health of socio-demographic,
24 lifestyle and affluence factors: an analysis of the Irish and international health behaviours
25 among school-aged children (HBSC) datasets 1998. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 43-6.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 17. Stein RE, Siegel MJ, Bauman LJ. Double jeopardy: what social risk adds to biomedical
33 risk in understanding child health and health care utilization. *Acad Pediatr* 2010;**10**(3):165-
34 71.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 18. Stevens GD. Gradients in the health status and developmental risks of young children: the
42 combined influences of multiple social risk factors. *Matern Child Health J* 2006;**10**(2):187-
43 99.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 19. Krieger N. Theories for social epidemiology in the 21st century: an ecosocial perspective.
51 *Int J Epidemiol* 2001;**30**(4):668-77.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 20. Krieger N. A glossary for social epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
4 2001;**55**(10):693-700.
5
6
7
8
9
10 21. Hertzman C. The biological embedding of early experience and its effects on health in
11 adulthood. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1999;**896**(1):85-95.
12
13
14
15
16 22. Hertzman C, Boyce T. How experience gets under the skin to create gradients in
17 developmental health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2010;**31**:329-47 C1-C3.
18
19
20
21
22
23 23. Butland B, Jebb S, Kopelman P, *et al.* Foresight. Tackling obesities: future choices —
24 Project report. London: Government Office for Science, 2007.
25
26
27 <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/foresight/docs/obesity/17.pdf> (accessed March 30, 2012).
28
29
30
31
32 24. Aboderin I, Kalache A, Ben-Shlomo Y, *et al.* Life course perspectives on coronary heart
33 disease, stroke and diabetes: key issues and implications for policy and research. Geneva:
34 World Health Organization, 2002.
35
36
37 http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2002/WHO_NMH_NPH_02.1.pdf (accessed March 30, 2012).
38
39
40
41
42
43 25. Molarius A, Berglund K, Eriksson C, *et al.* Socioeconomic conditions, lifestyle factors, and
44 self-rated health among men and women in Sweden. *Eur J Public Health* 2007;**17**(2):125-
45 33.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 26. Prosper M-H, Moczulski VL, Qureshi A. Obesity as a predictor of self-rated health. *Am J*
53 *Health Behav* 2009;**33**(3):319-29.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 27. Svedberg P, Bardage C, Sandin S, *et al.* A prospective study of health, life-style and
4 psychosocial predictors of self-rated health. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2006;**21**(10):767-76.
5
6
7
8
9
10 28. Zajacova A, Burgard SA. Body weight and health from early to mid-adulthood: a
11 longitudinal analysis. *J Health Soc Behav* 2010;**51**(1):92-107.
12
13
14
15
16 29. Tsiros MD, Olds T, Buckley JD, *et al.* Health-related quality of life in obese children and
17 adolescents. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2009;**33**(4):387-400.
18
19
20
21
22
23 30. Wake M, Hardy P, Sawyer MG, *et al.* Comorbidities of overweight/obesity in Australian
24 preschoolers: a cross-sectional population study. *Arch Dis Child* 2008;**93**(6):502-07.
25
26
27
28
29
30 31. Skinner AC, Perrin EM, Steiner MJ. Healthy for now? A cross-sectional study of the
31 comorbidities in obese preschool children in the United States. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*
32 2010;**49**(7):648-55.
33
34
35
36
37
38 32. O'Mahony D, Fallon UB, Hannon F, *et al.* The Lifeways Cross-Generation Study: design,
39 recruitment and data management considerations. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 3-6.
40
41
42
43
44
45 33. Niedhammer I, O'Mahony D, Daly S, *et al.* Occupational predictors of pregnancy outcomes
46 in Irish working women in the Lifeways cohort. *BJOG* 2009;**116**(7):943-52.
47
48
49
50
51
52 34. Murrin CM, Kelly GE, Tremblay RE, *et al.* Body mass index and height over three
53 generations: evidence from the Lifeways Cross-Generational Cohort Study. *BMC Public*
54 *Health* 2012;**12**:81.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 35. National Nutrition Surveillance Centre. Dietary habits of the Irish population: results from
6
7 SLÁN, Annual Report 2003. Dublin: National Nutritional Surveillance Centre, Department
8
9 of Public Health Medicine and Epidemiology, University College Dublin, Dublin and
10
11 Health Promotion Unit, Department of Health and Children, Dublin, 2003.
12
13
14
15
16 36. Murrin C. Maternal factors during pregnancy contributing to early life risk of childhood
17
18 obesity [PhD Thesis]. Dublin: University College Dublin, 2011.
19
20
21
22
23 37. Harrington J. Validation of a food frequency questionnaire as a tool for assessing nutrient
24
25 intake [MA Thesis]. Galway: National University of Ireland, 1997.
26
27
28
29
30 38. Gregory J, Collins D, Davies P, *et al.* National Diet and Nutrition Survey: children aged
31
32 1.5 - 4.5 years. Volume 1: Report of the diet and nutrition survey. London: HMSO, 1995.
33
34
35
36 39. Food Standards Agency. McCance and Widdowson's The composition of foods, sixth
37
38 summary edition. Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry, 2002.
39
40
41
42
43 40. FFQ_Software version 1.0. Dublin: National Nutrition Surveillance Centre, School of
44
45 Public Health and Population Science, University College Dublin, 2007.
46
47
48
49 41. Monette S, Séguin L, Gauvin L, *et al.* Validation of a measure of maternal perception of
50
51 the child's health status. *Child Care Health Dev* 2007;**33**(4):472-81.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
42. Katz MH. *Multivariable analysis: a practical guide for clinicians and public health researchers*. 3rd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
43. Wake M, Salmon L, Waters E, *et al*. Parent-reported health status of overweight and obese Australian primary school children: a cross-sectional population survey. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2002;**26**(5): 717-24.
44. Swallen KC, Reither EN, Haas SA, *et al*. Overweight, obesity, and health-related quality of life among adolescents: the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Pediatrics* 2005;**115**(2):340-47.
45. Vingilis ER, Wade TJ, Seeley JS. Predictors of adolescent self-rated health. Analysis of the National Population Health Survey. *Can J Public Health* 2002;**93**(3):193-97.
46. Kelleher CC, Whelan J, Daly L, *et al*. Socio-demographic, environmental, lifestyle and psychosocial factors predict self rated health in Irish Travellers, a minority nomadic population. *Health Place* 2012;**18**(2):330-38.
47. Kelleher CC, Friel S, Nic Gabhainn S, *et al*. Socio-demographic predictors of self-rated health in the Republic of Ireland: findings from the National Survey on Lifestyle, Attitudes and Nutrition, SLAN. *Soc Sci Med* 2003;**57**(3):477-86.
48. Eiser C, Morse R. Can parents rate their child's health-related quality of life? Results of a systematic review. *Qual Life Res* 2001;**10**(4):347-57.

- 1
2
3 49. Upton P, Lawford J, Eiser C. Parent-child agreement across child health-related quality of
4
5 life instruments: a review of the literature. *Qual Life Res* 2008;**17**(6):895-913.
6
7
8
9
10 50. Norrby U, Nordholm L, Fasth A. Reliability and validity of the swedish version of child
11 health questionnaire. *Scand J Rheumatol* 2003;**32**(2):101-7.
12
13
14
15
16 51. Davis E, Nicolas C, Waters E, *et al*. Parent-proxy and child self-reported health-related
17 quality of life: using qualitative methods to explain the discordance. *Qual Life Res*
18 2007;**16**(5):863-71.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 52. Theunissen NC, Vogels TG, Koopman HM, *et al*. The proxy problem: child report versus
26 parent report in health-related quality of life research. *Qual Life Res* 1998;**7**(5):387-97.
27
28
29
30
31
32 53. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Parent proxy-report of their children's health-
33 related quality of life: an analysis of 13,878 parents' reliability and validity across age
34 subgroups using the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*
35 2007;**5**:2.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 54. Spencer NJ, Coe C. The development and validation of a measure of parent-reported child
44 health and morbidity: the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile. *Child Care Health*
45 *Dev* 1996;**22**(6):367-79.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 55. Spencer NJ, Coe C. Validation of the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile in
53 routine child health surveillance. *Child Care Health Dev* 2000;**26**(4):323-36.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 56. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Workman-Daniels K, *et al.* Maternal rating of child
4 health at school age: does the vulnerable child syndrome persist ? *Pediatrics*
5 1993;**92**(3):380-88.
6
7
8
9
10
11 57. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Shorter T, *et al.* Factors associated with maternal rating
12 of infant health in central Harlem. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 1989;**10**(3):139-44.
13
14
15
16
17
18 58. McCormick MC, Athreya BH, Bernbaum JC, *et al.* Preliminary observations on maternal
19 rating of health of children: data from three subspecialty clinics. *J Clin Epidemiol*
20 1988;**41**(4):323-29.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 59. Lynch JL. Infant health, race/ethnicity, and early educational outcomes using the ECLS-B.
28 *Sociol Inq* 2011;**81**(4):499-526.
29
30
31
32
33
34 60. Gilman SE, McCormick MC. Insights from life course epidemiology. *Acad Pediatr*
35 2010;**10**(3):159-60.
36
37
38
39
40
41 61. Smith KW, Avis NE, Assmann SF. Distinguishing between quality of life and health status
42 in quality of life research: a meta-analysis. *Qual Life Res* 1999;**8**(5):447-59.
43
44
45
46
47 62. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Singer S, Pilpel N, *et al.* Health-related quality of life among children
48 and adolescents: associations with obesity. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2006;**30**(2):267-72.
49
50
51
52
53
54 63. Williams J, Wake M, Hesketh K, *et al.* Health-related quality of life of overweight and
55 obese children. *JAMA* 2005;**293**(1):70-6.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 64. de Beer M, Hofsteenge GH, Koot HM, *et al.* Health-related-quality-of-life in obese
6 adolescents is decreased and inversely related to BMI. *Acta Paediatr* 2007;**96**(5):710-14.
7
8
9
10
11 65. Shibli R, Rubin L, Akons H, *et al.* Morbidity of overweight (≥ 85 th percentile) in the first 2
12 years of life. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**(2):267-72.
13
14
15
16
17 66. Suglia SF, Chambers EC, Rosario A, *et al.* Asthma and obesity in three-year-old urban
18 children: role of sex and home environment. *J Pediatr* 2011;**159**(1):14-20.e11.
19
20
21
22
23 67. Tai A, Volkmer R, Burton A. Association between asthma symptoms and obesity in
24 preschool (4-5 year old) children. *J Asthma* 2009;**46**(4):362-65.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 68. Slining M, Adair LS, Goldman BD, *et al.* Infant overweight is associated with delayed
32 motor development. *J Pediatr* 2010;**157**(1):20-5.e21.
33
34
35
36
37 69. Williams JW, Canterford L, Hesketh KD, *et al.* Changes in body mass index and health
38 related quality of life from childhood to adolescence. *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2011;**6**(2-2):e442-
39 e448.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 70. Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, *et al.* Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through
48 action on the social determinants of health. *Lancet* 2008;**372**(9650):1661-69.
49
50
51
52
53 71. Imai K, Gregg EW, Chen YJ, Zhang P, *et al.* The association of BMI with functional status
54 and self-rated health in US adults. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2008;**16**(2):402-8.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 72. Simonsen MK, Hundrup YA, Grønbaek M, *et al.* A prospective study of the association
6 between weight changes and self-rated health. *BMC Womens Health* 2008;**8**:13.
7
8
9
10
11
12 73. Cameron AJ, Magliano DJ, Dunstan DW, *et al.* A bi-directional relationship between
13 obesity and health-related quality of life: evidence from the longitudinal AusDiab study. *Int*
14 *J Obes (Lond)* 2012;**36**(2):295-303.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 74. Sawyer MG, Harchak T, Wake M, *et al.* Four-year prospective study of BMI and mental
22 health problems in young children. *Pediatrics* 2011;**128**(4):677-84.
23
24
25
26
27
28 75. Jansen PW, Mensah FK, Clifford S, *et al.* Bidirectional associations between overweight
29 and health-related quality of life from 4-11 years: Longitudinal Study of Australian
30 Children. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2013;**37**(10):1307-13.
31
32
33
34
35
36 76. Coneus K, Spiess CK. The intergenerational transmission of health in early childhood -
37 evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study. *Econ Hum Biol* 2012;**10**(1):89-
38 97.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 77. Case A, Lubotsky D, Paxson C. Economic status and health in childhood: the origins of the
46 gradient. *Am Econ Rev* 2002;**92**(5):1308-34.
47
48
49
50
51
52 78. Silburn SR, Zubrick SR, Garton A, *et al.* Western Australia Child Health Survey: family
53 and community health. Perth, Western Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics and the
54 TVW Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, 1996.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 79. Waters E, Doyle J, Wolfe R, *et al.* Influence of parental gender and self-reported health and
6 illness on parent-reported child health. *Pediatrics* 2000;**106**(6):1422-28.
7
8
9
10
11
12 80. Dadds MR, Stein RE, Silver EJ. The role of maternal psychological adjustment in the
13 measurement of children's functional status. *J Pediatr Psychol* 1995;**20**(4):527-44.
14
15
16
17
18 81. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, *et al.* Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index
19 offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol*
20 2013;**42**(1):111-27.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 82. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, *et al.* Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal
28 Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. *Int J Epidemiol* 2013;**42**(1):97-
29 110.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 83. Howe L, Galobardes B, Tilling K, *et al.* Does drop-out from cohort studies bias estimates
37 of socioeconomic inequalities in health? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2011;**65**:A31.
38
39
40
41
42
43 84. Wolke D, Waylen A, Samara M, *et al.* Selective drop-out in longitudinal studies and non-
44 biased prediction of behaviour disorders. *Br J Psychiatry* 2009;**195**(3):249-56.
45
46
47
48
49 85. Nilsen RM, Vollset SE, Gjessing HK, *et al.* Self-selection and bias in a large prospective
50 pregnancy cohort in Norway. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 2009;**23**(6):597-608.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

LICENCE FOR PUBLICATION STATEMENT

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Group and co-owners or contracting owning societies (where published by the BMJ Group on their behalf), and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in any BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

For peer review only

eTable 1: Lifecourse variables examined for relationship with children's parent-rated health, PRH

Independent Variables	Time	Categories
Child's Individual characteristics		
<i>Demographic and Anthropometric</i>		
Birth-weight standardised for gestational age (g)	Measured at birth	continuous measure
Age at 5-year follow-up (years)	At 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Gender		Male, Female
Body Mass Index (BMI) kg/m ²	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using IOTF definitions
Waist Circumference (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Height (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
<i>Lifestyle/Nutrition</i>		
Breastfeeding	At infancy	breastfed or not
Top food group servings per day	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>6.47 servings) versus 1-4 Quintiles.
Fruits & Vegetables food group servings /day	At 5-yr follow-up	1 st Quintile (<2.1 servings) versus 2-5 Quintiles
Total Energy intake (kilocalories/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>1794 kcal) versus 1-4 Quintiles
Total Fats intake (grams/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>62.9g) versus 1-4 Quintiles
Family characteristics		
<i>Socio-Economic</i>		
Household weekly income	At 5-yr follow-up	composite family income more or less than 760 Euros a week
Entitlement to General Medical Card scheme, a means tested healthcare benefits scheme	At 5-yr follow-up	Families entitled or not to General Medical Card
<i>Psycho-Social</i>		
Fathers' participation (Family stability)	Early pregnancy stage	Families whose fathers participated in the study versus families whose fathers did not
Mother's marital status (Family structure)	At 5-yr follow-up	Married or cohabiting versus single, separated, divorced or widowed.
Elder children in family [Parity was a proxy measure for presence of elder siblings to the Lifeways child]	Early pregnancy stage	nullipara versus one or more para
Support from spouse or partner	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived "a lot" of support from spouse or partners versus perceived receiving "some, so-so, little" support
Support from parents	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived "a lot" of support from parents versus

1			
2			
3			perceived receiving “some,
4			so-so, little” support
5	Support from children, inclusive Lifeways child	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived “a lot” of
6			support from children versus
7			perceived receiving “some,
8			so-so, little” support
9	Support from close relatives	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived “a lot” of
10			support from relatives versus
11			perceived receiving “some,
12			so-so, little” support

Maternal characteristics

Demographic and Anthropometric

17	Age at 5-year follow-up (years)	At 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
18	Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	Pre-pregnancy, Self-reported in early pregnancy	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using WHO definitions
22	BMI at 5-year follow-up (kg/m ²)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using WHO definitions
27	Waist Circumference at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
29	Height at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure

Lifestyle/Nutrition

32	Smoking during pregnancy	Early pregnancy stage	Current smoker or not
34	Smoking at 5-year follow-up	At 5-yr follow-up	Current smoker or not
37	Top food group servings per day	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>8.35 servings) versus 1-4 Quintiles.
39	Fruits & Vegetables food group servings /day	At 5-yr follow-up	1 st Quintile (<4.5 servings) versus 2-5 Quintiles
41	Total Energy intake (kilocalories/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>2570.9 kcal) versus 1-4 Quintiles
43	Total Fats intake (grams/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>106.0 g) versus 1-4 Quintiles

Socio-Economic

46	Education level	Early pregnancy stage	Third level versus lower levels of education status
48	Employment status	At 5-yr follow-up	Non-earning versus Employed versus Self employed

Health

53	Self-rated health status of mothers	At 5-yr follow-up	Relatively Positive (“Excellent” or “Very Good”) versus Relatively Negative (“Poor”/ “Fair” /“Good”) responses
----	-------------------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Paternal Characteristics

Anthropometric

60	BMI at 5-year follow-up (kg/m ²)	Measured at	continuous measure
----	----------------------------------------------	-------------	--------------------

1			
2			
3			
4	Waist Circumference at 5-year follow-up (cm)	5-yr follow-up Measured at	continuous measure
5		5-yr follow-up	
6	Height at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at	continuous measure
7		5-yr follow-up	
8			
9	Lifestyle		
10	Smoking at 5-year follow-up	At 5-yr follow-up	Current smoker or not
11	Socio-Economic		
12	Education level	Early pregnancy stage	Third level versus lower levels of education status
13		At 5-yr follow-up	Non-earning versus Employed versus Self employed
14	Employment status		
15			
16			
17			
18	Health		
19	Self-rated health status of fathers (in proxy)	At 5-yr follow-up	Relatively Positive ("Excellent" or "Very Good") versus Relatively Negative ("Poor"/ "Fair" /"Good") responses
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			

eTable 2: Multivariable Logistic Regression model for predictors of children's relatively positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=303)

	Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH	
	BMI Categorical ¹		BMI Continuous ²		WC Continuous ³	
	Std OR	p-value	Std OR	p-value	Std OR	p-value
Child's Individual Characteristics						
BMI [IOTF], Obese ⁺ vs Overweight / Normal	1.53*	0.01				
BMI kg/m ² [Continuous]			0.58**	0.009		
Waist Circumference cm [Continuous]					0.60*	0.02
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.20	0.50	1.18	0.55	1.12	0.68
Top shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.09	0.76	1.11	0.69	1.11	0.70
Fruits Veg shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q1 ⁺ vs Q2-5	1.43	0.13	1.49	0.10	1.46	0.12
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income, Less ⁺ vs High	1.34	0.26	1.30	0.31	1.32	0.29
Entitlement to General Medical, Card Yes ⁺ vs No	0.98	0.93	1.01	0.97	1.01	0.95
Fathers' Participation, No ⁺ vs Yes	1.37	0.23	1.36	0.23	1.43	0.17
Support from Spouse/Partner, Less ⁺ vs More	0.86	0.59	0.84	0.53	0.88	0.63
Support from Parents, Less ⁺ vs More	1.30	0.32	1.41	0.20	1.42	0.19
Support from Children, Less ⁺ vs More	1.07	0.80	1.13	0.65	1.11	0.70
Support from Close Relatives, Less ⁺ vs More	0.93	0.81	0.93	0.79	0.92	0.79
Maternal Characteristics						
Energy Kcal [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.28	0.50	1.31	0.47	1.19	0.61
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	0.88	0.76	0.82	0.62	0.97	0.93
Top shelf servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.03	0.91	1.11	0.69	1.07	0.80
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	1.15	0.58	1.16	0.56	1.21	0.45
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	1.88**	0.008	1.92**	0.006	1.88**	0.007
Paternal Characteristics						
Current Smoking status, Yes ⁺ vs No	1.15	0.55	1.13	0.62	1.21	0.42
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	0.85	0.55	0.90	0.70	0.92	0.75
Employment, Non-earning ⁺ vs Self employed	1.33	0.24	1.29	0.30	1.32	0.27
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	1.20	0.46	1.22	0.42	1.18	0.50

Std OR=Standardised Odds Ratio, all variables rescaled to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one; **p<0.01 (2-tailed), *p<0.05 (2-tailed)

†Reference category (Std OR=1); Rel.Negative=Relatively Negative, Rel.Positive=Relatively Positive

¹Child BMI as a categorical variable

²Child BMI as a continuous variable

³Child waist circumference as a continuous variable

STROBE Statement: Preschoolers' parent rated health disparities are strongly associated with measures of adiposity in the Lifeways cohort study children

	Item No	Recommendation	Done
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	✓
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	✓
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	✓
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	✓
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	✓
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	✓
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	✓
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	✓
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	✓
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	✓
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	✓
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	✓
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	✓
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	✓
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	✓
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	✓
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	✓
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	✓
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	✓
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	✓
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	✓
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	✓
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted	✓

		estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	✓
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	✓
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	✓
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	✓
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	✓
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	✓
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	✓

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.

BMJ Open

Preschoolers' parent rated health disparities are strongly associated with measures of adiposity in the Lifeways cohort study children

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-005328.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Jun-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Shrivastava, Aakash; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science Murrin, Celine; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science Kelleher, Cecily; University College Dublin, School of Public Health, Physiotherapy & Population Science
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Paediatrics
Keywords:	Lifecourse, self-rated health, obesity, BMI, waist circumference, preschool children

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title: Preschoolers' parent rated health disparities are strongly associated with**
4 **measures of adiposity in the Lifeways cohort study children**
5
6

7 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

8 Professor Cecily C Kelleher

9 School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science,

10 Woodview House,

11 University College Dublin

12 Belfield,

13 Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland

14 Tel: +3531 7162045

15 Fax: +3531 7163421

16 cecily.kelleher@ucd.ie
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **AUTHORS**

25 Aakash Shrivastava¹ PhD

26 Celine Murrin¹ PhD

27 Cecily C Kelleher¹ MD

28 ¹School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science, University College Dublin,
29 Woodview House, Belfield, Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Running Title: Childhood obesity a persistent predictor of preschoolers' PRH**
36
37

38 **KEYWORDS**

39 Lifecourse, self-rated health, obesity, BMI, waist circumference, preschool children
40
41
42

43 **Word count: 3439**
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT (Words: 272)**Objective**

To examine the relationship between lifecourse factors from preschoolers' micro-ecosystem and their parent-reported (mother-reported) health (PRH), following them prospectively from preconception to age 5-years. To investigate if preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference were associated with preschoolers' PRH when controlled for lifecourse predictors.

Design

Lifeways cross-generation cohort study

Setting

Ireland

Participants

Of 1082 families, 62% mothers responded on a health and lifestyle questionnaire at follow-up. Food frequency, BMI and waist-circumference were measured. There were 547 family datasets available for analysis of children's PRH.

Main outcome measure

Mother-reported children's PRH at age-5. Associations with child's individual and familial exposures from preconception to age 5-years examined using logistic regression.

Results

In univariate analysis, relatively-positive rating of children's PRH were associated with children's lower intake of fats [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], higher intake of fruits/vegetables [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)]; as well as familial socio-economic characteristics {higher household income [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], non-entitlement to means-tested healthcare

1
2
3 [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers' higher education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], psycho-
4
5 social characteristics {father's participation in study [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers'
6
7 perceiving better support from partner [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], children
8
9 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)] or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]}, parents' lifestyle
10
11 {mothers' lower intake of energy [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], fathers' non-smoking status
12
13 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]}, and parents' health {mothers' self-rated health relatively-
14
15 positive [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)], fathers' self-rated health relatively-positive
16
17 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)]}.

18
19
20
21 In multivariable analysis ($\chi^2=34.2, df=21, N=303, R^2=0.26, p<0.05$), one of the two strong
22
23 predictors of children's relatively-positive PRH was child not being obese by International
24
25 Obesity Task Force classification [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)], observed also using BMI
26
27 (kg/m^2) [OR(95%CI)=0.73(0.58-0.93)] or waist-circumference (cm) [OR(95%CI)=0.89(0.81-
28
29 0.98)] as continuous variables. The other significant predictor was mothers' self-rated health
30
31 relatively-positive [OR(95%CI)=4.2(1.5-12.2)].

32 33 34 35 **Conclusions**

36
37
38 Preschoolers' health is adversely associated with obesity and this is independent of lifecourse
39
40 social and environmental inequalities. The findings suggest that reducing childhood obesity
41
42 and improving maternal health may be useful ways to improve child's global health.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Nationally representative sample of preschool-age children
- Examines the influence of lifecourse adversities, prospectively measured from preconception to age 5 on children's general health at age 5. The study analyses demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, food and nutrients intake, psycho-social, socio-economic and health-related exposures from both children's individual as well as parental experiences.
- Demonstrates a significant and independent association between preschoolers' measured BMI as well as waist circumference and their general health status.
- The study is limited by a relatively small sample and use of parent-reported health status.

MAIN TEXT

Introduction

The development of children is critical to their adult well-being^[1,2] and across the lifecourse even subjective estimates may be useful to reflect objectively measured health^[3,4]. Bronfenbrenner^[5] emphasised the importance of children's micro-ecosystem in their development. Recently, the World Health Organisation's (WHO) Commission on Social Determinants of Health (CSDH) presented a Total Environment Assessment Model for Early Child Development (TEAM-ECD),^[6] which again illustrates the importance of individual and family spheres of influence on children's health. The relevance of socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle environment in child development and health is widely acknowledged.^[6-8]

According to the lifecourse hypothesis, risk transmission is characterised by critical periods and accumulation of risk models.^[9] Life Course Health Development (LCHD) framework^[10] suggests that health is a consequence of multiple determinants that change in context of time and circumstances as an individual develops; these experiences are programmed into bio-behavioural regulatory systems during certain critical and sensitive periods of individual's lifetime to decide their health trajectory. The lifecourse framework on childhood disadvantage and adult health^[11] suggests that parental and childhood circumstances from the point of conception influences individual's health in later life, and the individual's childhood health and later life circumstances may further add to this foundation. Based on this, Hertzman and colleagues^[12] examined self-rated health in adulthood using an integrated lifecourse framework. There are a few other studies also which have examined lifecourse determinants of adult global^[13,14] or specific health status.^[15] On the contrary, the literature on the determinants of child global health status is sparse,^[16,17] particularly for the preschool-age children.^[18] Even rarer are studies whose examination includes early lifecourse determinants of child global health status.

1
2
3 Thus the first objective of our analysis was to prospectively examine the relationship between
4 demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, nutritional, psycho-social, socio-economic and
5 health-related lifecourse exposures taken from the children's individual and family spheres of
6 influence starting from preconception up to age 5-years and their global health status at
7 preschool-age.
8
9

10
11
12 In social epidemiology, the construct of “embodiment” refers to biological expression of
13 individuals' materio-social world.^[19,20] Similarly in lifecourse epidemiology, it is
14 hypothesised that early life experiences get “biologically embedded” during critical or
15 sensitive periods of child development leading to gradients in health.^[21,22]
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 The Foresight report identifies a large array of environmental determinants of obesity, a
25 number of which are again related to early child development.^[23] This suggests obesity as
26 pivotal risk factor for subsequent health conditions.^[24]
27
28
29
30

31 The negative relationship between obesity and self-rated health is now increasingly reported
32 in adult populations,^[25,26] some indicating a temporal relationship^[27,28] and suggesting that
33 obesity increases health inequalities over time.^[28] However, evidence on the relationship
34 between obesity and health is relatively limited in child population studies and those
35 available have reported health-related-quality-of-life (HR-QoL)^[29] instead of a generic
36 measure such as global self-rated health. Moreover, this association is yet to be established
37 for preschool-age children. To our knowledge just two population based studies have
38 examined this association in preschool age-group children^[30,31] and neither had nutritional
39 information.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children, Wake *et al.*^[30] did not find a significant
52 difference in global health status of overweight/obese and normal weight 4-5-year-old
53 children. Skinner *et al.*,^[31] using data on 3-5-year-olds from the US National Health and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Nutrition Examination Survey, reported a poorer global health status in obese and severely
4 obese preschoolers. Neither of these studies accounted for a number of possibly relevant
5 confounders, including parental BMI, parental health and nutritional variables.
6
7

8
9
10 We thus hypothesised that similar to findings from studies on older age-groups,
11 anthropometric markers of child obesity in our preschool-age children study would also
12 demonstrate a negative association with their global health status. The next objective of our
13 analysis was to examine whether anthropometric markers of child obesity would emerge as
14 strong predictors of global health status when accounted for other socio-economic, psycho-
15 social, and lifestyle environmental factors in a multivariable model.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Methods**

24
25
26 The Lifeways cross generation cohort study comprises three generations of 1082 Irish
27 families and was established in 2001-03; the recruitment procedure of this nationally
28 representative cohort has been described previously.^[32-34] The a priori purpose was to
29 examine familial and cross-generation influences on early childhood development over the
30 first five years of children's lives. Briefly, would-be mothers were at random recruited from
31 the two regional maternity hospitals in the Republic of Ireland to get a representative sample.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A comparison between the Lifeways mothers and a nationally representative sample of women of the same age group from the SLÁN (Survey of Lifestyle, Attitudes and Nutrition) surveys of Republic of Ireland^[35] confirmed that the Lifeways mothers were satisfactorily representative of the Irish general women on socio-demographic characteristics.^[33]

At this early pregnancy stage mothers completed a health and lifestyle status questionnaire adapted from a validated instrument developed for Irish national SLÁN surveys.^[35] Mothers reported their pre-pregnancy height (cm) and weight (kg) and their smoking status during pregnancy. Mothers' and partners' socio-economic status was recorded. Subsequently at

1
2
3 birth, the live infants were added to the cohort along-with maternity and birth related hospital
4
5 information.
6

7
8 In 2007-08, when these children averaged five years of age, the cohort follow-up recorded a
9
10 62% response rate.^[34,36] Though mothers who responded to the follow-up were more likely to
11
12 be of higher socioeconomic status, these mothers did not significantly differ in their baseline
13
14 anthropometric characteristics (including BMI) from non-responders.^[34,36] At this 5-year
15
16 follow-up, mothers repeated the health and lifestyle assessment questionnaire, with additional
17
18 questions related to her family, including a five-level likert item question “In general, would
19
20 you say your / your partner’s / your Lifeways child’s current health is Excellent, Very Good,
21
22 Good, Fair or Poor”. Mothers provided information on family’s socio-economic, psycho-
23
24 social, and lifestyle status. Mothers reported their habitual dietary intake for the previous year
25
26 on a semi-quantitative food frequency (SQFFQ) instrument developed from the EPIC study
27
28 (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition) and validated for Irish adult
29
30 population.^[37] Mothers also gave details for the Lifeways child’s habitual diet for the
31
32 previous year using a different SQFFQ instrument adapted from the UK National Diet and
33
34 Nutrition Survey of 4.5-year-old children.^[38] The mothers’ and children’s SQFFQ were
35
36 validated in the Lifeways study using a 7-day weighed food diary in a sub-sample.^[36] Food
37
38 items were aggregated by defined shelves (food groups) of the Irish food pyramid and
39
40 assessment was made for average servings per day of standard food item portions consumed
41
42 from the “top” and “fruit and vegetable” food groups (shelves of Irish food pyramid). The
43
44 “top” food group comprises of high calorie fat and sugar rich foods. Total energy (kcal) and
45
46 total fats (g) intake were computed using conversion values from McCance & Widdowson’s
47
48 food composition tables^[39] with a specially developed FFQ software version 1.0 ©.^[40]
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Mothers and children, and if available fathers, were offered at 5-year follow-up an
56
57 anthropometric assessment at their home for height (cm), weight (kg) and waist
58
59
60

1
2
3 circumference (cm) using a standardised protocol,^[34,36] with 80-85% mothers and children
4
5 participating. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated from weight and height information
6
7 (kg/m²).
8

9
10 Thus variables from discrete stages (pre-pregnancy, early pregnancy, at birth, early infancy
11
12 and 5-year follow-up) of child's early development representing lifecourse exposures from
13
14 distinct domains (demographic, anthropometric, socio-economic, psycho-social, lifestyle,
15
16 nutritional and health) of child's individual and family spheres of influence^[6-8] were
17
18 considered to analyse determinants of child's health status at age-5. The selection of
19
20 variables, domains and spheres of influence are based on the CSDH constructed TEAM-
21
22 ECD, a model of early child development.^[6-8] These lifecourse variables have been
23
24 summarised as per time frame in **Table 1**. This lifecourse time frame highlights the stages
25
26 and transition points relevant from perspective of child's health development.^[10] Additional
27
28 details on these variables are provided in **eTable 1** available in the web only supplement. The
29
30 independent variables have been arranged as child-related, family-related, mother-related,
31
32 father-related groups for ease of presentation.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Independent variables examined from lifecourse of 5-yr-old children

Lifecourse	Independent Variables
Pre-pregnancy	Maternal Pre-pregnancy BMI
Early pregnancy	Family stability Maternal smoking in pregnancy, Maternal Education level Paternal Education level
Birth	Child's Birth-weight, Gestational age, Gender Maternal Parity
Infancy	Child's breastfeeding status
When children averaged 5-yr age	Child's Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables food groups, Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake Family household weekly income, Entitlement to means tested healthcare benefits scheme, Family structure (marital status), Support from partner, parents, children & relatives Maternal Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables food groups, Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake, Self-rated health status Paternal Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Self-rated health status

Children's global health status rated in proxy by their mothers, hereafter referred to as parent-rated health (PRH), was the outcome variable of interest. The 5-graded scale response was dichotomised as relatively-positive health (excellent or very good) and relatively-negative health (poor or fair or good), based on similar dichotomisation in other studies on preschool and school children.^[17,18,30] It is reasonable to take a higher cut-off when dichotomising this age dependent variable in this very young age-group as there would be very limited numbers of poor or fair health children.^[17,18,41]

Initially, uni-variate associations were established between the independent predictors and children's PRH using independent t-tests or chi-square tests. Independent categorical variables were dichotomised in a manner that allowed contrasting extreme levels against the others. Thus, using International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) cut-offs, children's BMI was dichotomised as obese versus over-weight or normal-weight. Similarly nutrition variables ordered in quintiles were dichotomised as the extreme quintile (1st or 5th) versus the rest.

1
2
3 From these independent variables principally chosen on the basis of their relevance to the
4 child's development,^[6-8] all those that qualified at significance level 20% ($p<0.2$)^[42] in
5 univariate analyses were force entered into a multivariable logistic regression model. BMI
6 (kg/m^2) and waist circumference (cm), the anthropometric markers of obesity, were tested
7 separately in independent multivariable models. They were not analysed together within a
8 model as results of possible interactions among body composition variables would have been
9 difficult to interpret ^[43,44]. Initially BMI was tested as a categorical variable in a model,
10 followed by two additional models substituting it with BMI and then waist circumference as
11 continuous variables. Other independent variables were tested as categorical variables.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Ethical approval for the Lifeways study was obtained respectively from ethical committees of
24 participating hospitals and the University College Dublin, Ireland. Written informed consent
25 was obtained from study participants.
26
27
28
29

30 **Results**

31
32 There were 547 family datasets available for analysis of children's PRH. **Table 2** presents the
33 uni-variate associations between children's lifecourse variables and PRH. Within the
34 individual-sphere of influences, children's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary
35 foods and total fats, and higher intake of fruits/vegetables) and their anthropometric measures
36 at age-5 (not being obese, lower BMI, and lower waist circumference) qualified as
37 determinants of children's relatively-positive PRH for further examination in the
38 multivariable model.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 In other words, retaining $p<0.2$ as the criterion for significance, the children's healthy food
50 and nutrient intake habits – such as lower intake of unhealthy fat- and sugar- rich foods
51 (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)] or total fats (g) in their meals
52 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] and higher intake of healthy fruits and vegetables (servings/day)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] were positively associated with their favourable rating for health
4
5 by their mothers. Conversely, children's higher BMI (kg/m^2) [OR(95%CI)=0.85(0.71-1.03)]
6
7 and waist circumference (cm) [OR(95%CI)=0.95(0.88-1.02)] were inversely associated with
8
9 a positive parental-rated health status.
10

11
12 Within the family-sphere of influences, socio-economic status (higher household income,
13
14 non-entitlement to subsidised healthcare, both parents' higher education status, and father's
15
16 employment status), psycho-social status (father's study participation, mother's perceived
17
18 social support), mother's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary foods, total energy
19
20 and total fats), father's lifestyle behaviours (non-smoker), and both parents' health status
21
22 (relatively-positive self-rated health) qualified as determinants of children's relatively-
23
24 positive PRH for further examination in the multivariable model.
25
26

27
28 In other words, by maintaining $p < 0.2$ as the criterion for significance, several indicators of a
29
30 family's better socio-economic status— such as higher household income (Euros/week)
31
32 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], not requiring subsidised healthcare [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)],
33
34 mother having a third level education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], father having a third level
35
36 education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], father being self-employed [OR(95%CI)=2.5(0.8-
37
38 7.9)]; family's better psycho-social status— such as father's involvement in family affairs
39
40 [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mother's perceiving a positive social support from spouse
41
42 [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], parents [OR(95%CI)=2.0(1.0-4.1)], children
43
44 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)], or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]; family's better lifestyle
45
46 and food and nutrient intake habits— such as mother's lower intake of unhealthy fat- and
47
48 sugar- rich foods (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)], total energy (kcal)
49
50 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] and total fats (g) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)] in her meals, father's
51
52 not being a smoker [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]; and family's better health status— such as
53
54 mother [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)] and father [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)] having a positively
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

rated health status were positively associated with children’s favourable rating for health by their mothers.

