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Abstract

Background: Maternal metabolic health during the prenatal period is an established determinant of cardiometabolic disease risk. Many studies have focused on poor offspring outcomes after exposure to poor maternal health, while few have systematically appraised the evidence surrounding the role of maternal exercise in decreasing this risk. The aim of this study is to characterize and quantify the specific impact of prenatal exercise on children’s cardiometabolic health markers, at birth and in childhood.

Methods: A systematic review of Scopus, MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, CINAHL, and SPORTDiscus up to December 2017 was conducted. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and prospective cohort studies of prenatal aerobic exercise and/or resistance training reporting eligible offspring outcomes were included. Four reviewers independently identified eligible citations and extracted study-level data. The primary outcome was birth weight; secondary outcomes, specified a priori, included large-for-gestational age status, fat and lean mass, dyslipidemia, dysglycemia, and blood pressure. We included 73 of the 9804 citations initially identified. Data from RCTs was pooled using random effects models. Statistical heterogeneity was quantified using the $I^2$ test. Analyses were done between June and December 2017 and the search was updated in December 2017.

(Continued on next page)
Results: Fifteen observational studies (n = 290,951 children) and 39 RCTs (n = 6875 children) were included. Observational studies were highly heterogeneous and had discrepant conclusions, but globally showed no clinically relevant effect of exercise on offspring outcomes. Meta-analyzed RCTs indicated that prenatal exercise did not significantly impact birth weight (mean difference [MD] = 22.1 g, 95% confidence interval [CI] = 51.5 to 7.3 g, n = 6766) or large-for-gestational age status (risk ratio 0.85, 95% CI 0.51 to 1.44, n = 937) compared to no exercise. Sub-group analyses showed that prenatal exercise reduced birth weight according to timing (starting after 20 weeks of gestation, MD = 84.3 g, 95% CI = 142.2, − 26.4 g, n = 1124), type of exercise (aerobic only, MD = 58.7 g, 95% CI = 109.7, − 7.8 g; n = 2058), pre-pregnancy activity status (previously inactive, MD = 34.8 g, 95% CI = 69.0, − 0.5 g; n = 2829), and exercise intensity (light to moderate intensity only, MD = 45.5 g, 95% CI = 82.4, − 8.6 g; n = 2651). Fat mass percentage at birth was not altered by prenatal exercise (0.19%, 95% CI = 0.27, 0.65%; n = 130); however, only two studies reported this outcome. Other outcomes were too scarcely reported to be meta-analyzed.

Conclusions: Prenatal exercise does not causally impact birth weight, fat mass, or large-for-gestational-age status in a clinically relevant way. Longer follow up of offspring exposed to prenatal exercise is needed along with measures of relevant metabolic variables (e.g., fat and lean mass).

Protocol Registration: Protocol registration number: CRD42015029163.
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Key Points
- In general, birth weight is not impacted in a clinically significant manner by prenatal exercise programs.
- Our understanding of the impact of prenatal exercise on the child’s metabolic health and future risk of cardiometabolic disease is limited as very few trials and cohort studies examined other health indicators aside from birth weight—an imperfect marker of health and future outcomes.
- Few trials and cohort studies followed up the children to see potential lasting effects of maternal prenatal exercise on their metabolic health.
- Clinicians looking to counsel their clients might highlight that while prenatal exercise is perfectly safe for the baby, the best evidence currently available indicate exercise is not sufficient by itself to protect the child against cardiometabolic diseases.

Background
Obesity and metabolic syndrome are two of the most common chronic diseases among children [1–3]. Recent evidence suggests these conditions have their roots in utero as maternal obesity, dyslipidemia, and hyperglycemia are associated with child cardiometabolic health [4–9]. Animal- and population-based studies suggest that prenatal exposures may influence offspring development and cardiometabolic risk in childhood [10, 11]. Moderate-intensity exercise at least three times per week can maintain or improve maternal physical fitness [12] and cardiovascular health during pregnancy through a decrease in blood pressure [13], plasma triglycerides [13, 14], and insulin resistance [15–17]. Therefore, prenatal exercise could create a beneficial fetal milieu and reduce the risk of obesity and metabolic syndrome for the offspring by regulating weight and cardiometabolic factors at birth and later in childhood. However, comprehensive syntheses of high-quality evidence on this topic are scarce.