For peer review only

Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=547)

	Relatively Negative PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		OR	95% CI
	N	(n=42) %(n) Mean (SD)	(n=505) %(n) Mean (SD)			
Child's Individual Characteristics						
Birth-weight adjusted for gestational age (g)	487	(34) 3564.1 (616)	(453) 3548.4 (552)	1.00	(0.999-1.001)	
Child's Age (Yrs)	547	(42) 5.42 (0.23)	(505) 5.46 (0.25)			
Gender	547					
Male		8.0% (22)	92.0% (242)	Ref		
Female		7.1% (21)	92.9% (262)	1.14	(0.60-2.20)	
BMI (kg/m ²)	464	(35) 17.09 (2.5)	(429) 16.59 (1.6)	0.85	(0.71-1.03) [^]	
BMI [IOTF]	464					
Obese		16.7% (5)	83.3% (25)	Ref		
Overweight / Normal		6.9% (30)	93.1% (404)	2.69	(0.96-7.54) [^]	
Waist Circumference (cm)	462	(35) 57.01 (6.8)	(427) 55.88 (4.3)	0.95	(0.88-1.02) [†]	
Height (cm)	464	(35) 111.6 (5.6)	(429) 112.1 (4.8)	1.02	(0.95-1.10)	
Breastfeeding	528					
Not breastfed		6.5% (16)	93.5% (229)	Ref		
Breastfed		8.8% (25)	91.2% (258)	0.72	(0.38-1.38)	
Energy (Kcal)	547					
Quintile 5 (>1794 kcal)		10% (11)	90.0% (99)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		7.1% (31)	92.9% (406)	1.46	(0.71-3.00)	
Fats (g)	547					
Quintile 5 (>62.9 g)		12.8% (14)	87.2% (95)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)	93.6% (410)	2.16	(1.09-4.26) [*]	
Top food group (servings/day)	547					
Quintile 5 (>6.47 servings)		10.9% (12)	89.1% (98)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)	93.1% (407)	1.66	(0.82-3.36) [†]	
Fruits Veg food group (servings/d)	547					
Quintile 1 (<2.1 servings)		12.8% (14)	87.2% (95)	Ref		
Quintile 2-5		6.4% (28)	93.6% (410)	2.16	(1.09-4.26) [*]	
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income	509					
Less than 760 Euros/wk		13.3% (26)	86.7% (170)	Ref		
More than 760 Euros/wk		4.8% (15)	95.2% (298)	3.04	(1.57-5.90) ^{**}	
Entitlement to General Medical Card	532					
Entitled		13% (12)	87.0% (80)	Ref		
Not entitled		6.6% (29)	93.4% (411)	2.13	(1.04-4.34) [*]	
Fathers' Participation	547					
Not		9.7% (31)	90.3% (290)	Ref		
Yes		4.9% (11)	95.1% (215)	2.09	(1.03-4.25) [*]	
Marital Status	542					
Others		11.4% (5)	88.6% (39)	Ref		
Married/Cohabiting		7.2% (36)	92.8% (462)	1.65	(0.61-4.43)	
Elder children in family (Parity)	535					
Nullipara		8% (18)	92.0% (207)	Ref		
Multipara		7.7% (24)	92.3% (286)	1.04	(0.55-1.96)	
Support from Spouse/Partner	538					
Lesser support		12.9% (17)	87.1% (115)	Ref		
More support		6.2% (25)	93.8% (381)	2.25	(1.18-4.32) [*]	
Support from Parents	487					
Lesser support		12.5% (12)	87.5% (84)	Ref		
More support		6.6% (26)	93.4% (365)	2.01	(0.97-4.14) [^]	
Support from Children	532					
Lesser support		10.6% (20)	89.4% (169)	Ref		
More support		5.8% (20)	94.2% (323)	1.91	(1.00-3.65) [*]	
Support from Close Relatives	510					
Lesser support		12.4% (19)	87.6% (134)	Ref		
More support		6.2% (22)	93.8% (335)	2.16	(1.13-4.12) [*]	

Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (continued)

	N	Relatively Negative PRH (n=42)		Relatively Positive PRH (n=505)		OR	95% CI
		%(n)	Mean (SD)	%(n)	Mean (SD)		
Maternal Characteristics							
Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	475	(36)	23.3 (3.3)	(439)	23.8 (3.9)	1.04	(0.94-1.14)
Pre-pregnancy BMI [WHO cut offs]							
Obese		2.6% (1)		97.4% (38)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		8% (35)		92.0% (401)		0.30	(0.04-2.26)
Mother's Age (Yrs)	546	(42)	36.5 (6.3)	(504)	37.1 (5.3)	1.02	(0.96-1.08)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	432		25.6 (3.9)		26.3 (5.0)	1.03	(0.95-1.12)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up [WHO cut offs]	432						
Obese		7.2% (5)		92.8% (64)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		7.4% (27)		92.6% (336)		0.97	(0.36-2.62)
Waist Circumference (cm)	434	(31)	85.3 (10.6)	(403)	87.6 (11.9)	1.02	(0.99-1.05)
Height (cm)	454	(33)	161.9 (6.8)	(421)	162.9 (6.0)	1.03	(0.97-1.09)
Smoking in pregnancy	534						
Smoker		8.1% (8)		91.9% (91)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (33)		92.4% (402)		1.07	(0.48-2.4)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	541						
Smoker		7.6% (9)		92.4% (110)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (32)		92.4% (390)		1.0	(0.46-2.15)
Energy (Kcal)	546						
Quintile 5 (>2570.9 kcal)		13% (14)		87.0% (94)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)		93.6% (410)		2.18	(1.11-4.30)*
Fats (g)	546						
Quintile 5 (>106 g)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (407)		1.68	(0.83-3.40)†
Top food group (servings/day)	545						
Quintile 5 (>8.35 servings)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (406)		1.67	(0.83-3.39)†
Fruits Veg food group (servings/day)	546						
Quintile 1 (<4.5 servings)		9.1% (10)		90.9% (100)		Ref	
Quintile 2-5		7.3% (32)		92.7% (404)		1.26	(0.60-2.65)
Education level	534						
Lower		10.4% (25)		89.6% (215)		Ref	
Third Level		5.8% (17)		94.2% (277)		1.90	(1.00-3.60)*
Employment	545						
Not Earning		6.4% (15)		93.6% (221)		Ref	
Employed		9% (22)		91.0% (222)		0.69	(0.35-1.36)
Self employed		7.7% (5)		92.3% (60)		0.81	(0.29-2.33)
Self reported health	546						
Relatively Negative		17.1% (27)		82.9% (131)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		3.9% (15)		96.1% (373)		5.10	(2.64-9.93)**
Paternal Characteristics							
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	66	(4)		(62)		0.97	(0.76-1.23)
Waist Circumference (cm)	65	(3)		(62)		1.01	(0.90-1.13)
Height (cm)	66	(4)		(62)		1.01	(0.88-1.15)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	521						
Smoker		11.5% (16)		88.5% (123)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		5.5% (21)		94.5% (361)		2.24	(1.13-4.42)*
Education level	514						
Lower		11.1% (16)		88.9% (128)		Ref	
Third Level		6.2% (23)		93.8% (347)		1.89	(0.97-3.68)^
Employment	518						
Not Earning		9.2% (8)		90.8% (79)		Ref	
Employed		7.9% (24)		92.1% (279)		1.18	(0.51-2.72)
Self employed		3.9% (5)		96.1% (123)		2.49	(0.79-7.89)†
Self reported health	510						
Relatively Negative		12.6% (20)		87.4% (139)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		4.6% (16)		95.4% (335)		3.01	(1.52-5.99)**

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, ^p<0.1, †p<0.2; Ref=reference category (OR=1)

1
2
3 **Table 3** presents the multivariable model for association between qualifying lifecourse
4 variables and children's relatively-positive PRH at age-5. A significantly strong predictor of
5 children's relatively-positive PRH was child's not being obese by IOTF classification
6 [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)]. When BMI was tested as a continuous variable, there was 0.73
7 (95%CI=0.58-0.93) times lower odds of the child being positively rated on health status for
8 every 1 kg/m² increase in their BMI. Similarly in the waist circumference model, for every 1
9 cm increase there was 0.89 (95%CI=0.81-0.98) times lower odds of the child getting a
10 relatively-positive rating on health status. Thus the association between children's BMI or
11 waist circumference and their PRH only strengthened following adjustments in this
12 multivariate model, irrespective of being analysed as a categorical or continuous variable.
13 Another significant predictor of children's relatively-positive PRH was mother's having rated
14 her own health as relatively-positive. These predictors maintained the highest strength of
15 association with children's health status when independent variables were standardised (not
16 reported here). None of the other variables reached the level of statistical significance. The
17 models explained over 25 percent of variance for children's PRH.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3: Multivariable Logistic Regression model for predictors of children’s relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=303)

	Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH	
	BMI Categorical ¹		BMI Continuous ²		WC Continuous ³	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Child's Individual Characteristics						
BMI [IOTF], Obese ⁺ vs Overweight / Normal	5.48	(1.43-21.03) *				
BMI kg/m ² [Continuous]			0.73	(0.58-0.93) **		
Waist Circumference cm [Continuous]					0.89	(0.81-0.98) *
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.57	(0.42-5.79)	1.49	(0.40-5.53)	1.32	(0.36-4.80)
Top food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.23	(0.33-4.53)	1.30	(0.36-4.63)	1.29	(0.36-4.62)
Fruits Veg food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q1 ⁺ vs Q2-5	2.57	(0.75-8.80)	2.86	(0.83-9.93)	2.73	(0.78-9.49)
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income, Less ⁺ vs High	1.85	(0.63-5.40)	1.76	(0.59-5.21)	1.79	(0.61-5.26)
Entitlement to General Medical, Card Yes ⁺ vs No	0.94	(0.24-3.71)	1.03	(0.26-4.07)	1.04	(0.26-4.10)
Fathers' Participation, Not ⁺ vs Yes	1.88	(0.68-5.21)	1.86	(0.67-5.16)	2.06	(0.74-5.71)
Support from Spouse/Partner, Less ⁺ vs More	0.70	(0.20-2.49)	0.67	(0.19-2.33)	0.74	(0.22-2.52)
Support from Parents, Less ⁺ vs More	1.92	(0.53-6.93)	2.33	(0.64-8.42)	2.37	(0.66-8.53)
Support from Children, Less ⁺ vs More	1.15	(0.38-3.45)	1.29	(0.42-3.91)	1.25	(0.41-3.82)
Support from Close Relatives, Less ⁺ vs More	0.86	(0.23-3.13)	0.84	(0.24-3.02)	0.84	(0.23-3.01)
Maternal Characteristics						
Energy Kcal [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.89	(0.30-11.84)	2.00	(0.31-12.86)	1.57	(0.28-8.84)
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	0.72	(0.09-5.54)	0.59	(0.07-4.77)	0.92	(0.13-6.41)
Top food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.08	(0.29-3.94)	1.30	(0.36-4.65)	1.18	(0.32-4.34)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	1.34	(0.47-3.78)	1.35	(0.48-3.80)	1.48	(0.53-4.13)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	4.20	(1.45-12.20) **	4.42	(1.53-12.79) **	4.17	(1.47-11.87) **
Paternal Characteristics						
Current Smoking status, Yes ⁺ vs No	1.37	(0.48-3.93)	1.31	(0.45-3.83)	1.53	(0.54-4.35)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	0.69	(0.21-2.28)	0.79	(0.24-2.57)	0.83	(0.26-2.67)
Employment, Non-earning ⁺ vs Self employed	1.60	(0.73-3.53)	1.52	(0.69-3.32)	1.57	(0.70-3.53)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	1.48	(0.52-4.20)	1.54	(0.54-4.35)	1.43	(0.51-3.96)

OR=Odds Ratio; ⁺Reference category (OR=1); **p<0.01 (2-tailed), *p<0.05 (2-tailed)

Rel.Negative=Relatively Negative, Rel.Positive=Relatively Positive

¹Child BMI as a categorical variable; Model Chi-sq = 34.2, df = 21, p = 0.034; -2LL = 128.6, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.26

²Child BMI as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 35.9, df = 21, p = 0.022; -2LL = 126.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.27

³Child waist circumference as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 33.8, df = 21, p = 0.038; -2LL = 128.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.25

Discussion

This analysis showed that determinants from both child's individual and family spheres have an influence on child's health at preschool-age. The factors from all three material, psycho-social and lifestyle domains, the major explanations for child health inequalities,^[8] were associated at uni-variate levels. However, in the final model this analysis clearly demonstrated a negative association between child's obesity and health status. Child's not being obese was one of the significantly strong predictors of child's relatively-positive health status, which was also observed with measured BMI and waist circumference analysed as continuous variables.

This negative relationship observed between measured obesity and PRH conforms to published literature on primary school age-group children and adolescents.^[45-47] Most importantly, for the first time to our knowledge, this analysis demonstrates the association having adjusted for food and nutrient intake, along-with a wide range of other explanatory variables.

Self-rated health is an important and valid measure of morbidity, mortality, longevity and health status,^[3,4] also in Irish adult^[48,49] and children.^[16] It is believed to be a more inclusive measure of health than the objective measurements, with a capacity to comprehensively evaluate health dynamics, behaviours and psycho-physiological states that are not otherwise easy to measure.^[3]

This holistic measure better accommodates the WHO defined concept of health as opposed to a diagnosed specific disease.^[3] Use of parent proxy for child self-reported health is justified for children too young to have adequate cognitive skills.^[50,51] Systematic reviews report good agreement between ratings by children and their parents on child HRQoL, particularly for physical health domain.^[50-52] Parents tend to be thoughtful when responding to proxy questions and report children's usual health disposition.^[53] Studies on construct validity report positively.^[54-57] Maternal ratings of child's general health status were found sensitive when validated against children's illnesses and other morbidity or healthcare indicators,^[41,58-60] including evidence of a gradient in strength of these associations.^[41] Many national-level studies have accepted parent proxy as an

1
2
3 appropriate measure^[17,18,61,62] and successfully used it to longitudinally demonstrate risk and
4
5 consequences of child health.^[17,61]
6

7
8 Self-rated health, a composite measure, represents all domains of HR-QoL,^[4] but better represents
9
10 physical health than HR-QoL.^[63] Studies on older age-group children have reported stronger/sole
11
12 negative associations for general/physical health domain of HR-QoL and obesity,^[46,64] irrespective
13
14 whether children themselves or parents reported their HRQoL,^[29] and also whether BMI was
15
16 analysed as a categorical,^[45,46] or continuous variable.^[65,66]
17

18
19 Another relevance of this analysis is in demonstrating this association of obesity with general-
20
21 health in a nationally representative sample of preschool-age children, for which literature is scant.
22
23 Though, a few have shown similar association of obesity with specific paediatric conditions or
24
25 admission history in this age-group.^[30,31,67-70] A longitudinal study speculated that pre-school
26
27 obesity influences a decline in early-age health, and then both obesity and poor-health tracks into
28
29 adolescence.^[71] The WHO recommends high priority for determinants of health inequalities during
30
31 early development.^[72]
32
33

34
35 The Lifeways previously demonstrated longitudinal association between parental socio-economic
36
37 and lifestyle characteristics and child's BMI and waist circumference.^[36] In this analysis when
38
39 same anthropometric measures are included along-with material, psycho-social, and lifestyle
40
41 determinants of child obesity and health, a prominent relationship emerges between children's
42
43 anthropometric measures and health status. One possible explanation is that determinants of health
44
45 inequalities biologically embed^[21,22] in early life and child obesity is an early phenotypic
46
47 expression of this inequality; though the continued influence of environmental factors is not
48
49 undermined. Adult^[25,26] and adolescence studies^[46,47] have also shown this association to be
50
51 independent of socio-demographic, lifestyle or health-related factors.
52
53
54

55
56 The observed association between BMI or waist circumference and PRH in the present analysis
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may be temporal, as demonstrated in adults.^[27,28] Though a number of large scale cross sectional
4
5 studies have shown an association between anthropometric measures of obesity and self rated
6
7 health,^[73] only recently a few nationally representative prospective studies have established the
8
9 temporality of this association in adults.^[27,28] Though this relationship maybe bi-directional to an
10
11 extent,^[74,75] the mounting evidence from longitudinal birth cohort studies regarding a sequential
12
13 relationship between lifetime growth trajectories and adult disease, disability and deaths^[2]
14
15 primarily rules out reverse causality in this association and suggests that the association observed
16
17 in our birth cohort is also more likely to be temporal. Moreover, the available findings from a few
18
19 longitudinal studies on primary school age children suggest that at least in the childhood this
20
21 inverse association found between BMI and HRQoL is predominantly in the given direction and
22
23 not the reverse.^[76,77] However, this needs careful interpretation as both anthropometric and health
24
25 data were concurrently collected, and this limitation may be addressed with next sweep of cohort
26
27 data collection.
28
29
30

31
32 This analysis demonstrated that maternal health was strongly predictive of her child's health. One
33
34 concern is that mother's perception of her own health may bias her perception of her child's
35
36 health. However, this intergenerational association has been previously reported,^[41,58,59,78-81] and
37
38 reporting mothers can effectively discriminate between their own and children's
39
40 health.^[41,58,59,79,80,82] Several mechanisms such as inherited susceptibility, uterine environment and
41
42 shared environment have been suggested for this familial aggregation pattern.^[58,79,80]
43
44
45

46
47 Maternal BMI may be related to both maternal self-rated health and child's BMI, so the observed
48
49 associations in this analysis could possibly be a reflection of an association between maternal BMI
50
51 and child's PRH. However, this was not observed in our analysis. Maternal BMI at both pre-
52
53 pregnancy and 5-year follow-up were not associated with child's PRH at univariate level. Also,
54
55 when maternal BMI was forcibly added into the multivariable model (not reported here), the
56
57 observed associations did not attenuate.
58
59
60

1
2
3 The study has limitations in use of reported rather than measured health status and a relatively
4 small sample size. Though the study was able to detect the major explanatory domains for child
5 health inequalities documented in the literature^[8], the relatively small sample size of this study
6 may possibly have underpowered it to detect variables with lesser effect sizes. The complete case
7 approach to analysis reduced the sample size of the final multivariate model, which may have
8 power implications. However, this missing data was on account of an accumulation across a
9 number of variables. On analysis, there was no evidence of selectivity in the participants for whom
10 there were missing data (**eTable 2**). **eTable 2**, available in the web only supplement, compares
11 children included and not included in the final model for variables belonging to explanatory
12 domains. It suggests that there were no significant differences in the characteristics of children
13 included and not included (due to missing data) for analysis, suggesting that the children in the
14 final model are representative of the study participants as a whole. It may be argued that the
15 reduced sample size possibly influenced the odds ratio estimate for the association between
16 children's relatively-positive PRH and the child's not being obese (using a categorical IOTF
17 classification). Nonetheless this association between children's anthropometric measures and their
18 parent-rated health variable is likely to be coherent, because these associations remain statistically
19 significant even when BMI and WC are analysed as continuous variables.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 As in most birth cohort studies,^[83,84] the Lifeways birth cohort also experienced the attrition of
42 mothers belonging to lower socio-economic status in the early stages of the study. Though this
43 may underestimate some socioeconomic inequalities^[85], it does not negate the exposure-outcome
44 associations detected through regression models of such longitudinal studies^[86,87].

45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Nevertheless, this study has advantages in use of lifecourse variables from pre-conception to age
52 of 5-years, with measured BMI and waist circumference data. It also has detailed foods and
53 nutrient data along-with other socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle variables for child and
54 both parents.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In conclusion, these analyses from the Lifeways cohort show that lifecourse adversities were
4 associated with mother-reported health for preschoolers, suggesting an early life influence.
5
6 Preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference demonstrated strong negative associations with
7 mother-reported health independent of socio-economic, psycho-social, and lifestyle factors,
8 suggesting early biological expression of lifecourse adversities. The findings have important
9 implications in understanding how early life environment may create inequalities in developmental
10 health.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Footnotes**Acknowledgements**

The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study is overseen by an interdisciplinary scientific steering group chaired by CCK, the principal investigator. The authors greatly appreciate the participation of the Lifeways cohort families.

Contributors

AS undertook all analyses reported in this manuscript, interpreted the findings and drafted the manuscript. CM contributed to data collection at five year follow-up, interpretation of the analysis and critical revision of the manuscript. CCK designed the study, supervised the analyses, interpretation of results and intellectual content of the manuscript. All three authors approved the final version.

Funding

The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study was established as part of European Science Foundation funded 'Social Variations in Health Expectancy in Europe' international research programme and its various sweeps have been funded by the Health Research Board of Ireland. Funding sources had no involvement in design, collection, analysis, interpretation, writing and submission of this manuscript.

Competing interests

None of the authors have any conflict of interest, including financial interests relevant to this article to disclose.

Ethical approvals

Ethics committees of Coombe University Hospital, Dublin, University College Hospital Galway, University College Dublin, Dublin, and the Irish College of General Practitioners, Ireland.

Data sharing statement

No additional data available. The data manager may be contacted at john.obrien@ucd.ie for more details on the Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study.

Appendices

The supplement includes eTable 1 displaying details of examined variables and eTable 2 which compares children included and not included (due to missing data) in the final model for variables belonging to explanatory domains.

REFERENCES

1. Barker DJ. Sir Richard Doll Lecture. Developmental origins of chronic disease. *Public Health* 2012;**126**(3):185-9.
2. Power C1, Kuh D, Morton S. From developmental origins of adult disease to life course research on adult disease and aging: insights from birth cohort studies. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2013;**34**:7-28.
3. Benyamini Y. Self-ratings of health and longevity: a health psychologist's viewpoint on epidemiological findings. *The European Health Psychologist* 2008;**10**:10–13.
4. Bjorner J, Fayers P, Idler E. Self-rated health. In: Fayers PM, Hays RD, eds. *Assessing quality of life in clinical trials: methods and practice*. 2nd edn. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005:309-24.
5. Bronfenbrenner U. Ecological models of human development. In: Postlethwaite TN, Husen T, eds. *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Vol 3. 2nd ed. Oxford, England: Elsevier Sciences, Ltd., 1994: 1643-47.
6. Siddiqi A, Irwin LG, Hertzman C. Total environment assessment model for early child development. Evidence report for the WHO commission on social determinants of health. World Health Organization, 2007.
http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/ecd_kn_evidence_report_2007.pdf
(accessed March 30, 2012).

- 1
2
3 7. Maggi S, Irwin LJ, Siddiqi A, *et al.* The social determinants of early child development: an
4
5 overview. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2010;**46**(11):627-35.
6
7
- 8
9
10 8. Hertzman C, Li J, Mattes E, *et al.* Social determinants of child health and well-being
11
12 [Editorial]. *Health Sociology Review* 2009;**18**(1):3-11.
13
- 14
15
16 9. Ben-Shlomo Y, Kuh D. A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology:
17
18 conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. *Int J Epidemiol*
19
20 2002;**31**(2):285-93.
21
22
- 23
24
25 10. Halfon N, Hochstein M. Life course health development: an integrated framework for
26
27 developing health, policy, and research. *Milbank Q* 2002; **80**(3):433-79, iii.
28
29
- 30
31
32 11. Graham H, and Power Chris. *Childhood disadvantage and adult health: a lifecourse*
33
34 *framework*. London: NHS Health Development Agency, 2004.
35
36 http://www.gserve.nice.org.uk/niceMedia/pdf/childhood_disadvantage_health.pdf
37
38 (accessed May 24, 2014).
39
40
- 41
42
43 12. Hertzman C, Power C, Matthews S, *et al.* Using an interactive framework of society and
44
45 lifecourse to explain self-rated health in early adulthood. *Soc Sci Med* 2001;**53**(12):1575-
46
47 85.
48
49
- 50
51
52 13. Mensah FK, Hobcraft J. Childhood deprivation, health and development: associations with
53
54 adult health in the 1958 and 1970 British prospective birth cohort studies. *J Epidemiol*
55
56 *Community Health* 2008;**62**(7):599-606.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 14. Kestila L, Koskinen S, Martelin T, *et al*. Determinants of health in early adulthood: what is
6 the role of parental education, childhood adversities and own education ? *Eur J Public*
7
8 *Health* 2006;**16**(3):305-14.
9
10
11
12
13
14 15. Pollitt R, Rose K, Kaufman J. Evaluating the evidence for models of life course
15 socioeconomic factors and cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review. *BMC Public*
16 *Health* 2005;**5**(1):7.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 16. Kelleher CC, Tay J, Gabhainn SN. Influence on self-rated health of socio-demographic,
24 lifestyle and affluence factors: an analysis of the Irish and international health behaviours
25 among school-aged children (HBSC) datasets 1998. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 43-6.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 17. Stein RE, Siegel MJ, Bauman LJ. Double jeopardy: what social risk adds to biomedical
33 risk in understanding child health and health care utilization. *Acad Pediatr* 2010;**10**(3):165-
34 71.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 18. Stevens GD. Gradients in the health status and developmental risks of young children: the
42 combined influences of multiple social risk factors. *Matern Child Health J* 2006;**10**(2):187-
43 99.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 19. Krieger N. Theories for social epidemiology in the 21st century: an ecosocial perspective.
51 *Int J Epidemiol* 2001;**30**(4):668-77.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
20. Krieger N. A glossary for social epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2001;**55**(10):693-700.
21. Hertzman C. The biological embedding of early experience and its effects on health in adulthood. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1999;**896**(1):85-95.
22. Hertzman C, Boyce T. How experience gets under the skin to create gradients in developmental health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2010;**31**:329-47 C1-C3.
23. Butland B, Jebb S, Kopelman P, *et al.* Foresight. Tackling obesities: future choices — Project report. London: Government Office for Science, 2007.
<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/foresight/docs/obesity/17.pdf> (accessed March 30, 2012).
24. Aboderin I, Kalache A, Ben-Shlomo Y, *et al.* Life course perspectives on coronary heart disease, stroke and diabetes: key issues and implications for policy and research. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2002.
http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2002/WHO_NMH_NPH_02.1.pdf (accessed March 30, 2012).
25. Molarius A, Berglund K, Eriksson C, *et al.* Socioeconomic conditions, lifestyle factors, and self-rated health among men and women in Sweden. *Eur J Public Health* 2007;**17**(2):125-33.
26. Prosper M-H, Moczulski VL, Qureshi A. Obesity as a predictor of self-rated health. *Am J Health Behav* 2009;**33**(3):319-29.

- 1
2
3 27. Svedberg P, Bardage C, Sandin S, *et al.* A prospective study of health, life-style and
4 psychosocial predictors of self-rated health. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2006;**21**(10):767-76.
5
6
7
8
9
10 28. Zajacova A, Burgard SA. Body weight and health from early to mid-adulthood: a
11 longitudinal analysis. *J Health Soc Behav* 2010;**51**(1):92-107.
12
13
14
15
16 29. Tsiros MD, Olds T, Buckley JD, *et al.* Health-related quality of life in obese children and
17 adolescents. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2009;**33**(4):387-400.
18
19
20
21
22
23 30. Wake M, Hardy P, Sawyer MG, *et al.* Comorbidities of overweight/obesity in Australian
24 preschoolers: a cross-sectional population study. *Arch Dis Child* 2008;**93**(6):502-07.
25
26
27
28
29
30 31. Skinner AC, Perrin EM, Steiner MJ. Healthy for now? A cross-sectional study of the
31 comorbidities in obese preschool children in the United States. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*
32 2010;**49**(7):648-55.
33
34
35
36
37
38 32. O'Mahony D, Fallon UB, Hannon F, *et al.* The Lifeways Cross-Generation Study: design,
39 recruitment and data management considerations. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 3-6.
40
41
42
43
44
45 33. Niedhammer I, O'Mahony D, Daly S, *et al.* Occupational predictors of pregnancy outcomes
46 in Irish working women in the Lifeways cohort. *BJOG* 2009;**116**(7):943-52.
47
48
49
50
51
52 34. Murrin CM, Kelly GE, Tremblay RE, *et al.* Body mass index and height over three
53 generations: evidence from the Lifeways Cross-Generational Cohort Study. *BMC Public*
54 *Health* 2012;**12**:81.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 35. National Nutrition Surveillance Centre. Dietary habits of the Irish population: results from
6
7 SLÁN, Annual Report 2003. Dublin: National Nutritional Surveillance Centre, Department
8
9 of Public Health Medicine and Epidemiology, University College Dublin, Dublin and
10
11 Health Promotion Unit, Department of Health and Children, Dublin, 2003.
12
13
14
15
16 36. Murrin C. Maternal factors during pregnancy contributing to early life risk of childhood
17
18 obesity [PhD Thesis]. Dublin: University College Dublin, 2011.
19
20
21
22
23 37. Harrington J. Validation of a food frequency questionnaire as a tool for assessing nutrient
24
25 intake [MA Thesis]. Galway: National University of Ireland, 1997.
26
27
28
29
30 38. Gregory J, Collins D, Davies P, *et al*. National Diet and Nutrition Survey: children aged
31
32 1.5 - 4.5 years. Volume 1: Report of the diet and nutrition survey. London: HMSO, 1995.
33
34
35
36 39. Food Standards Agency. McCance and Widdowson's The composition of foods, sixth
37
38 summary edition. Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry, 2002.
39
40
41
42
43 40. FFQ_Software version 1.0. Dublin: National Nutrition Surveillance Centre, School of
44
45 Public Health and Population Science, University College Dublin, 2007.
46
47
48
49 41. Monette S, Séguin L, Gauvin L, *et al*. Validation of a measure of maternal perception of
50
51 the child's health status. *Child Care Health Dev* 2007;**33**(4):472-81.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 42. Katz MH. *Multivariable analysis: a practical guide for clinicians and public health*
4 *researchers*. 3rd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
5
6
7
8
9
10 43. Rogers I and the EURO-BLCS Study Group. The influence of birthweight and intrauterine
11 environment on adiposity and fat distribution in later life. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord*
12 2003;**27**(7):755-77.
13
14
15
16
17
18 44. Wells JC, Chomtho S, Fewtrell MS. Programming of body composition by early growth
19 and nutrition. *Proc Nutr Soc* 2007;**66**(3):423-34.
20
21
22
23
24
25 45. Wake M, Salmon L, Waters E, *et al*. Parent-reported health status of overweight and obese
26 Australian primary school children: a cross-sectional population survey. *Int J Obes Relat*
27 *Metab Disord* 2002;**26**(5): 717-24.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 46. Swallen KC, Reither EN, Haas SA, *et al*. Overweight, obesity, and health-related quality of
35 life among adolescents: the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Pediatrics*
36 2005;**115**(2):340-47.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 47. Vingilis ER, Wade TJ, Seeley JS. Predictors of adolescent self-rated health. Analysis of the
44 National Population Health Survey. *Can J Public Health* 2002;**93**(3):193-97.
45
46
47
48
49 48. Kelleher CC, Whelan J, Daly L, *et al*. Socio-demographic, environmental, lifestyle and
50 psychosocial factors predict self rated health in Irish Travellers, a minority nomadic
51 population. *Health Place* 2012;**18**(2):330-38.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 49. Kelleher CC, Friel S, Nic Gabhainn S, *et al.* Socio-demographic predictors of self-rated
4 health in the Republic of Ireland: findings from the National Survey on Lifestyle, Attitudes
5 and Nutrition, SLAN. *Soc Sci Med* 2003;**57**(3):477-86.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 50. Eiser C, Morse R. Can parents rate their child's health-related quality of life? Results of a
13 systematic review. *Qual Life Res* 2001;**10**(4):347-57.
14
15
16
17
18 51. Upton P, Lawford J, Eiser C. Parent-child agreement across child health-related quality of
19 life instruments: a review of the literature. *Qual Life Res* 2008;**17**(6):895-913.
20
21
22
23
24
25 52. Norrby U, Nordholm L, Fasth A. Reliability and validity of the swedish version of child
26 health questionnaire. *Scand J Rheumatol* 2003;**32**(2):101-7.
27
28
29
30
31
32 53. Davis E, Nicolas C, Waters E, *et al.* Parent-proxy and child self-reported health-related
33 quality of life: using qualitative methods to explain the discordance. *Qual Life Res*
34 2007;**16**(5):863-71.
35
36
37
38
39
40 54. Theunissen NC, Vogels TG, Koopman HM, *et al.* The proxy problem: child report versus
41 parent report in health-related quality of life research. *Qual Life Res* 1998;**7**(5):387-97.
42
43
44
45
46
47 55. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Parent proxy-report of their children's health-
48 related quality of life: an analysis of 13,878 parents' reliability and validity across age
49 subgroups using the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*
50 2007;**5**:2.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 56. Spencer NJ, Coe C. The development and validation of a measure of parent-reported child
4 health and morbidity: the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile. *Child Care Health*
5 *Dev* 1996;**22**(6):367-79.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 57. Spencer NJ, Coe C. Validation of the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile in
13 routine child health surveillance. *Child Care Health Dev* 2000;**26**(4):323-36.
14
15
16
17
18 58. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Workman-Daniels K, *et al.* Maternal rating of child
19 health at school age: does the vulnerable child syndrome persist ? *Pediatrics*
20 1993;**92**(3):380-88.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 59. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Shorter T, *et al.* Factors associated with maternal rating
28 of infant health in central Harlem. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 1989;**10**(3):139-44.
29
30
31
32
33
34 60. McCormick MC, Athreya BH, Bernbaum JC, *et al.* Preliminary observations on maternal
35 rating of health of children: data from three subspecialty clinics. *J Clin Epidemiol*
36 1988;**41**(4):323-29.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 61. Lynch JL. Infant health, race/ethnicity, and early educational outcomes using the ECLS-B.
44 *Sociol Inq* 2011;**81**(4):499-526.
45
46
47
48
49 62. Gilman SE, McCormick MC. Insights from life course epidemiology. *Acad Pediatr*
50 2010;**10**(3):159-60.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 63. Smith KW, Avis NE, Assmann SF. Distinguishing between quality of life and health status
4 in quality of life research: a meta-analysis. *Qual Life Res* 1999;**8**(5):447-59.
5
6
7
8
9
10 64. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Singer S, Pilpel N, *et al.* Health-related quality of life among children
11 and adolescents: associations with obesity. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2006;**30**(2):267-72.
12
13
14
15
16 65. Williams J, Wake M, Hesketh K, *et al.* Health-related quality of life of overweight and
17 obese children. *JAMA* 2005;**293**(1):70-6.
18
19
20
21
22
23 66. de Beer M, Hofsteenge GH, Koot HM, *et al.* Health-related-quality-of-life in obese
24 adolescents is decreased and inversely related to BMI. *Acta Paediatr* 2007;**96**(5):710-14.
25
26
27
28
29
30 67. Shibli R, Rubin L, Akons H, *et al.* Morbidity of overweight (≥ 85 th percentile) in the first 2
31 years of life. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**(2):267-72.
32
33
34
35
36 68. Suglia SF, Chambers EC, Rosario A, *et al.* Asthma and obesity in three-year-old urban
37 children: role of sex and home environment. *J Pediatr* 2011;**159**(1):14-20.e11.
38
39
40
41
42
43 69. Tai A, Volkmer R, Burton A. Association between asthma symptoms and obesity in
44 preschool (4-5 year old) children. *J Asthma* 2009;**46**(4):362-65.
45
46
47
48
49
50 70. Slining M, Adair LS, Goldman BD, *et al.* Infant overweight is associated with delayed
51 motor development. *J Pediatr* 2010;**157**(1):20-5.e21.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 71. Williams JW, Canterford L, Hesketh KD, *et al.* Changes in body mass index and health
4 related quality of life from childhood to adolescence. *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2011;**6**(2-2):e442-
5 e448.
6
7
8
9
10
11 72. Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, *et al.* Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through
12 action on the social determinants of health. *Lancet* 2008;**372**(9650):1661-69.
13
14
15
16
17 73. Imai K, Gregg EW, Chen YJ, Zhang P, *et al.* The association of BMI with functional status
18 and self-rated health in US adults. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2008;**16**(2):402-8.
19
20
21
22
23
24 74. Simonsen MK, Hundrup YA, Grønbaek M, *et al.* A prospective study of the association
25 between weight changes and self-rated health. *BMC Womens Health* 2008;**8**:13.
26
27
28
29
30
31 75. Cameron AJ, Magliano DJ, Dunstan DW, *et al.* A bi-directional relationship between
32 obesity and health-related quality of life: evidence from the longitudinal AusDiab study. *Int*
33 *J Obes (Lond)* 2012;**36**(2):295-303.
34
35
36
37
38
39 76. Sawyer MG, Harchak T, Wake M, *et al.* Four-year prospective study of BMI and mental
40 health problems in young children. *Pediatrics* 2011;**128**(4):677-84.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 77. Jansen PW, Mensah FK, Clifford S, *et al.* Bidirectional associations between overweight
48 and health-related quality of life from 4-11 years: Longitudinal Study of Australian
49 Children. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2013;**37**(10):1307-13.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 78. Coneus K, Spiess CK. The intergenerational transmission of health in early childhood -
4 evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study. *Econ Hum Biol* 2012;**10**(1):89-
5 97.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 79. Case A, Lubotsky D, Paxson C. Economic status and health in childhood: the origins of the
13 gradient. *Am Econ Rev* 2002;**92**(5):1308-34.
14
15
16
17
18 80. Silburn SR, Zubrick SR, Garton A, *et al.* Western Australia Child Health Survey: family
19 and community health. Perth, Western Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics and the
20 TVW Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, 1996.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 81. Waters E, Doyle J, Wolfe R, *et al.* Influence of parental gender and self-reported health and
28 illness on parent-reported child health. *Pediatrics* 2000;**106**(6):1422-28.
29
30
31
32
33
34 82. Dadds MR, Stein RE, Silver EJ. The role of maternal psychological adjustment in the
35 measurement of children's functional status. *J Pediatr Psychol* 1995;**20**(4):527-44.
36
37
38
39
40
41 83. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, *et al.* Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index
42 offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol*
43 2013;**42**(1):111-27.
44
45
46
47
48
49 84. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, *et al.* Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal
50 Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. *Int J Epidemiol* 2013;**42**(1):97-
51 110.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 85. Howe L, Galobardes B, Tilling K, *et al.* Does drop-out from cohort studies bias estimates
4 of socioeconomic inequalities in health? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2011;**65**:A31.
5
6
7
8
9
10 86. Wolke D, Waylen A, Samara M, *et al.* Selective drop-out in longitudinal studies and non-
11 biased prediction of behaviour disorders. *Br J Psychiatry* 2009;**195**(3):249-56.
12
13
14
15
16 87. Nilsen RM, Vollset SE, Gjessing HK, *et al.* Self-selection and bias in a large prospective
17 pregnancy cohort in Norway. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 2009;**23**(6):597-608.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