Previous systematic reviews examining the role of prenatal exercise on offspring outcomes have been conducted with heterogeneous results and the interpretation of their findings are limited for several reasons: (1) the primary outcome of interest for previous systematic reviews varied (birth weight or large-for-gestational age (LGA) status); (2) inclusion criteria were variable (types of exercise targeted; inclusion of diet as an intervention; type and number of databases queried; low quality study designs); (3) there were flaws in methodological rigor (type of analysis, pooling heterogeneous studies together); and (4) few evaluated health outcomes in offspring beyond birth weight. The reviews that found a reduction in birth weight (from − 440 g, 95% confidence interval [CI] = 610 to − 270 g [18], to − 31 g, 95%CI = 57 to − 24 g [19], compared to sedentary controls) or LGA status after exposure to prenatal exercise pooled randomized trials and observational studies [18], included interventions that combined exercise and dietary changes [20], or used fixed effect models to analyze the data [19]. Fixed effect models assume that one true effect size is shared by all the included studies regardless of the population or type of exercise studied. Thus, utilizing a fixed effects model considers less variability in the primary studies, and is more likely to reach statistical significance with a large enough sample size [21].
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Random effect models should, thus, be preferred when dealing with complex physiological conditions like the effect of different prenatal exercises undergone by different populations on offspring parameters. Other reviews [12, 22, 23] did not find any significant impact of prenatal exercise on birth weight, but were also limited by their specific scope [12, 23] or restricted search strategy [22].

To overcome these limitations and update past reviews [12, 18–20, 22, 23], we synthesized evidence from randomized controlled trials and prospective cohort studies separately to assess the impact of prenatal exercise on offspring cardiometabolic risk factors including weight, adiposity, and blood pressure at birth and in childhood while investigating the effects of maternal body mass index (BMI) and training variables. The clinical question guiding this review was: “Does maternal exercise training elicit short- and/or long-term cardiometabolic health benefits in offspring, compared to no exercise training?”

Methods
Study Design
Using a protocol designed a priori (PROSPERO #CRD42015029163), we conducted our systematic review using methodological approaches outlined in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews [24] and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) criteria [25]. The search was targeted to identify studies to address the specific research question: Do regular aerobic and/or resistance exercises during pregnancy, compared to no exercise, reduce the risk of cardiometabolic disease in offspring? We defined regular exercise as voluntary movements done to improve or maintain fitness on a weekly basis for at least a month. The review team, composed of researchers in the fields of physiology, exercise, and developmental origins of health and disease, formulated the review question, reviewed the search strategies and review methods, and provided input throughout the review process.

Literature Search Strategy
We searched Medline (Ovid), EMBASE (Ovid), CENTRAL (the Cochrane Library—Wiley), from inception to May 2016 for studies on prenatal pregnancy and cardiometabolic outcomes in the offspring. We added Scopus (Elsevier), CINAHL (EBSCO), and SPORTDiscus (EBSCO) to our target databases following comments from reviewers and reran the search through all six databases in May 2017. The Cochrane Highly Sensitive Search Strategy [26] was used as a model for searching; we designed search strategies specific to each database (see example on PROSPERO registration page). In order to identify ongoing or planned trials, we searched the World Health Organization's International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ClinicalTrials.gov). In addition to electronic searching, we hand-searched the bibliographies of relevant narrative and systematic reviews as well as those of included studies for additional citations. The search was rerun in December 2017 to include additional citations. Reference management was performed in EndNote™ (ver. 16, Thompson Reuters).

Study Selection
We used a two-step process for study selection. First, all titles and abstracts of search results were screened independently in duplicate (by LG, NH, JLH, and CO) to determine if a study met the general inclusion criteria. The same reviewers independently examined the full texts of relevant citations. Disagreements were resolved by discussion between the reviewers or by third-party adjudication (LG or DSK), as needed. We included only randomized controlled trials or prospective cohort studies examining the impact of exercise undergone during pregnancy (from conception to delivery) on offspring cardiometabolic outcomes (see Table 1 for detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria). We hoped to reduce bias by selecting studies with the best experimental and observational designs; observational cohorts were included with the expectation that follow up data may be provided to inform long term offspring outcomes. No other restrictions, including language or publication status, were considered. The primary outcome measure was birth weight. Secondary outcomes included offspring fat and lean mass at birth, LGA status and weight, fat and lean mass, blood pressure, dyslipidemia, and dysglycemia at any time in childhood.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment
Three reviewers (LG, NH, and JLH) extracted data from included full texts using a standardized and piloted data extraction form. Extracted data included funding sources, demographics of the enrolled mothers and children (country, gestational age at randomization, maternal age at randomization, pre-pregnancy BMI, maternal smoking status at randomization; child age at latest follow-up), details of the prenatal exercise (type of exercise: aerobic or resistance training, frequency, intensity, timing during pregnancy; exercise measure: self-report or supervised), and predetermined offspring outcomes as described above and in Tables 1 and 2. When a trial reported results for more than one time period, results at birth and at the longest follow up were extracted separately. Intent-to-treat analysis was preferred when the data was presented accordingly. Data management was performed using Microsoft Word 2007 (Microsoft Corp).

We evaluated the internal validity of included studies with the Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias tools [24, 27], in duplicate (LG and CO). Study authors were
contacted if data as published was incomplete for the needs of the review.

**Data Synthesis and Analysis**

We quantitatively analyzed data from the included studies using Review Manager (RevMan version 5.3.5, the Cochrane Collaboration). Pooled dichotomous data, calculated based on the generic inverse variance method, are presented as a risk ratio (RR) and pooled continuous data are expressed as a mean difference (MD), with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Only random effects models were used as populations and interventions varied. Statistical heterogeneity was explored and quantified using the $I^2$ test. After validation against the associated protocols and/or trial registration information available, evidence of selective reporting found for any of the included trials was marked in the risk of bias assessment. A sensitivity analysis grouping only studies with low or unclear risk of bias was done for the primary outcome. Our pre-defined sub-group analyses, which were planned only for our primary outcome (birth weight) and only with data from randomized controlled trials (RCTs), were maternal pre-pregnancy activity level (inactive vs. active), maternal pre-pregnancy BMI, type of intervention (resistance training only vs. aerobic training only vs. combined), timing of exercise (starting in the first half of pregnancy, i.e., < 20 gestational weeks, vs. starting after the first half, i.e., ≥ 20 gestational weeks), country of origin, and internal validity (high vs. moderate/low quality). These sub-groups were intended to help pinpoint which components, if any, were responsible for the effect observed. Relevant components could then be highlighted in research and clinical interactions to promote better effectiveness. All tests of statistical inference reflect a two-sided $\alpha$ of 0.05.

**Results**

**Search Results**

Of 9804 citations identified through the literature search, 54 unique studies conducted between 1993 and 2017 were included, of which 15 were cohort studies [28–42] and 39 RCTs [43–81] with 19 companion publications [82–100] (see Fig. 1 for the flow chart and Tables 2 and 3 for studies characteristics). Nine additional studies not included in the previous meta-analyses were included [28, 51, 52, 55, 65, 67, 70, 76, 77, 80]. Most studies (12) were conducted in the USA [31, 33, 36, 37, 41, 42, 47, 49, 61, 66, 73, 92]; others were from Australia and New Zealand [29, 62, 101], Brazil [43, 52, 53, 63, 68, 74, 81], Canada [28, 65], Colombia [72], Croatia [80], Denmark [30, 32, 34, 35, 40], Finland [54], Iran [56, 57], Kosovo [67], The Netherlands [69], Norway [55, 60, 102], Spain [44–46, 48, 50, 70, 79], Sweden [71], and the UK [38, 39, 76]. No study recruited previously active women.
## Table 2: Included observational studies