LICENCE FOR PUBLICATION STATEMENT

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Group and co-owners or contracting owning societies (where published by the BMJ Group on their behalf), and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in any BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

For peer review only

1
2
3 1 **Title: Preschoolers' parent rated health disparities are strongly associated with**
4 2 **measures of adiposity in the Lifeways cohort study children**
5
6 3

7 4 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

8
9 5 Professor Cecily C Kelleher

10 6 School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science,

11 7 Woodview House,

12 8 University College Dublin

13 9 Belfield,

14 10 Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland

15 11 Tel: +3531 7162045

16 12 Fax: +3531 7163421

17 13 cecily.kelleher@ucd.ie
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 15 **AUTHORS**

26 16 Aakash Shrivastava¹ PhD

27 17 Celine Murrin¹ PhD

28 18 Cecily C Kelleher¹ MD

29 19 ¹School of Public Health, Physiotherapy and Population Science, University College Dublin,
30 20 Woodview House, Belfield, Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland
31
32
33
34

35 22 **Running Title: Childhood obesity a persistent predictor of preschoolers' PRH**
36
37
38

39 24 **KEYWORDS**

40 25 Lifecourse, self-rated health, obesity, BMI, waist circumference, preschool children
41
42
43

44 27 **Word count: 3439**
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 **ABSTRACT (Words: 272)**
4
5 2

6 3 **Objective**
7

8
9 4 To examine the relationship between lifecourse factors from preschoolers' micro-ecosystem
10
11 5 and their parent-reported (mother-reported) health (PRH), following them prospectively from
12
13 6 preconception to age 5-years. To investigate if preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference
14
15 7 were associated with preschoolers' PRH when controlled for lifecourse predictors.
16
17

18 8 **Design**
19

20
21 9 Lifeways cross-generation cohort study
22

23 10 **Setting**
24

25
26 11 Ireland
27
28

29 12 **Participants**
30

31
32 13 Of 1082 families, 62% mothers responded on a health and lifestyle questionnaire at follow-
33
34 14 up. Food frequency, BMI and waist-circumference were measured. **There were 547 family**
35
36 15 **datasets available for analysis of children's PRH.**
37
38

39 16 **Main outcome measure**
40

41
42 17 Mother-reported children's PRH at age-5. Associations with child's individual and familial
43
44 18 exposures from preconception to age 5-years examined using logistic regression.
45

46 19 **Results**
47

48
49 20 In univariate analysis, relatively-positive rating of children's PRH were associated with
50
51 21 children's lower intake of fats [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], higher intake of fruits/vegetables
52
53 22 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)]; as well as familial socio-economic characteristics {higher
54
55 23 household income [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], non-entitlement to means-tested healthcare
56
57
58
59
60

1 [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers' higher education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)]}, psycho-
2 social characteristics {father's participation in study [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mothers'
3 perceiving better support from partner [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], children
4 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)] or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]}, parents' lifestyle
5 {mothers' lower intake of energy [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)], fathers' non-smoking status
6 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]}, and parents' health {mothers' self-rated health relatively-
7 positive [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)], fathers' self-rated health relatively-positive
8 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)]}.

9 In multivariable analysis ($\chi^2=34.2, df=21, N=303, R^2=0.26, p<0.05$), one of the two strong
10 predictors of children's relatively-positive PRH was child not being obese by International
11 Obesity Task Force classification [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)], observed also using BMI
12 (kg/m^2) [OR(95%CI)=0.73(0.58-0.93)] or waist-circumference (cm) [OR(95%CI)=0.89(0.81-
13 0.98)] as continuous variables. The other significant predictor was mothers' self-rated health
14 relatively-positive [OR(95%CI)=4.2(1.5-12.2)].

15 **Conclusions**

16 Preschoolers' health is adversely associated with obesity and this is independent of lifecourse
17 social and environmental inequalities. **The findings suggest that reducing childhood obesity
18 and improving maternal health may be useful ways to improve child's global health.**

19

1
2
3 **1 Strengths and limitations of this study**
4

- 5
6 2 • Nationally representative sample of preschool-age children
7
8
9 3 • Examines the influence of lifecourse adversities, prospectively measured from
10
11 4 preconception to age 5 on children's general health at age 5. The study analyses
12
13 5 demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, food and nutrients intake, psycho-social,
14
15 6 socio-economic and health-related exposures from both children's individual as well
16
17 7 as parental experiences.
18
19
20 8 • Demonstrates a significant and independent association between preschoolers'
21
22 9 measured BMI as well as waist circumference and their general health status.
23
24
25 10 • The study is limited by a relatively small sample and use of parent-reported health
26
27 11 status.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 MAIN TEXT

2 Introduction

3 The development of children is critical to their adult well-being^[1,2] and across the lifecourse
4 even subjective estimates may be useful to reflect objectively measured health^[3,4].
5 Bronfenbrenner^[5] emphasised the importance of children's micro-ecosystem in their
6 development. Recently, the World Health Organisation's (WHO) Commission on Social
7 Determinants of Health (CSDH) presented a Total Environment Assessment Model for Early
8 Child Development (TEAM-ECD),^[6] which again illustrates the importance of individual and
9 family spheres of influence on children's health. The relevance of socio-economic, psycho-
10 social and lifestyle environment in child development and health is widely acknowledged.^[6-8]
11 According to the lifecourse hypothesis, risk transmission is characterised by critical periods
12 and accumulation of risk models.^[9] Life Course Health Development (LCHD) framework^[10]
13 suggests that health is a consequence of multiple determinants that change in context of time
14 and circumstances as an individual develops; these experiences are programmed into bio-
15 behavioural regulatory systems during certain critical and sensitive periods of individual's
16 lifetime to decide their health trajectory. The lifecourse framework on childhood
17 disadvantage and adult health^[11] suggests that parental and childhood circumstances from the
18 point of conception influences individual's health in later life, and the individual's childhood
19 health and later life circumstances may further add to this foundation. Based on this,
20 Hertzman and colleagues^[12] examined self-rated health in adulthood using an integrated
21 lifecourse framework. There are a few other studies also which have examined lifecourse
22 determinants of adult global^[13,14] or specific health status.^[15] On the contrary, the literature on
23 the determinants of child global health status is sparse,^[16,17] particularly for the preschool-age
24 children.^[18] Even rarer are studies whose examination includes early lifecourse determinants
25 of child global health status.

1
2
3 1 Thus the first objective of our analysis was to prospectively examine the relationship between
4
5 2 demographic, anthropometric, lifestyle, nutritional, psycho-social, socio-economic and
6
7 3 health-related lifecourse exposures taken from the children's individual and family spheres of
8
9 4 influence starting from preconception up to age 5-years and their global health status at
10
11 5 preschool-age.

12
13
14 6 In social epidemiology, the construct of "embodiment" refers to biological expression of
15
16 7 individuals' materio-social world.^[19,20] Similarly in lifecourse epidemiology, it is
17
18 8 hypothesised that early life experiences get "biologically embedded" during critical or
19
20 9 sensitive periods of child development leading to gradients in health.^[21,22]

21
22
23
24 10 The Foresight report identifies a large array of environmental determinants of obesity, a
25
26 11 number of which are again related to early child development.^[23] This suggests obesity as
27
28 12 pivotal risk factor for subsequent health conditions.^[24]

29
30
31 13 The negative relationship between obesity and self-rated health is now increasingly reported
32
33 14 in adult populations,^[25,26] some indicating a temporal relationship^[27,28] and suggesting that
34
35 15 obesity increases health inequalities over time.^[28] However, evidence on the relationship
36
37 16 between obesity and health is relatively limited in child population studies and those
38
39 17 available have reported health-related-quality-of-life (HR-QoL)^[29] instead of a generic
40
41 18 measure such as global self-rated health. Moreover, this association is yet to be established
42
43 19 for preschool-age children. To our knowledge just two population based studies have
44
45 20 examined this association in preschool age-group children^[30,31] and neither had nutritional
46
47 21 information.

48
49
50
51 22 In the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children, Wake *et al.*^[30] did not find a significant
52
53 23 difference in global health status of overweight/obese and normal weight 4-5-year-old
54
55 24 children. Skinner *et al.*,^[31] using data on 3-5-year-olds from the US National Health and
56
57
58
59
60

1 Nutrition Examination Survey, reported a poorer global health status in obese and severely
2 obese preschoolers. Neither of these studies accounted for a number of possibly relevant
3 confounders, including parental BMI, parental health and nutritional variables.

4 We thus hypothesised that similar to findings from studies on older age-groups,
5 anthropometric markers of child obesity in our preschool-age children study would also
6 demonstrate a negative association with their global health status. The next objective of our
7 analysis was to examine whether anthropometric markers of child obesity would emerge as
8 strong predictors of global health status when accounted for other socio-economic, psycho-
9 social, and lifestyle environmental factors in a multivariable model.

10 **Methods**

11 The Lifeways cross generation cohort study comprises three generations of 1082 Irish
12 families and was established in 2001-03; the recruitment procedure of this nationally
13 representative cohort has been described previously.^[32-34] The a priori purpose was to
14 examine familial and cross-generation influences on early childhood development over the
15 first five years of children's lives. Briefly, would-be mothers were at random recruited from
16 the two regional maternity hospitals in the Republic of Ireland to get a representative sample.
17 A comparison between the Lifeways mothers and a nationally representative sample of
18 women of the same age group from the SLÁN (Survey of Lifestyle, Attitudes and Nutrition)
19 surveys of Republic of Ireland^[35] confirmed that the Lifeways mothers were satisfactorily
20 representative of the Irish general women on socio-demographic characteristics.^[33]

21 At this early pregnancy stage mothers completed a health and lifestyle status questionnaire
22 adapted from a validated instrument developed for Irish national SLÁN surveys.^[35] Mothers
23 reported their pre-pregnancy height (cm) and weight (kg) and their smoking status during
24 pregnancy. Mothers' and partners' socio-economic status was recorded. Subsequently at

1 birth, the live infants were added to the cohort along-with maternity and birth related hospital
2 information.

3 In 2007-08, when these children averaged five years of age, the cohort follow-up recorded a
4 62% response rate.^[34,36] Though mothers who responded to the follow-up were more likely to
5 be of higher socioeconomic status, these mothers did not significantly differ in their baseline
6 anthropometric characteristics (including BMI) from non-responders.^[34,36] At this 5-year
7 follow-up, mothers repeated the health and lifestyle assessment questionnaire, with additional
8 questions related to her family, including a five-level likert item question “In general, would
9 you say your / your partner’s / your Lifeways child’s current health is Excellent, Very Good,
10 Good, Fair or Poor”. Mothers provided information on family’s socio-economic, psycho-
11 social, and lifestyle status. Mothers reported their habitual dietary intake for the previous year
12 on a semi-quantitative food frequency (SQFFQ) instrument developed from the EPIC study
13 (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition) and validated for Irish adult
14 population.^[37] Mothers also gave details for the Lifeways child’s habitual diet for the
15 previous year using a different SQFFQ instrument adapted from the UK National Diet and
16 Nutrition Survey of 4.5-year-old children.^[38] The mothers’ and children’s SQFFQ were
17 validated in the Lifeways study using a 7-day weighed food diary in a sub-sample.^[36] Food
18 items were aggregated by defined shelves (food groups) of the Irish food pyramid and
19 assessment was made for average servings per day of standard food item portions consumed
20 from the “top” and “fruit and vegetable” food groups (shelves of Irish food pyramid). The
21 “top” food group comprises of high calorie fat and sugar rich foods. Total energy (kcal) and
22 total fats (g) intake were computed using conversion values from McCance & Widdowson’s
23 food composition tables^[39] with a specially developed FFQ software version 1.0 ©.^[40]

24 Mothers and children, and if available fathers, were offered at 5-year follow-up an
25 anthropometric assessment at their home for height (cm), weight (kg) and waist

1
2
3 1 circumference (cm) using a standardised protocol,^[34,36] with 80-85% mothers and children
4
5 2 participating. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated from weight and height information
6
7 3 (kg/m²).
8
9

10 4 Thus variables from discrete stages (pre-pregnancy, early pregnancy, at birth, early infancy
11
12 5 and 5-year follow-up) of child's early development representing lifecourse exposures from
13
14 6 distinct domains (demographic, anthropometric, socio-economic, psycho-social, lifestyle,
15
16 7 nutritional and health) of child's individual and family spheres of influence^[6-8] were
17
18 8 considered to analyse determinants of child's health status at age-5. The selection of
19
20 9 variables, domains and spheres of influence are based on the CSDH constructed TEAM-
21
22 10 ECD, a model of early child development.^[6-8] These lifecourse variables have been
23
24 11 summarised as per time frame in **Table 1**. This lifecourse time frame highlights the stages
25
26 12 and transition points relevant from perspective of child's health development.^[10] Additional
27
28 13 details on these variables are provided in **eTable 1** available in the web only supplement. The
29
30 14 independent variables have been arranged as child-related, family-related, mother-related,
31
32 15 father-related groups for ease of presentation.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Table 1: Independent variables examined from lifecourse of 5-yr-old children

Lifecourse	Independent Variables
Pre-pregnancy	Maternal Pre-pregnancy BMI
Early pregnancy	Family stability Maternal smoking in pregnancy, Maternal Education level Paternal Education level
Birth	Child's Birth-weight, Gestational age, Gender Maternal Parity
Infancy	Child's breastfeeding status
When children averaged 5-yr age	Child's Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables food groups, Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake Family household weekly income, Entitlement to means tested healthcare benefits scheme, Family structure (marital status), Support from partner, parents, children & relatives Maternal Age, Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Food intake: top and fruits & vegetables food groups, Nutrient intake: energy and fats intake, Self-rated health status Paternal Height, BMI, Waist circumference, Smoking, Employment status, Self-rated health status

2

3 Children's global health status rated in proxy by their mothers, hereafter referred to as parent-rated health (PRH), was the outcome variable of interest. The 5-graded scale response was

4

5 dichotomised as relatively-positive health (excellent or very good) and relatively-negative

6 health (poor or fair or good), based on similar dichotomisation in other studies on preschool

7 and school children.^[17,18,30] It is reasonable to take a higher cut-off when dichotomising this

8 age dependent variable in this very young age-group as there would be very limited numbers

9 of poor or fair health children.^[17,18,41]

10 Initially, uni-variate associations were established between the independent predictors and

11 children's PRH using independent t-tests or chi-square tests. Independent categorical

12 variables were dichotomised in a manner that allowed contrasting extreme levels against the

13 others. Thus, using International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) cut-offs, children's BMI was

14 dichotomised as obese versus over-weight or normal-weight. Similarly nutrition variables

15 ordered in quintiles were dichotomised as the extreme quintile (1st or 5th) versus the rest.