| Study          | Country     | Method                  | N (mother-child pairs) | Type of exercise | Intensity | Moment of exposure | Effect of prenatal exercise on offspring, compared to sedentary mothers* |
|----------------|-------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Hatch 1993 [31]| USA         | Two-centers cohort      | 200                    | Aerobic, Resistance | Vigorous | Throughout pregnancy | Adjusted birth weight difference: $\beta = + 2.76$ g (95% CI 54, 497) |
| Johnson 1994 [33]| USA | Multi-center cohort | 234                    | Aerobic           | Not specified | Not specified | Birth weight mean difference: +109.2 g (p < 0.05) |
| Sternfeld 1995 [42]| USA | Institute-based, no GDM | 139                    | Aerobic          | Moderate to vigorous | Throughout pregnancy | Birth weight mean difference: +68 g (p < 0.05) |
| Magann 2002 [37]| USA | Convenience sample     | 750                    | Aerobic          | Moderate   | Conception to 28 GW | Birth weight mean difference: -42 g (p = 0.87) |
| Neuwenhuijsen 2002 [39]| England | Population-based | 11,462                | Aerobic          | Not specified | 18–20 weeks of pregnancy | Birth weight mean difference: +16.7 g (95% CI −11.4, 44.9) |
| Duncombe 2006 [29]| Australia | Convenience sample | 148                    | Aerobic, Resistance | Vigorous (HR > 140 bpm) | GW 16 to 38 | Birth weight mean difference: −47 g (p = 0.49) |
| Snapp 2008 [41]| USA         | Institute-based GDM cohort | 75,160                | Aerobic          | Moderate   | Throughout pregnancy | Birth weight: no difference |
| Juhl, AJOG, 2010 [35]| Denmark | Population-based (non-smokers only) registry study | 58,435                | Aerobic, resistance | NA       | Throughout pregnancy | Adjusted birth weight mean difference: −23 g (95% CI −44 to −1) |
| Juhl, Epidemiology 2010 [34]| Denmark | Population-based registry study | 48,781                | Aerobic          | Light to vigorous | Not reported | Adjusted birth weight mean difference: −7 (95% CI −3 to 16) |
| Julic 2010 [36]| USA         | Convenience sample      | 1118                   | Aerobic, resistance | Vigorous | First trimester (conception to 12 GW) | Adjusted birth weight difference: $\beta = + 40$ g (95% CI 154, 234) |
| Hegaard 2010 [32]| Denmark | One-center cohort       | 3961                   | Aerobic, resistance | Moderate to vigorous | At 16 and 30 GW | Adjusted birth weight mean difference: −2 g (95% CI −47, 42; 16 GW), and −9 (95% CI −62, 43; 30 GW) |
| Fleten 2010 [30]| Denmark | Population-based registry study | 43,705                | Aerobic, resistance | Light to moderate (self-report) | From conception to 17 GW; from 17 to 30 GW | Adjusted birth weight difference: $\beta = 0.22$ g (95% CI −0.1, 0.7; 17 GW), and $\beta = 0.44$ g (95% CI 2.0, −0.8; 17 to 30 GW) |
| Schou Andersen 2012 [40]| Denmark | Population-based registry study | 40,280                | Aerobic, resistance | Not specified | GW 16 and 36 | Birth weight mean difference: −15 g (p < 0.005) |
| Millard 2013 [38]| England | Population-based       | 4665                   | Aerobic, resistance | Not specified | GW 18 | Unadjusted BMI difference at 7.1 years: −0.1 kg/m², p < 0.001 |
| Bisson 2017 [28]| Canada     | Population-based       | 1913                   | Aerobic, resistance | Not specified | First, second and third trimester | Adjusted birth weight difference: $\beta = 0.20$ g (95% CI −0.3, 0.7) |

*BMI body mass index, FG fasting glucose, GDM gestational diabetes mellitus, GW gestational weeks, HDLc high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, LGA large-for-gestational-age, LDLc low-density lipoproteins cholesterol, SBP systolic blood pressure