1
2
3 1 From these independent variables principally chosen on the basis of their relevance to the
4
5 2 child's development,^[6-8] all those that qualified at significance level 20% ($p < 0.2$)^[42] in
6
7 3 univariate analyses were force entered into a multivariable logistic regression model. BMI
8
9 4 (kg/m^2) and waist circumference (cm), the anthropometric markers of obesity, were tested
10
11 5 separately in independent multivariable models. **They were not analysed together within a**
12
13 6 **model as results of possible interactions among body composition variables would have been**
14
15 7 **difficult to interpret** ^[43,44]. Initially BMI was tested as a categorical variable in a model,
16
17 8 followed by two additional models substituting it with BMI and then waist circumference as
18
19 9 continuous variables. Other independent variables were tested as categorical variables.

20
21
22
23
24 10 Ethical approval for the Lifeways study was obtained respectively from ethical committees of
25
26 11 participating hospitals and the University College Dublin, Ireland. Written informed consent
27
28 12 was obtained from study participants.

30 13 **Results**

31
32
33 14 There were 547 family datasets available for analysis of children's PRH. **Table 2** presents the
34
35 15 uni-variate associations between children's lifecourse variables and PRH. Within the
36
37 16 individual-sphere of influences, children's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary
38
39 17 foods and total fats, and higher intake of fruits/vegetables) and their anthropometric measures
40
41 18 at age-5 (not being obese, lower BMI, and lower waist circumference) qualified as
42
43 19 determinants of children's relatively-positive PRH for further examination in the
44
45 20 multivariable model.

46
47
48
49 21 In other words, retaining $p < 0.2$ as the criterion for significance, the children's healthy food
50
51 22 and nutrient intake habits – such as **lower** intake of unhealthy fat- and sugar- rich foods
52
53 23 (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)] or total fats (g) in their meals
54
55 24 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] and **higher** intake of healthy fruits and vegetables (servings/day)

1 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] were positively associated with their favourable rating for health
2 by their mothers. Conversely, children's **higher** BMI (kg/m^2) [OR(95%CI)=0.85(0.71-1.03)]
3 and waist circumference (cm) [OR(95%CI)=0.95(0.88-1.02)] were inversely associated with
4 a positive parental-rated health status.

5 Within the family-sphere of influences, socio-economic status (higher household income,
6 non-entitlement to subsidised healthcare, both parents' higher education status, and father's
7 employment status), psycho-social status (father's study participation, mother's perceived
8 social support), mother's lifestyle behaviours (lower intake of fatty/sugary foods, total energy
9 and total fats), father's lifestyle behaviours (non-smoker), and both parents' health status
10 (relatively-positive self-rated health) qualified as determinants of children's relatively-
11 positive PRH for further examination in the multivariable model.

12 In other words, by maintaining $p < 0.2$ as the criterion for significance, several indicators of a
13 family's better socio-economic status— such as **higher** household income (Euros/week)
14 [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.6-5.9)], not requiring subsidised healthcare [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)],
15 mother having a third level education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], father having a third level
16 education [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.6)], father being self-employed [OR(95%CI)=2.5(0.8-
17 7.9)]; family's better psycho-social status— such as father's involvement in family affairs
18 [OR(95%CI)=2.1(1.0-4.3)], mother's perceiving a positive social support from spouse
19 [OR(95%CI)=2.3(1.2-4.3)], parents [OR(95%CI)=2.0(1.0-4.1)], children
20 [OR(95%CI)=1.9(1.0-3.7)], or relatives [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.1)]; family's better lifestyle
21 and food and nutrient intake habits— such as mother's **lower** intake of unhealthy fat- and
22 sugar- rich foods (servings/day) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)], total energy (kcal)
23 [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.3)] and total fats (g) [OR(95%CI)=1.7(0.8-3.4)] in her meals, father's
24 not being a smoker [OR(95%CI)=2.2(1.1-4.4)]; and family's better health status— such as
25 mother [OR(95%CI)=5.1(2.6-9.9)] and father [OR(95%CI)=3.0(1.5-6.0)] having a positively

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 rated health status were positively associated with children’s favourable rating for health by
2 their mothers.
3

For peer review only

1 Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=547)

	Relatively Negative PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		OR	95% CI
	N	(n=42) %(n) Mean (SD)	(n=505) %(n) Mean (SD)			
Child's Individual Characteristics						
Birth-weight adjusted for gestational age (g)	487	(34) 3564.1 (616)	(453) 3548.4 (552)	1.00	(0.999-1.001)	
Child's Age (Yrs)	547	(42) 5.42 (0.23)	(505) 5.46 (0.25)			
Gender	547					
Male		8.0% (22)	92.0% (242)	Ref		
Female		7.1% (21)	92.9% (262)	1.14	(0.60-2.20)	
BMI (kg/m ²)	464	(35) 17.09 (2.5)	(429) 16.59 (1.6)	0.85	(0.71-1.03) [^]	
BMI [IOTF]	464					
Obese		16.7% (5)	83.3% (25)	Ref		
Overweight / Normal		6.9% (30)	93.1% (404)	2.69	(0.96-7.54) [^]	
Waist Circumference (cm)	462	(35) 57.01 (6.8)	(427) 55.88 (4.3)	0.95	(0.88-1.02) [†]	
Height (cm)	464	(35) 111.6 (5.6)	(429) 112.1 (4.8)	1.02	(0.95-1.10)	
Breastfeeding	528					
Not breastfed		6.5% (16)	93.5% (229)	Ref		
Breastfed		8.8% (25)	91.2% (258)	0.72	(0.38-1.38)	
Energy (Kcal)	547					
Quintile 5 (>1794 kcal)		10% (11)	90.0% (99)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		7.1% (31)	92.9% (406)	1.46	(0.71-3.00)	
Fats (g)	547					
Quintile 5 (>62.9 g)		12.8% (14)	87.2% (95)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)	93.6% (410)	2.16	(1.09-4.26) [*]	
Top food group (servings/day)	547					
Quintile 5 (>6.47 servings)		10.9% (12)	89.1% (98)	Ref		
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)	93.1% (407)	1.66	(0.82-3.36) [†]	
Fruits Veg food group (servings/d)	547					
Quintile 1 (<2.1 servings)		12.8% (14)	87.2% (95)	Ref		
Quintile 2-5		6.4% (28)	93.6% (410)	2.16	(1.09-4.26) [*]	
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income	509					
Less than 760 Euros/wk		13.3% (26)	86.7% (170)	Ref		
More than 760 Euros/wk		4.8% (15)	95.2% (298)	3.04	(1.57-5.90) ^{**}	
Entitlement to General Medical Card	532					
Entitled		13% (12)	87.0% (80)	Ref		
Not entitled		6.6% (29)	93.4% (411)	2.13	(1.04-4.34) [*]	
Fathers' Participation	547					
Not		9.7% (31)	90.3% (290)	Ref		
Yes		4.9% (11)	95.1% (215)	2.09	(1.03-4.25) [*]	
Marital Status	542					
Others		11.4% (5)	88.6% (39)	Ref		
Married/Cohabiting		7.2% (36)	92.8% (462)	1.65	(0.61-4.43)	
Elder children in family (Parity)	535					
Nullipara		8% (18)	92.0% (207)	Ref		
Multipara		7.7% (24)	92.3% (286)	1.04	(0.55-1.96)	
Support from Spouse/Partner	538					
Lesser support		12.9% (17)	87.1% (115)	Ref		
More support		6.2% (25)	93.8% (381)	2.25	(1.18-4.32) [*]	
Support from Parents	487					
Lesser support		12.5% (12)	87.5% (84)	Ref		
More support		6.6% (26)	93.4% (365)	2.01	(0.97-4.14) [^]	
Support from Children	532					
Lesser support		10.6% (20)	89.4% (169)	Ref		
More support		5.8% (20)	94.2% (323)	1.91	(1.00-3.65) [*]	
Support from Close Relatives	510					
Lesser support		12.4% (19)	87.6% (134)	Ref		
More support		6.2% (22)	93.8% (335)	2.16	(1.13-4.12) [*]	

1 Table 2: Uni-variate lifecourse associates of children's relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (continued)

	N	Relatively Negative PRH (n=42)		Relatively Positive PRH (n=505)		OR	95% CI
		%(n)	Mean (SD)	%(n)	Mean (SD)		
Maternal Characteristics							
Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	475	(36)	23.3 (3.3)	(439)	23.8 (3.9)	1.04	(0.94-1.14)
Pre-pregnancy BMI [WHO cut offs]							
Obese		2.6% (1)		97.4% (38)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		8% (35)		92.0% (401)		0.30	(0.04-2.26)
Mother's Age (Yrs)	546	(42)	36.5 (6.3)	(504)	37.1 (5.3)	1.02	(0.96-1.08)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	432		25.6 (3.9)		26.3 (5.0)	1.03	(0.95-1.12)
BMI at 5-yr follow-up [WHO cut offs]	432						
Obese		7.2% (5)		92.8% (64)		Ref	
Overweight / Normal		7.4% (27)		92.6% (336)		0.97	(0.36-2.62)
Waist Circumference (cm)	434	(31)	85.3 (10.6)	(403)	87.6 (11.9)	1.02	(0.99-1.05)
Height (cm)	454	(33)	161.9 (6.8)	(421)	162.9 (6.0)	1.03	(0.97-1.09)
Smoking in pregnancy	534						
Smoker		8.1% (8)		91.9% (91)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (33)		92.4% (402)		1.07	(0.48-2.4)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	541						
Smoker		7.6% (9)		92.4% (110)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		7.6% (32)		92.4% (390)		1.0	(0.46-2.15)
Energy (Kcal)	546						
Quintile 5 (>2570.9 kcal)		13% (14)		87.0% (94)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.4% (28)		93.6% (410)		2.18	(1.11-4.30)*
Fats (g)	546						
Quintile 5 (>106 g)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (407)		1.68	(0.83-3.40)†
Top food group (servings/day)	545						
Quintile 5 (>8.35 servings)		11% (12)		89.0% (97)		Ref	
Quintile 1-4		6.9% (30)		93.1% (406)		1.67	(0.83-3.39)†
Fruits Veg food group (servings/day)	546						
Quintile 1 (<4.5 servings)		9.1% (10)		90.9% (100)		Ref	
Quintile 2-5		7.3% (32)		92.7% (404)		1.26	(0.60-2.65)
Education level	534						
Lower		10.4% (25)		89.6% (215)		Ref	
Third Level		5.8% (17)		94.2% (277)		1.90	(1.00-3.60)*
Employment	545						
Not Earning		6.4% (15)		93.6% (221)		Ref	
Employed		9% (22)		91.0% (222)		0.69	(0.35-1.36)
Self employed		7.7% (5)		92.3% (60)		0.81	(0.29-2.33)
Self reported health	546						
Relatively Negative		17.1% (27)		82.9% (131)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		3.9% (15)		96.1% (373)		5.10	(2.64-9.93)**
Paternal Characteristics							
BMI at 5-yr follow-up (kg/m ²)	66	(4)		(62)		0.97	(0.76-1.23)
Waist Circumference (cm)	65	(3)		(62)		1.01	(0.90-1.13)
Height (cm)	66	(4)		(62)		1.01	(0.88-1.15)
Smoking at 5-yr follow-up	521						
Smoker		11.5% (16)		88.5% (123)		Ref	
Non-Smoker		5.5% (21)		94.5% (361)		2.24	(1.13-4.42)*
Education level	514						
Lower		11.1% (16)		88.9% (128)		Ref	
Third Level		6.2% (23)		93.8% (347)		1.89	(0.97-3.68)^
Employment	518						
Not Earning		9.2% (8)		90.8% (79)		Ref	
Employed		7.9% (24)		92.1% (279)		1.18	(0.51-2.72)
Self employed		3.9% (5)		96.1% (123)		2.49	(0.79-7.89)†
Self reported health	510						
Relatively Negative		12.6% (20)		87.4% (139)		Ref	
Relatively Positive		4.6% (16)		95.4% (335)		3.01	(1.52-5.99)**

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, ^p<0.1, †p<0.2; Ref=reference category (OR=1)

1 **Table 3** presents the multivariable model for association between qualifying lifecourse
2 variables and children's relatively-positive PRH at age-5. A significantly strong predictor of
3 children's relatively-positive PRH was child's not being obese by IOTF classification
4 [OR(95%CI)=5.5(1.4-21.0)]. When BMI was tested as a continuous variable, there was 0.73
5 (95%CI=0.58-0.93) times **lower** odds of the child being positively rated on health status for
6 every 1 kg/m² increase in their BMI. Similarly in the waist circumference model, for every 1
7 cm increase there was 0.89 (95%CI=0.81-0.98) times **lower** odds of the child getting a
8 relatively-positive rating on health status. Thus the association between children's BMI or
9 waist circumference and their PRH only strengthened following adjustments in this
10 multivariate model, irrespective of being analysed as a categorical or continuous variable.
11 Another significant predictor of children's relatively-positive PRH was mother's having rated
12 her own health as relatively-positive. These predictors maintained the highest strength of
13 association with children's health status when independent variables were standardised (not
14 reported here). None of the other variables reached the level of statistical significance. The
15 models explained over 25 percent of variance for children's PRH.

Table 3: Multivariable Logistic Regression model for predictors of children’s relatively-positive parent-rated health, PRH (N=303)

	Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH		Relatively Positive PRH	
	BMI Categorical ¹		BMI Continuous ²		WC Continuous ³	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Child's Individual Characteristics						
BMI [IOTF], Obese ⁺ vs Overweight / Normal	5.48	(1.43-21.03) *				
BMI kg/m ² [Continuous]			0.73	(0.58-0.93) **		
Waist Circumference cm [Continuous]					0.89	(0.81-0.98) *
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.57	(0.42-5.79)	1.49	(0.40-5.53)	1.32	(0.36-4.80)
Top food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.23	(0.33-4.53)	1.30	(0.36-4.63)	1.29	(0.36-4.62)
Fruits Veg food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q1 ⁺ vs Q2-5	2.57	(0.75-8.80)	2.86	(0.83-9.93)	2.73	(0.78-9.49)
Family Characteristics						
Household Weekly Income, Less ⁺ vs High	1.85	(0.63-5.40)	1.76	(0.59-5.21)	1.79	(0.61-5.26)
Entitlement to General Medical, Card Yes ⁺ vs No	0.94	(0.24-3.71)	1.03	(0.26-4.07)	1.04	(0.26-4.10)
Fathers' Participation, Not ⁺ vs Yes	1.88	(0.68-5.21)	1.86	(0.67-5.16)	2.06	(0.74-5.71)
Support from Spouse/Partner, Less ⁺ vs More	0.70	(0.20-2.49)	0.67	(0.19-2.33)	0.74	(0.22-2.52)
Support from Parents, Less ⁺ vs More	1.92	(0.53-6.93)	2.33	(0.64-8.42)	2.37	(0.66-8.53)
Support from Children, Less ⁺ vs More	1.15	(0.38-3.45)	1.29	(0.42-3.91)	1.25	(0.41-3.82)
Support from Close Relatives, Less ⁺ vs More	0.86	(0.23-3.13)	0.84	(0.24-3.02)	0.84	(0.23-3.01)
Maternal Characteristics						
Energy Kcal [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.89	(0.30-11.84)	2.00	(0.31-12.86)	1.57	(0.28-8.84)
Fats gm [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	0.72	(0.09-5.54)	0.59	(0.07-4.77)	0.92	(0.13-6.41)
Top food group servings/d [Quintiles], Q5 ⁺ vs Q1-4	1.08	(0.29-3.94)	1.30	(0.36-4.65)	1.18	(0.32-4.34)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	1.34	(0.47-3.78)	1.35	(0.48-3.80)	1.48	(0.53-4.13)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	4.20	(1.45-12.20) **	4.42	(1.53-12.79) **	4.17	(1.47-11.87) **
Paternal Characteristics						
Current Smoking status, Yes ⁺ vs No	1.37	(0.48-3.93)	1.31	(0.45-3.83)	1.53	(0.54-4.35)
Education, Lower ⁺ vs Third level	0.69	(0.21-2.28)	0.79	(0.24-2.57)	0.83	(0.26-2.67)
Employment, Non-earning ⁺ vs Self employed	1.60	(0.73-3.53)	1.52	(0.69-3.32)	1.57	(0.70-3.53)
Self reported health status, Rel.Negative ⁺ vs Rel.Positive	1.48	(0.52-4.20)	1.54	(0.54-4.35)	1.43	(0.51-3.96)

OR=Odds Ratio; ⁺Reference category (OR=1); **p<0.01 (2-tailed), *p<0.05 (2-tailed)

Rel.Negative=Relatively Negative, Rel.Positive=Relatively Positive

¹Child BMI as a categorical variable; Model Chi-sq = 34.2, df = 21, p = 0.034; -2LL = 128.6, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.26

²Child BMI as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 35.9, df = 21, p = 0.022; -2LL = 126.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.27

³Child waist circumference as a continuous variable; Model Chi-sq = 33.8, df = 21, p = 0.038; -2LL = 128.9, Nagelkerke R-sq = 0.25

1 Discussion

2 This analysis showed that determinants from both child's individual and family spheres have an
3 influence on child's health at preschool-age. The factors from all three material, psycho-social and
4 lifestyle domains, the major explanations for child health inequalities,^[8] were associated at uni-
5 variate levels. However, in the final model this analysis clearly demonstrated a negative
6 association between child's obesity and health status. Child's not being obese was one of the
7 significantly strong predictors of child's relatively-positive health status, which was also observed
8 with measured BMI and waist circumference analysed as continuous variables.

9 This negative relationship observed between measured obesity and PRH conforms to published
10 literature on primary school age-group children and adolescents.^[45-47] Most importantly, for the
11 first time to our knowledge, this analysis demonstrates the association having adjusted for food
12 and nutrient intake, along-with a wide range of other explanatory variables.