*A positive difference means that the mean birth weight was higher in the exercise group than in the sedentary group.
16 recruited inactive women [43, 44, 46, 49, 52, 53, 55–58, 66–68, 70, 73, 92, 102], and the rest did not use previous exercise levels as a criterion. Most studies did not consider maternal BMI in their inclusion criteria, although eight specifically recruited women with overweight and/or obesity [51, 55, 64, 68, 69, 75, 77, 81], and three [49, 57, 65] women without overweight. The majority of experimental trials included healthy pregnant women, except five who targeted women with type 1 [61] or gestational diabetes [47, 52, 69, 74, 80], whereas observational cohorts were locally representative [31, 32, 41, 42], nationally representative [28, 30, 34, 35, 38–40], or convenience samples [29, 36, 37]. The funnel plot indicates that studies where exposure to prenatal exercise reduced birth weight were probably more likely to be published, at least for the smaller studies (Additional file 1: Fig. S1; especially seen for smaller studies). Concerning internal validity, most trials were adjudicated as of low or unclear risk of bias [43–46, 49, 52, 53, 57–59, 63, 67, 68, 74, 75, 83] (see Additional file 2: Fig. S2). The remaining trials were considered as high risk of bias due to their high dropout rates and unclear/inefficient blinding methods. All cohorts but one [29] were adjudicated at serious risk of bias, usually due to selection bias or missing data (Additional file 3: Fig. S3).
Table 3 Included randomized controlled trials

| First author and year | Country | Population characteristics | Timing of intervention | Intervention type | Frequency | Intensity | Supervised | Sample size neonates (E/C) | Neonate outcome |
|------------------------|---------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Erkkola 1975 [54]      | Finland | Healthy                    | 10–14 GW To 38 GW      | Aerobic           | 3x/wk 60 min | Moderate to Vigorous – 140 bpm HR and fatigue | NR           | 44 (23/21)                  | ●              |
| Hollingsworth 1987 [61]| USA     | Type 1 diabetes            | 13 GW to 37–40 GW      | Aerobic           | Daily 20 min after each meal | NR | No | 33 (13/21) | ●              |
| Avery 1997 [47]        | USA     | GDM sedentary (exercise <2x/wk) | 28 GW to delivery     | Aerobic walking and cycling | 3-4x/wk 30 min | Moderate < 70% HR max | Partial | 29 (15/14) | ●              |
| Kihlstrand 1999 [78]   | Sweden  | Healthy                    | 20 GW to delivery      | Aerobic           | 1x/wk, 30 min | NR           | Yes        | 241 (122/119)               | ●              |
| Clapp 2000 [49]        | USA     | Healthy                    | 8 GW to delivery       | Aerobic           | 3-5x/wk 20 min | Moderate 55–60% VO2 max | Yes | 46 (22/24) | ● ●            |
| Marquez-Sterling 2000  | USA     | No regular exercise in the last year | 18–20 GW to delivery | Aerobic           | 3x/wk 60 min | Moderate to vigorous 120–156 bpm | Yes | 15 (9/6) | ●              |
| Garshabi 2005 [56]     | Iran    | Healthy                    | 17–22 GW to 29–34 GW   | Aerobic and resistance | 3x/wk 60 min | Moderate < 140 bpm | Yes | 212 (107/105) | ●              |
| Santos 2005 [81]       | Brazil  | Healthy                    | 18 GW to NR            | Aerobic and resistance | 3x/wk 40–45 min | Moderate 50–60% HR max < 140 bpm | Yes | 72 (37/35) | ●              |
| Bacik 2008 [43]        | Brazil  | No regular exercise        | 18–20 GW to delivery   | Aerobic           | 3x/wk 50 min | Moderate < 70% HR max | Yes | 70 (33/37) | ●              |
| Barakat 2009 [44]      | Spain   | Healthy                    | 12–13 GW to 38–39 GW   | Resistance        | 3x/wk, 35–40 min | Light to vigorous < 60–80% HR max 10–12 Rep range | Yes | 142 (72/70) | ●              |
| De Barros 2010 [52]    | Brazil  | GDM Sedentary (IPAQ)       | 31 GW to delivery      | Resistance        | 3x/wk 30–40 min | Moderate to vigorous 5–6 RPE/10 | Partial | 64 (32/32) | ●              |
| Hopkins 2010 [62]      | New Zealand | Healthy                 | 2 GW to 36 GW or delivery | Aerobic           | ≤ 5 days 40 min | Moderate to vigorous 65% VO2 max | Partial | 84 (47/37) | ● ● ●        |
| Haakstad 2011 [59]     | Norway  | Healthy                    | 17–18 GW 36–38 GW      | Aerobic and resistance | 2-7x/wk 60 min | Moderate to vigorous 12–14 RPE | Partial | 105 (52/53) | ●              |
| Nascimento 2011 [68]   | Brazil  | BMI ≥ 26 kg/m²             | 17 GW to delivery      | Aerobic and resistance | 6x/wk 40 min | Moderate < 140 bpm | Partial | 82 (40/42) | ● ● ●        |
| De Oliveria Melo 2012 [53] | Brazil | Inactive Healthy          | 13 or 20 GW to delivery | Aerobic           | 3x/wk > 15 min | Moderate to vigorous 60–80% HR max Borg RPE 12–16 | Yes | 171 (54/60/57) | ● ● ●        |
| Oostdam 2012 [69]      | Netherlands | BMI ≥ 25 kg/m² with additional risk factor for GDM | 15 GW to delivery | Aerobic and resistance | 2x/wk 60 min | Moderate to vigorous 12–14 RPE | Yes | 105 (52/53) | ● ● ●        |
| Pinzon 2012 [72]       | Colombia | Healthy                  | 16–20 GW to 32–36 GW   | Resistance        | 3x/wk 60 min | Light to moderate 55–75% HR max | Yes | 35 (18/17) | ●              |
| First author and year | Country | Population characteristics | Timing of intervention | Intervention type | Frequency | Intensity | Supervised | Sample size (E/C) | Neocate outcome |
|-----------------------|---------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Price 2012 [73]       | USA     | BMI < 39 kg/m² No exercise (≥ 1x/wk for 6 months) | 12–14 GW to 36 GW | Aerobic and resistance | 4x/wk 45–60 min | Moderate to vigorous 12–14 RPE | Partial | 62 (31/31) | ● |
| Barakat 2013 [46]     | Spain   | Healthy (exercise < 4x/wk) | 6–9 GW to 38–39 GW | Aerobic, resistance | 3x/wk 40–45 min | Light to moderate 60–75% HR max 10–12 Rep range | Yes | 290 (138/152) | ● |
| Kasawara 2013 [63]    | Brazil  | Chronic HTN or history of preeclampsia | 12–20 GW to delivery | Aerobic | 1x/wk 30 min | Light to moderate 20% above resting HR to < 140 bpm | Yes | 103 (53/50) | ● |
| Ruiz 2013 [79]        | Spain   | Exercise < 20 min < 3x/wk | 9 GW to 38–39 GW | Aerobic and resistance | 3x/wk 25–30 min | Light to moderate < 60% HRmax Borg RPE 10–12 | Yes | 962 (481/481) | ● |
| Barakat 2014 [48]     | Spain   | Healthy | 9–13 GW to 39–40 GW | Aerobic, resistance | 3x/wk 55–60 min | Moderate 55–60% HR max Borg RPE 12–13 | Yes | 200 (107/93) | ● |
| Cordero 2014 [50]     | Spain   | Healthy | 10–14 GW to delivery | Aerobic and resistance | 3x/wk, 32 min | Moderate to vigorous < 60% HR max Borg RPE 12–14 | Yes | 257 (101/156) | ● |
| Ghodsi 2014 [57]      | Iran    | BMI 19.8–26 kg/m² No regular exercise | 20–26 GW to 38 GW | Aerobic | 3x/wk 15 min | Light to moderate 50–60% HR max | No | 80 (40/40) | ● |
| Kong 2014 [64]        | USA     | BMI ≥ 25 kg/m² (< 30 min, 3x/wk) | 12–15 GW To 35 GW | Aerobic | 5x/wk, 30 min | Moderate (step counts) | No | 37 (18/19) | ● |
| Murtezani 2014 [67]   | Kosovo | Healthy (exercise < 20 min, 3x/wk) | 14–20 GW to delivery | Aerobic and resistance | 3x/wk 40–45 min | Moderate to vigorous 12–14 RPE | Yes | 63 (30/33) | ● |
| Petrov Fieril 2014 [71]| Sweden | Healthy | 14 GW to 25 GW | Resistance | 2x/wk 60 min | Moderate to vigorous (self-selected) | No | 72 (38/34) | ● |
| Hellenes 2015 [60]    | Norway  | Healthy | 18–22 GW to 32–36 GW | Aerobic and resistance | 3x/wk 45–60 min | Moderate to vigorous 13–14 RPE | Partial | 855 (429/426) | ● |
| Ramos 2015 [74]       | Brazil  | GDM | 24–28 GW to 36 GW | Aerobic | 3x/wk 50 min | NR | NR | 6 (2/4) | ● |
| Ussher 2015 [76]      | United Kingdom | Smokers (> 4 cigarettes/day prior to pregnancy) | 10–24 GW for 8 GW | Aerobic | 1-2x/wk 30 min | Moderate (self-report) | Yes | 713 (354/359) | ● |
| Barakat 2016 [45]     | Spain   | Healthy | 9–11 GW to 38–39 GW | Aerobic, resistance | 3x/wk 50–55 min | Moderate to vigorous < 70% HR max Borg RPE 12–14 | Yes | 765 (382/383) | ● |
| Guelfi 2016 [58]      | Australia | History of GDM in previous pregnancies with no structured exercise | 14 to 28 GW | Aerobic | 3x/wk 30–60 min | Moderate to vigorous intervals 65–85% HR max | Yes | 172 (87/85) | ● ● |
| Perales 2016 [70]     | Spain   | Pre gestational exercise < 4x/wk, or current exercise ≤ 2x/wk 20 mins | 9–11 GW To delivery | Aerobic, Resistance | 3x/wk 55–60 min | Light to moderate 55–60% HR max | Yes | 166 (83/83) | ● |
| Seneviratne 2016 [75] | New Zealand | BMI ≥ 25 kg/m² | 20 GW to 35 GW | Aerobic | 3 5x/wk 15–30 min | Moderate 40–59% VO₂R | No | 74 (37/37) | ● ● |
Table 3 Included randomized controlled trials (Continued)