13 Self-rated health is an important and valid measure of morbidity, mortality, longevity and health
14 status,^[3,4] also in Irish adult^[48,49] and children.^[16] It is believed to be a more inclusive measure of
15 health than the objective measurements, with a capacity to comprehensively evaluate health
16 dynamics, behaviours and psycho-physiological states that are not otherwise easy to measure.^[3]

17 This holistic measure better accommodates the WHO defined concept of health as opposed to a
18 diagnosed specific disease.^[3] Use of parent proxy for child self-reported health is justified for
19 children too young to have adequate cognitive skills.^[50,51] Systematic reviews report good
20 agreement between ratings by children and their parents on child HRQoL, particularly for physical
21 health domain.^[50-52] Parents tend to be thoughtful when responding to proxy questions and report
22 children's usual health disposition.^[53] Studies on construct validity report positively.^[54-57] Maternal
23 ratings of child's general health status were found sensitive when validated against children's
24 illnesses and other morbidity or healthcare indicators,^[41,58-60] including evidence of a gradient in
25 strength of these associations.^[41] Many national-level studies have accepted parent proxy as an

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 appropriate measure^[17,18,61,62] and successfully used it to longitudinally demonstrate risk and
2 consequences of child health.^[17,61]

3 Self-rated health, a composite measure, represents all domains of HR-QoL,^[4] but better represents
4 physical health than HR-QoL.^[63] Studies on older age-group children have reported stronger/sole
5 negative associations for general/physical health domain of HR-QoL and obesity,^[46,64] irrespective
6 whether children themselves or parents reported their HRQoL,^[29] and also whether BMI was
7 analysed as a categorical,^[45,46] or continuous variable.^[65,66]

8 Another relevance of this analysis is in demonstrating this association of obesity with general-
9 health in a nationally representative sample of preschool-age children, for which literature is scant.

10 Though, a few have shown similar association of obesity with specific paediatric conditions or
11 admission history in this age-group.^[30,31,67-70] A longitudinal study speculated that pre-school
12 obesity influences a decline in early-age health, and then both obesity and poor-health tracks into
13 adolescence.^[71] The WHO recommends high priority for determinants of health inequalities during
14 early development.^[72]

15 The Lifeways previously demonstrated longitudinal association between parental socio-economic
16 and lifestyle characteristics and child's BMI and waist circumference.^[36] In this analysis when
17 same anthropometric measures are included along-with material, psycho-social, and lifestyle
18 determinants of child obesity and health, a prominent relationship emerges between children's
19 anthropometric measures and health status. One possible explanation is that determinants of health
20 inequalities biologically embed^[21,22] in early life and child obesity is an early phenotypic
21 expression of this inequality; though the continued influence of environmental factors is not
22 undermined. Adult^[25,26] and adolescence studies^[46,47] have also shown this association to be
23 independent of socio-demographic, lifestyle or health-related factors.

24 The observed association between BMI or waist circumference and PRH in the present analysis

1
2
3 1 may be temporal, as demonstrated in adults.^[27,28] Though a number of large scale cross sectional
4
5 2 studies have shown an association between anthropometric measures of obesity and self rated
6
7 3 health,^[73] only recently a few nationally representative prospective studies have established the
8
9 4 temporality of this association in adults.^[27,28] Though this relationship maybe bi-directional to an
10
11 5 extent,^[74,75] the mounting evidence from longitudinal birth cohort studies regarding a sequential
12
13 6 relationship between lifetime growth trajectories and adult disease, disability and deaths^[2]
14
15 7 primarily rules out reverse causality in this association and suggests that the association observed
16
17 8 in our birth cohort is also more likely to be temporal. Moreover, the available findings from a few
18
19 9 longitudinal studies on primary school age children suggest that at least in the childhood this
20
21 10 inverse association found between BMI and HRQoL is predominantly in the given direction and
22
23 11 not the reverse.^[76,77] However, this needs careful interpretation as both anthropometric and health
24
25 12 data were concurrently collected, and this limitation may be addressed with next sweep of cohort
26
27 13 data collection.

28
29
30
31
32 14 This analysis demonstrated that maternal health was strongly predictive of her child's health. One
33
34 15 concern is that mother's perception of her own health may bias her perception of her child's
35
36 16 health. However, this intergenerational association has been previously reported,^[41,58,59,78-81] and
37
38 17 reporting mothers can effectively discriminate between their own and children's
39
40 18 health.^[41,58,59,79,80,82] Several mechanisms such as inherited susceptibility, uterine environment and
41
42 19 shared environment have been suggested for this familial aggregation pattern.^[58,79,80]

43
44
45
46 20 Maternal BMI may be related to both maternal self-rated health and child's BMI, so the observed
47
48 21 associations in this analysis could possibly be a reflection of an association between maternal BMI
49
50 22 and child's PRH. However, this was not observed in our analysis. Maternal BMI at both pre-
51
52 23 pregnancy and 5-year follow-up were not associated with child's PRH at univariate level. Also,
53
54 24 when maternal BMI was forcibly added into the multivariable model (not reported here), the
55
56 25 observed associations did not attenuate.

1
2
3 1 The study has limitations in use of reported rather than measured health status and a relatively
4
5 2 small sample size. Though the study was able to detect the major explanatory domains for child
6
7 3 health inequalities documented in the literature^[8], the relatively small sample size of this study
8
9 4 may possibly have underpowered it to detect variables with lesser effect sizes. The complete case
10
11 5 approach to analysis reduced the sample size of the final multivariate model, **which may have**
12
13 6 **power implications.** However, this missing data was on account of **an accumulation across a**
14
15 7 **number of variables. On analysis, there was no evidence of selectivity in the participants for whom**
16
17 8 **there were missing data (eTable 2). eTable 2, available in the web only supplement, compares**
18
19 9 **children included and not included in the final model for variables belonging to explanatory**
20
21 10 **domains. It suggests that there were no significant differences in the characteristics of children**
22
23 11 **included and not included (due to missing data) for analysis, suggesting that the children in the**
24
25 12 **final model are representative of the study participants as a whole.** It may be argued that the
26
27 13 reduced sample size possibly influenced the odds ratio estimate for the association between
28
29 14 children's relatively-positive PRH and the child's not being obese (using a categorical IOTF
30
31 15 classification). Nonetheless this association between children's anthropometric measures and their
32
33 16 parent-rated health variable is likely to be coherent, because these associations remain statistically
34
35 17 significant even when BMI and WC are analysed as continuous variables.

36
37
38
39
40
41 18 As in most birth cohort studies,^[83,84] the Lifeways birth cohort also experienced the attrition of
42
43 19 mothers belonging to lower socio-economic status in the early stages of the study. Though this
44
45 20 may underestimate some socioeconomic inequalities^[85], it does not negate the exposure-outcome
46
47 21 associations detected through regression models of such longitudinal studies^[86,87].

48
49
50
51 22 Nevertheless, this study has advantages in use of lifecourse variables from pre-conception to age
52
53 23 of 5-years, with measured BMI and waist circumference data. It also has detailed foods and
54
55 24 nutrient data along-with other socio-economic, psycho-social and lifestyle variables for child and
56
57 25 both parents.

1
2
3 1 In conclusion, these analyses from the Lifeways cohort show that lifecourse adversities were
4
5 2 associated with mother-reported health for preschoolers, suggesting an early life influence.
6
7 3 Preschoolers' BMI and waist-circumference demonstrated strong negative associations with
8
9 4 mother-reported health independent of socio-economic, psycho-social, and lifestyle factors,
10
11 5 suggesting early biological expression of lifecourse adversities. The findings have important
12
13 6 implications in understanding how early life environment may create inequalities in developmental
14
15 7 health.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **1 Footnotes**
4

5
6 **2 Acknowledgements**
7

8 The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study is overseen by an interdisciplinary scientific
9 steering group chaired by CCK, the principal investigator. The authors greatly appreciate the
10 participation of the Lifeways cohort families.
11
12

13
14
15 **6 Contributors**
16

17 AS undertook all analyses reported in this manuscript, interpreted the findings and drafted the
18 manuscript. CM contributed to data collection at five year follow-up, interpretation of the analysis
19 and critical revision of the manuscript. CCK designed the study, supervised the analyses,
20 interpretation of results and intellectual content of the manuscript. All three authors approved the
21 final version.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **12 Funding**
31

32 The Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study was established as part of European Science
33 Foundation funded 'Social Variations in Health Expectancy in Europe' international research
34 programme and its various sweeps have been funded by the Health Research Board of Ireland.
35 Funding sources had no involvement in design, collection, analysis, interpretation, writing and
36 submission of this manuscript.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **18 Competing interests**
45

46
47 None
48

49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **1 Ethical approvals**
4

5
6 2 Ethics committees of Coombe University Hospital, Dublin, University College Hospital Galway,
7
8 3 University College Dublin, Dublin, and the Irish College of General Practitioners, Ireland.
9

10
11 **4 Data sharing statement**
12

13 5 There are no additional data available. The data manager may be contacted at john.obrien@ucd.ie
14
15 6 for more details on the Lifeways Cross-Generation Cohort Study.
16
17

18
19 **7 Appendices**
20

21 8 The supplement includes eTable 1 displaying details of examined variables and eTable 2 which
22
23 9 compares children included and not included (due to missing data) in the final model for variables
24
25 10 belonging to explanatory domains.
26
27