| First author and year | Country | Population characteristics | Timing of intervention | Intervention type | Frequency | Intensity | Supervised | Sample size neonates (E/C) | Neonate outcome |
|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Daly 2017 [51]        | Ireland | No diabetes, BMI > 30 kg/m² | 12 GW to 6 wk. post-partum | Aerobic and resistance | 3×/wk 30–40 min | NR        | Yes        | 87 (44/43)                | ●              |
| Labonte 2017 [65]     | Canada  | Healthy BMI 18.5–25 kg/m²²  | 2nd to 3rd trimester   | Aerobic           | 3×/wk 20 min     | Moderate 55% VO₂max | Partial  | 18 (19/8)                 | ●              |
| Garnaes 2017 [55]     | Norway  | BMI > 28 kg/m² (exercise < 2×/week) | 12–18 GW to delivery | Aerobic and resistance | 3–5×/wk 60 min  | Moderate to vigorous 12–15 RPE | Partial  | 74 (38/36)                | ●              |
| Sklempe 2017 [80]     | Croatia | GDM                         | 22–26 GW to delivery | Aerobic and resistance | 2–7×/wk 40–45 min | Moderate 65–75% HR max Borg RPE 13–14 | Partial  | 38 (18/20)                | ●              |
| Wang 2017 [77]        | China   | BMI > 24 kg/m²²             | 8–12 GW to delivery   | Aerobic           | 3×/wk 30–60 min | Light to vigorous intervals 50–85% HR max | Yes        | 226 (112/114)             | ● ●            |

Outcomes columns with dot indicate the specific outcome was reported by the study. BMI body mass index, bpm beat per minute, FM fat mass, GDM gestational diabetes mellitus, GW gestational weeks, HR heart rate, LGA large-for-gestational age, NR not reported, RPE rating of perceived exertion, VO₂max maximal oxygen consumption, VO₂R oxygen uptake reserve, wk week.
Evidence from Observational Studies

Primary Outcome: Birth weight

Fifteen observational studies investigated the relationship between exercise in pregnancy and offspring cardiometabolic outcomes (see Table 2). They were too heterogeneous in terms of exposure assessment and outcome reporting to be meta-analyzed. For the primary outcome, two cohorts found an increased average birth...
weight after exposure to exercise [31, 33] (from + 109 g, p < 0.05 to + 276 g, 95% CI 54, 497, n = 434), nine found no impact [28, 29, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42] (n = 143,432), and three lower average birth weight after prenatal exercise [30, 35, 40] (from −23 g, 95% CI −1.3 to −0.1 g, n = 142,420).