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 REFERENCES
4
5 2
6
7 3 1. Barker DJ. Sir Richard Doll Lecture. Developmental origins of chronic disease. *Public*
8
9 4 *Health* 2012;**126**(3):185-9.
10
11 5
12
13 6 2. Power C1, Kuh D, Morton S. From developmental origins of adult disease to life course
14
15 7 research on adult disease and aging: insights from birth cohort studies. *Annu Rev Public*
16
17 8 *Health*. 2013;**34**:7-28.
18
19 9
20
21
22 10 3. Benyamini Y. Self-ratings of health and longevity: a health psychologist's viewpoint on
23
24 11 epidemiological findings. *The European Health Psychologist* 2008;**10**:10–13.
25
26
27 12
28
29 13 4. Bjorner J, Fayers P, Idler E. Self-rated health. In: Fayers PM, Hays RD, eds. *Assessing*
30
31 14 *quality of life in clinical trials: methods and practice*. 2nd edn. New York: Oxford
32
33 15 University Press, 2005:309-24.
34
35
36 16
37
38 17 5. Bronfenbrenner U. Ecological models of human development. In: Postlethwaite TN, Husen
39
40 18 T, eds. *International Encyclopedia of Education*. Vol 3. 2nd ed. Oxford, England: Elsevier
41
42 19 Sciences, Ltd., 1994: 1643-47.
43
44
45 20
46
47 21 6. Siddiqi A, Irwin LG, Hertzman C. Total environment assessment model for early child
48
49 22 development. Evidence report for the WHO commission on social determinants of health.
50
51 23 World Health Organization, 2007.
52
53 24 http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/ecd_kn_evidence_report_2007.pdf
54
55 25 (accessed March 30, 2012).
56
57
58 26
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 7. Maggi S, Irwin LJ, Siddiqi A, *et al.* The social determinants of early child development: an
4 overview. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2010;**46**(11):627-35.
5
6
7 3
8
9
10 4 8. Hertzman C, Li J, Mattes E, *et al.* Social determinants of child health and well-being
11 [Editorial]. *Health Sociology Review* 2009;**18**(1):3-11.
12
13
14 6
15
16 7 9. Ben-Shlomo Y, Kuh D. A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology:
17 conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. *Int J Epidemiol*
18 2002;**31**(2):285-93.
19
20
21 9
22
23 10
24
25 11 10. Halfon N, Hochstein M. Life course health development: an integrated framework for
26 developing health, policy, and research. *Milbank Q* 2002; **80**(3):433-79, iii.
27
28
29
30 13
31
32 14 11. Graham H, and Power Chris. *Childhood disadvantage and adult health: a lifecourse*
33 *framework*. London: NHS Health Development Agency, 2004.
34
35
36 16 http://www.gserve.nice.org.uk/niceMedia/pdf/childhood_disadvantage_health.pdf
37
38 17 (accessed May 24, 2014).
39
40
41 18
42
43 19 12. Hertzman C, Power C, Matthews S, *et al.* Using an interactive framework of society and
44 lifecourse to explain self-rated health in early adulthood. *Soc Sci Med* 2001;**53**(12):1575-
45 20 85.
46
47 21
48
49
50 22
51
52 23 13. Mensah FK, Hobcraft J. Childhood deprivation, health and development: associations with
53 adult health in the 1958 and 1970 British prospective birth cohort studies. *J Epidemiol*
54 24 *Community Health* 2008;**62**(7):599-606.
55
56 25
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 1
- 4
- 5 2 14. Kestila L, Koskinen S, Martelin T, *et al.* Determinants of health in early adulthood: what is
- 6
- 7 the role of parental education, childhood adversities and own education ? *Eur J Public*
- 8
- 9 *Health* 2006;**16**(3):305-14.
- 10 4
- 11 5
- 12
- 13
- 14 6 15. Pollitt R, Rose K, Kaufman J. Evaluating the evidence for models of life course
- 15
- 16 socioeconomic factors and cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review. *BMC Public*
- 17
- 18 *Health* 2005;**5**(1):7.
- 19 8
- 20 9
- 21
- 22
- 23 10 16. Kelleher CC, Tay J, Gabhainn SN. Influence on self-rated health of socio-demographic,
- 24
- 25 lifestyle and affluence factors: an analysis of the Irish and international health behaviours
- 26
- 27 among school-aged children (HBSC) datasets 1998. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 43-6.
- 28 12
- 29 13
- 30
- 31
- 32 14 17. Stein RE, Siegel MJ, Bauman LJ. Double jeopardy: what social risk adds to biomedical
- 33
- 34 risk in understanding child health and health care utilization. *Acad Pediatr* 2010;**10**(3):165-
- 35
- 36 16 71.
- 37
- 38 17
- 39
- 40
- 41 18 18. Stevens GD. Gradients in the health status and developmental risks of young children: the
- 42
- 43 combined influences of multiple social risk factors. *Matern Child Health J* 2006;**10**(2):187-
- 44
- 45 20 99.
- 46
- 47 21
- 48
- 49
- 50 22 19. Krieger N. Theories for social epidemiology in the 21st century: an ecosocial perspective.
- 51
- 52 23 *Int J Epidemiol* 2001;**30**(4):668-77.
- 53
- 54 24
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
2
3 1 20. Krieger N. A glossary for social epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
4
5 2 2001;**55**(10):693-700.
6
7 3
8
9
10 4 21. Hertzman C. The biological embedding of early experience and its effects on health in
11
12 5 adulthood. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1999;**896**(1):85-95.
13
14 6
15
16 7 22. Hertzman C, Boyce T. How experience gets under the skin to create gradients in
17
18 8 developmental health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2010;**31**:329-47 C1-C3.
19
20 9
21
22
23 10 23. Butland B, Jebb S, Kopelman P, *et al.* Foresight. Tackling obesities: future choices —
24
25 11 Project report. London: Government Office for Science, 2007.
26
27 12 <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/foresight/docs/obesity/17.pdf> (accessed March 30, 2012).
28
29 13
30
31
32 14 24. Aboderin I, Kalache A, Ben-Shlomo Y, *et al.* Life course perspectives on coronary heart
33
34 15 disease, stroke and diabetes: key issues and implications for policy and research. Geneva:
35
36 16 World Health Organization, 2002.
37
38 17 http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2002/WHO_NMH_NPH_02.1.pdf (accessed March 30, 2012).
39
40 18
41
42
43 19 25. Molarius A, Berglund K, Eriksson C, *et al.* Socioeconomic conditions, lifestyle factors, and
44
45 20 self-rated health among men and women in Sweden. *Eur J Public Health* 2007;**17**(2):125-
46
47 21 33.
48
49 22
50
51
52 23 26. Prosper M-H, Moczulski VL, Qureshi A. Obesity as a predictor of self-rated health. *Am J*
53
54 24 *Health Behav* 2009;**33**(3):319-29.
55
56 25
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 27. Svedberg P, Bardage C, Sandin S, *et al.* A prospective study of health, life-style and
4
5 2 psychosocial predictors of self-rated health. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2006;**21**(10):767-76.
6
7 3
8
9 4 28. Zajacova A, Burgard SA. Body weight and health from early to mid-adulthood: a
10
11 5 longitudinal analysis. *J Health Soc Behav* 2010;**51**(1):92-107.
12
13 6
14
15 7 29. Tsiros MD, Olds T, Buckley JD, *et al.* Health-related quality of life in obese children and
16
17 8 adolescents. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2009;**33**(4):387-400.
18
19 9
20
21 10 30. Wake M, Hardy P, Sawyer MG, *et al.* Comorbidities of overweight/obesity in Australian
22
23 11 preschoolers: a cross-sectional population study. *Arch Dis Child* 2008;**93**(6):502-07.
24
25 12
26
27 13 31. Skinner AC, Perrin EM, Steiner MJ. Healthy for now? A cross-sectional study of the
28
29 14 comorbidities in obese preschool children in the United States. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*
30
31 15 2010;**49**(7):648-55.
32
33 16
34
35 17 32. O'Mahony D, Fallon UB, Hannon F, *et al.* The Lifeways Cross-Generation Study: design,
36
37 18 recruitment and data management considerations. *Ir Med J* 2007;**100**(8):suppl 3-6.
38
39 19
40
41 20 33. Niedhammer I, O'Mahony D, Daly S, *et al.* Occupational predictors of pregnancy outcomes
42
43 21 in Irish working women in the Lifeways cohort. *BJOG* 2009;**116**(7):943-52.
44
45 22
46
47 23 34. Murrin CM, Kelly GE, Tremblay RE, *et al.* Body mass index and height over three
48
49 24 generations: evidence from the Lifeways Cross-Generational Cohort Study. *BMC Public*
50
51 25 *Health* 2012;**12**:81.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1
4
5 2 35. National Nutrition Surveillance Centre. Dietary habits of the Irish population: results from
6
7 3 SLÁN, Annual Report 2003. Dublin: National Nutritional Surveillance Centre, Department
8
9 4 of Public Health Medicine and Epidemiology, University College Dublin, Dublin and
10
11 5 Health Promotion Unit, Department of Health and Children, Dublin, 2003.
12
13 6
14
15
16 7 36. Murrin C. Maternal factors during pregnancy contributing to early life risk of childhood
17
18 8 obesity [PhD Thesis]. Dublin: University College Dublin, 2011.
19
20 9
21
22
23 10 37. Harrington J. Validation of a food frequency questionnaire as a tool for assessing nutrient
24
25 11 intake [MA Thesis]. Galway: National University of Ireland, 1997.
26
27 12
28
29 13 38. Gregory J, Collins D, Davies P, *et al.* National Diet and Nutrition Survey: children aged
30
31 14 1.5 - 4.5 years. Volume 1: Report of the diet and nutrition survey. London: HMSO, 1995.
32
33 15
34
35
36 16 39. Food Standards Agency. McCance and Widdowson's The composition of foods, sixth
37
38 17 summary edition. Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry, 2002.
39
40 18
41
42
43 19 40. FFQ_Software version 1.0. Dublin: National Nutrition Surveillance Centre, School of
44
45 20 Public Health and Population Science, University College Dublin, 2007.
46
47 21
48
49 22 41. Monette S, Séguin L, Gauvin L, *et al.* Validation of a measure of maternal perception of
50
51 23 the child's health status. *Child Care Health Dev* 2007;**33**(4):472-81.
52
53 24
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 42. Katz MH. *Multivariable analysis: a practical guide for clinicians and public health*
4 *researchers*. 3rd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
5 2
6
7 3
8
9
10 4 43. Rogers I and the EURO-BLCS Study Group. The influence of birthweight and intrauterine
11 *environment on adiposity and fat distribution in later life. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord*
12 *2003;27(7):755-77.*
13 6
14
15
16 7
17
18 8 44. Wells JC, Chomtho S, Fewtrell MS. Programming of body composition by early growth
19 *and nutrition. Proc Nutr Soc 2007;66(3):423-34.*
20 9
21
22
23 10
24
25 11 45. Wake M, Salmon L, Waters E, *et al*. Parent-reported health status of overweight and obese
26 *Australian primary school children: a cross-sectional population survey. Int J Obes Relat*
27 *Metab Disord 2002;26(5): 717-24.*
28 12
29
30 13
31
32 14
33
34 15 46. Swallen KC, Reither EN, Haas SA, *et al*. Overweight, obesity, and health-related quality of
35 *life among adolescents: the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. Pediatrics*
36 *2005;115(2):340-47.*
37 16
38
39 17
40
41 18
42
43 19 47. Vingilis ER, Wade TJ, Seeley JS. Predictors of adolescent self-rated health. Analysis of the
44 *National Population Health Survey. Can J Public Health 2002;93(3):193-97.*
45 20
46
47 21
48
49 22 48. Kelleher CC, Whelan J, Daly L, *et al*. Socio-demographic, environmental, lifestyle and
50 *psychosocial factors predict self rated health in Irish Travellers, a minority nomadic*
51 *population. Health Place 2012;18(2):330-38.*
52 23
53
54 24
55
56 25
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 49. Kelleher CC, Friel S, Nic Gabhainn S, *et al.* Socio-demographic predictors of self-rated
4 health in the Republic of Ireland: findings from the National Survey on Lifestyle, Attitudes
5 and Nutrition, SLAN. *Soc Sci Med* 2003;**57**(3):477-86.
6
7
8
9 4
10
11 5 50. Eiser C, Morse R. Can parents rate their child's health-related quality of life? Results of a
12 systematic review. *Qual Life Res* 2001;**10**(4):347-57.
13
14
15
16 7
17
18 8 51. Upton P, Lawford J, Eiser C. Parent-child agreement across child health-related quality of
19 life instruments: a review of the literature. *Qual Life Res* 2008;**17**(6):895-913.
20
21
22
23 10
24
25 11 52. Norrby U, Nordholm L, Fasth A. Reliability and validity of the swedish version of child
26 health questionnaire. *Scand J Rheumatol* 2003;**32**(2):101-7.
27
28
29
30 13
31
32 14 53. Davis E, Nicolas C, Waters E, *et al.* Parent-proxy and child self-reported health-related
33 quality of life: using qualitative methods to explain the discordance. *Qual Life Res*
34 2007;**16**(5):863-71.
35
36
37
38 17
39
40 18 54. Theunissen NC, Vogels TG, Koopman HM, *et al.* The proxy problem: child report versus
41 parent report in health-related quality of life research. *Qual Life Res* 1998;**7**(5):387-97.
42
43
44
45 20
46
47 21 55. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Parent proxy-report of their children's health-
48 related quality of life: an analysis of 13,878 parents' reliability and validity across age
49 subgroups using the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*
50 2007;**5**:2.
51
52
53
54 24
55
56
57 25
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 56. Spencer NJ, Coe C. The development and validation of a measure of parent-reported child
4 health and morbidity: the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile. *Child Care Health*
5 2 *Dev* 1996;**22**(6):367-79.
6
7 3
8
9 4
10
11 5 57. Spencer NJ, Coe C. Validation of the Warwick Child Health and Morbidity Profile in
12 routine child health surveillance. *Child Care Health Dev* 2000;**26**(4):323-36.
13 6
14
15 7
16
17 8 58. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Workman-Daniels K, *et al.* Maternal rating of child
18 health at school age: does the vulnerable child syndrome persist ? *Pediatrics*
19 9 1993;**92**(3):380-88.
20 10
21
22 11
23
24 12 59. McCormick MC, Brooks-Gunn J, Shorter T, *et al.* Factors associated with maternal rating
25 of infant health in central Harlem. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 1989;**10**(3):139-44.
26 13
27 14
28
29 15 60. McCormick MC, Athreya BH, Bernbaum JC, *et al.* Preliminary observations on maternal
30 rating of health of children: data from three subspecialty clinics. *J Clin Epidemiol*
31 16 1988;**41**(4):323-29.
32 17
33 18
34 19 61. Lynch JL. Infant health, race/ethnicity, and early educational outcomes using the ECLS-B.
35 *Sociol Inq* 2011;**81**(4):499-526.
36 20
37 21
38
39 22 62. Gilman SE, McCormick MC. Insights from life course epidemiology. *Acad Pediatr*
40 23 2010;**10**(3):159-60.
41 24
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 63. Smith KW, Avis NE, Assmann SF. Distinguishing between quality of life and health status
4 in quality of life research: a meta-analysis. *Qual Life Res* 1999;**8**(5):447-59.
5
6 2
7 3
8
9
10 4 64. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Singer S, Pilpel N, *et al.* Health-related quality of life among children
11 and adolescents: associations with obesity. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2006;**30**(2):267-72.
12 5
13 6
14
15
16 7 65. Williams J, Wake M, Hesketh K, *et al.* Health-related quality of life of overweight and
17 obese children. *JAMA* 2005;**293**(1):70-6.
18 8
19
20 9
21
22
23 10 66. de Beer M, Hofsteenge GH, Koot HM, *et al.* Health-related-quality-of-life in obese
24 adolescents is decreased and inversely related to BMI. *Acta Paediatr* 2007;**96**(5):710-14.
25 11
26
27 12
28
29 13 67. Shibli R, Rubin L, Akons H, *et al.* Morbidity of overweight (≥ 85 th percentile) in the first 2
30 years of life. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**(2):267-72.
31 14
32
33
34 15
35
36 16 68. Suglia SF, Chambers EC, Rosario A, *et al.* Asthma and obesity in three-year-old urban
37 children: role of sex and home environment. *J Pediatr* 2011;**159**(1):14-20.e11.
38 17
39
40 18
41
42 19 69. Tai A, Volkmer R, Burton A. Association between asthma symptoms and obesity in
43 preschool (4-5 year old) children. *J Asthma* 2009;**46**(4):362-65.
44 20
45
46
47 21
48
49 22 70. Slining M, Adair LS, Goldman BD, *et al.* Infant overweight is associated with delayed
50 motor development. *J Pediatr* 2010;**157**(1):20-5.e21.
51 23
52
53
54 24
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 71. Williams JW, Canterford L, Hesketh KD, *et al.* Changes in body mass index and health
4 related quality of life from childhood to adolescence. *Int J Pediatr Obes* 2011;**6**(2-2):e442-
5 e448.
6
7 3
8
9 4
10
11 5 72. Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, *et al.* Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through
12 action on the social determinants of health. *Lancet* 2008;**372**(9650):1661-69.
13
14 6
15
16 7
17
18 8 73. Imai K, Gregg EW, Chen YJ, Zhang P, *et al.* The association of BMI with functional status
19 and self-rated health in US adults. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2008;**16**(2):402-8.
20
21 9
22
23 10
24
25 11 74. Simonsen MK, Hundrup YA, Grønbaek M, *et al.* A prospective study of the association
26 between weight changes and self-rated health. *BMC Womens Health* 2008;**8**:13.
27
28 12
29
30 13
31
32 14 75. Cameron AJ, Magliano DJ, Dunstan DW, *et al.* A bi-directional relationship between
33 obesity and health-related quality of life: evidence from the longitudinal AusDiab study. *Int*
34 *J Obes (Lond)* 2012;**36**(2):295-303.
35
36 16
37
38 17
39
40 18 76. Sawyer MG, Harchak T, Wake M, *et al.* Four-year prospective study of BMI and mental
41 health problems in young children. *Pediatrics* 2011;**128**(4):677-84.
42
43 19
44
45 20
46
47 21 77. Jansen PW, Mensah FK, Clifford S, *et al.* Bidirectional associations between overweight
48 and health-related quality of life from 4-11 years: Longitudinal Study of Australian
49 Children. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2013;**37**(10):1307-13.
50
51 23
52
53 24
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 78. Coneus K, Spiess CK. The intergenerational transmission of health in early childhood -
4
5 2 evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study. *Econ Hum Biol* 2012;**10**(1):89-
6
7 3 97.
8
9 4
10
11 5 79. Case A, Lubotsky D, Paxson C. Economic status and health in childhood: the origins of the
12
13 6 gradient. *Am Econ Rev* 2002;**92**(5):1308-34.
14
15 7
16
17 8 80. Silburn SR, Zubrick SR, Garton A, *et al.* Western Australia Child Health Survey: family
18
19 9 and community health. Perth, Western Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics and the
20
21 10 TVW Telethon Institute for Child Health Research, 1996.
22
23 11
24
25 12 81. Waters E, Doyle J, Wolfe R, *et al.* Influence of parental gender and self-reported health and
26
27 13 illness on parent-reported child health. *Pediatrics* 2000;**106**(6):1422-28.
28
29 14
30
31 15 82. Dadds MR, Stein RE, Silver EJ. The role of maternal psychological adjustment in the
32
33 16 measurement of children's functional status. *J Pediatr Psychol* 1995;**20**(4):527-44.
34
35 17
36
37 18 83. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, *et al.* Cohort Profile: the 'children of the 90s'--the index
38
39 19 offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol*
40
41 20 2013;**42**(1):111-27.
42
43 21
44
45 22 84. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, *et al.* Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal
46
47 23 Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. *Int J Epidemiol* 2013;**42**(1):97-
48
49 24 110.
50
51 25
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 85. Howe L, Galobardes B, Tilling K, *et al.* Does drop-out from cohort studies bias estimates
4 of socioeconomic inequalities in health? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2011;**65**:A31.
5 2
6
7 3
8
9 4 86. Wolke D, Waylen A, Samara M, *et al.* Selective drop-out in longitudinal studies and non-
10 biased prediction of behaviour disorders. *Br J Psychiatry* 2009;**195**(3):249-56.
11 5
12
13 6
14
15 7 87. Nilsen RM, Vollset SE, Gjessing HK, *et al.* Self-selection and bias in a large prospective
16 pregnancy cohort in Norway. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 2009;**23**(6):597-608.
17 8
18
19 9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **1 LICENCE FOR PUBLICATION STATEMENT**

4 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf
5 of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide
6 basis to the BMJ Group and co-owners or contracting owning societies (where published by the
7 BMJ Group on their behalf), and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in
8 any BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

eTable 1: Lifecourse variables examined for relationship with children's parent-rated health, PRH

Independent Variables	Time	Categories
Child's Individual characteristics		
Demographic and Anthropometric		
Birth-weight standardised for gestational age (g)	Measured at birth	continuous measure
Age at 5-year follow-up (years)	At 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Gender		Male, Female
Body Mass Index (BMI) kg/m ²	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using IOTF definitions
Waist Circumference (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Height (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Lifestyle/Nutrition		
Breastfeeding	At infancy	breastfed or not
Top food group servings per day	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>6.47 servings) versus 1-4 Quintiles.
Fruits & Vegetables food group servings /day	At 5-yr follow-up	1 st Quintile (<2.1 servings) versus 2-5 Quintiles
Total Energy intake (kilocalories/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>1794 kcal) versus 1-4 Quintiles
Total Fats intake (grams/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>62.9g) versus 1-4 Quintiles
Family characteristics		
Socio-Economic		
Household weekly income	At 5-yr follow-up	composite family income more or less than 760 Euros a week
Entitlement to General Medical Card scheme, a means tested healthcare benefits scheme	At 5-yr follow-up	Families entitled or not to General Medical Card
Psycho-Social		
Fathers' participation (Family stability)	Early pregnancy stage	Families whose fathers participated in the study versus families whose fathers did not
Mother's marital status (Family structure)	At 5-yr follow-up	Married or cohabiting versus single, separated, divorced or widowed.
Elder children in family [Parity was a proxy measure for presence of elder siblings to the Lifeways child]	Early pregnancy stage	nullipara versus one or more para
Support from spouse or partner	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived "a lot" of support from spouse or partners versus perceived receiving "some, so-so, little" support
Support from parents	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived "a lot" of support from parents versus perceived receiving "some, so-so, little" support

Support from children, inclusive Lifeways child	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived “a lot” of support from children versus perceived receiving “some, so-so, little” support
Support from close relatives	At 5-yr follow-up	Mothers perceived “a lot” of support from relatives versus perceived receiving “some, so-so, little” support

Maternal characteristics

Demographic and Anthropometric

Age at 5-year follow-up (years)	At 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	Pre-pregnancy, Self-reported in early pregnancy	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using WHO definitions
BMI at 5-year follow-up (kg/m ²)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure Also as obese versus overweight or normal using WHO definitions
Waist Circumference at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Height at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure

Lifestyle/Nutrition

Smoking during pregnancy	Early pregnancy stage	Current smoker or not
Smoking at 5-year follow-up	At 5-yr follow-up	Current smoker or not
Top food group servings per day	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>8.35 servings) versus 1-4 Quintiles.
Fruits & Vegetables food group servings /day	At 5-yr follow-up	1 st Quintile (<4.5 servings) versus 2-5 Quintiles
Total Energy intake (kilocalories/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>2570.9 kcal) versus 1-4 Quintiles
Total Fats intake (grams/day)	At 5-yr follow-up	5 th Quintile (>106.0 g) versus 1-4 Quintiles

Socio-Economic

Education level	Early pregnancy stage	Third level versus lower levels of education status
Employment status	At 5-yr follow-up	Non-earning versus Employed versus Self employed

Health

Self-rated health status of mothers	At 5-yr follow-up	Relatively Positive (“Excellent” or “Very Good”) versus Relatively Negative (“Poor”/ “Fair” /“Good”) responses
-------------------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Paternal Characteristics

Anthropometric

BMI at 5-year follow-up (kg/m ²)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Waist Circumference at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at 5-yr follow-up	continuous measure
Height at 5-year follow-up (cm)	Measured at	continuous measure

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

		5-yr follow-up	
Lifestyle			
Smoking at 5-year follow-up		At 5-yr follow-up	Current smoker or not
Socio-Economic			
Education level		Early pregnancy stage	Third level versus lower levels of education status
Employment status		At 5-yr follow-up	Non-earning versus Employed versus Self employed
Health			
Self-rated health status of fathers (in proxy)		At 5-yr follow-up	Relatively Positive (“Excellent” or “Very Good”) versus Relatively Negative (“Poor”/ “Fair” /“Good”) responses

For peer review only

eTable 2: Comparative characteristics of children included and not included in the final model (with and without missing data) for selective variables from each of the explanatory domains -

S.No.	Variables		Children NOT in the final model – with missing data (n=244)	Children IN the final model – without missing data (n=303)	Statistic - chi-square or t-test	p-value
	OUTCOME VARIABLE	sub-categories	n (%)	n (%)		
1	Parent rated health status of the child	Good+Fair+Poor Excellent+Very Good	19 (7.8%) 225 (92.2%)	23 (7.6%) 280 (92.4%)	0.01	0.93
	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES					
	Anthropometric Variables					
2	Child BMI categorised by IOTF classification	Obese Overweight plus Normal	10 (6.2%) 151 (93.8%)	20 (6.6%) 283 (93.4%)	0.03	0.87
3	Child BMI (continuous) kg/m ²	Mean (Std Dev)	16.73 (1.53)	16.57 (1.74)	0.96	0.34
4	Child waist circumference (continuous) cm		55.95 (4.49)	55.97 (4.54)	0.06	0.95
	Nutrition Variables					
5	Top food group consumed by Child (servings/day)	Quintile 5 Quintiles1-4	46 (18.9%) 198 (81.1%)	64 (21.1%) 239 (78.9%)	0.43	0.51
6	Top food group consumed by Mothers (servings/day)	Quintile 5 Quintiles1-4	46 (19.0%) 196 (81.0%)	63 (20.8%) 240 (79.2%)	0.27	0.61
	Behaviour Variables					
7	Father's smoking	Smoker Non-Smoker	58 (26.6%) 160 (73.4%)	81 (26.7%) 222 (73.3%)	0.01	0.97
	Health Variables					
8	Father's health status rating	Good+Fair+Poor Excellent+Very Good	69 (33.3%) 138 (66.7%)	90 (29.7%) 213 (70.3%)	0.76	0.39
9	Mother's health status rating	Good+Fair+Poor Excellent+Very Good	79 (32.5%) 164 (67.5%)	79 (26.1%) 224 (73.9%)	2.72	0.10
	Socio Economic Variables					
10	Father's Education	Lower Third level	64 (30.3%) 147 (69.7%)	80 (26.4%) 223 (73.6%)	0.95	0.33
11	Father's employment status	Not Earning Employed Self employed	44 (20.5%) 117 (54.4%) 54 (25.1%)	43 (14.2%) 186 (61.4%) 74 (24.4%)	4.02	0.13
	Psycho-Social Variables					
12	Support from Parents	Lesser support More support	33 (17.9%) 151 (82.1%)	63 (20.8%) 240 (79.2%)	0.59	0.44

STROBE Statement: Preschoolers' parent rated health disparities are strongly associated with measures of adiposity in the Lifeways cohort study children

	Item No	Recommendation	Done
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	✓
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	✓
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	✓
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	✓
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	✓
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	✓
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	✓
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	✓
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	✓
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	✓
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	✓
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	✓
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	✓
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	✓
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	✓
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	✓
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	✓
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	✓
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	✓
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	✓
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	✓
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	✓
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted	✓

		estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	✓
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	✓
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	✓
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	✓
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	✓
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	✓
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	✓

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.