Secondary Outcomes
Two studies found investigated the risk of being born LGA after exposure to prenatal exercise. Although both found a similar reduction in risk, none were statistically significant (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.67, 1.02, n = 1913 [28]; prevalence 0.73%, 95% CI 0.10, 5.18%, n = 20,458 [41]). Two studies reported long-term secondary outcomes after following up offspring at 7.1 [40] and 15.5 years old [38]. No significant relationships were found with exposure to prenatal exercise on BMI, blood pressure, blood lipids, or fasting glucose in these studies after adjustment for confounders.

Evidence from Randomized Controlled Trials

Primary Outcome
For the primary outcome, 38 trials involving 6766 pregnant women provided data for the meta-analysis of birth weight (see Table 3). Compared to control condition (no prenatal exercise), there was no difference in birth weight after exercise interventions delivered in pregnancy at any time period, frequency, or intensity of exercise (mean difference (MD): −22.1 g, 95% confidence interval [CI] −51.5 to 7.3 g; I² 22%; see Fig. 2). Restricting to the studies with healthy populations did not yield very different results (MD −23.6 g, 95% CI −54.7, 7.5; I² 3%; 31 trials, n = 5777). The moderate statistical heterogeneity led us to conduct our pre-defined sub-group analyses. Sub-grouping by maternal BMI indicated that prenatal exercise had no effect according to pre-pregnancy BMI categories (see Fig. 2), either < 25 kg/m² (MD −69.4, 95% CI −210.3, 71.5; I² 54%; four trials, n = 831), > 25 kg/m² (MD −49.5, 95% CI −112.1, 13.2; I² 0%; eight trials, n = 960), or > 30 kg/m² (MD −528.9, 95% CI −151.1, 226.7; I² 60%; two trials; n = 106). Sub-grouping according to maternal pre-pregnancy activity level (inactive vs. active) indicated that prenatal exercise could reduce birth weight in previously inactive women (MD −34.8 g, 95% CI −69.0, −0.5 g; I² 0%; 18 trials, n = 2829); however, as no study specifically included active women, we could not assess that sub-group (Fig. 3). Sub-grouping according to type of exercise showed that aerobic-only training similarly reduced birth weight (MD −58.7 g, 95% CI −109.7, −7.8; I² 12%; 17 studies, n = 2058), but resistance training only (5 trials, n = 543), or combined regimens (16 trials, n = 4183) had non-significant effects (see Fig. 4). Prenatal exercise regimens starting after the 20th week of pregnancy marginally reduced birth weight (MD −84.3 g, 95% CI −142.2, −26.4 g; I² 0%, n = 1124), whereas interventions starting before this time had no impact on birth weight (20 studies, n = 3853, see Fig. 5). Interventions that were light to moderate intensity reduced birth weight (MD −45.5 g, 95% CI −82.4, −8.6 g; I² 3%; 9 trials, n = 2651) but not those that were moderate to vigorous intensity (25 trials, n = 2992; Fig. 6). Finally, frequency of exercise did not impact birth weight, whether interventions were less than three times a week (4 trials, n = 1131) or at least that frequent (31 trials, n = 5408; Fig. 7). Restricting to studies with low to moderate risk of bias did not yield different
results (MD − 10.9, 95% CI − 42.1, 20.4; I² 0%; 17 trials, n = 3418; data not shown); however, studies from developing countries were more likely to find that prenatal exercise reduced birth weight (MD − 78.7 g, 95% CI − 135.4, − 22.0 g; I² 43%; 12 trials, n = 1120) compared to studies in developed countries (MD − 8.3 g, 95% CI − 43.8, 27.11 g; I² 32%; 26 trials, n = 5646; data not shown).

### Secondary Outcomes

Only LGA status and fat mass at birth could be meta-analyzed. Data concerning the other outcomes were either not reported by more than one study or were not clinically homogeneous enough to be pooled (e.g., collected at different ages). Prenatal exercise did not reduce the risk of LGA (RR 0.85, 95% CI 0.51, 1.44; I² 58%; seven studies; n = 937; Fig. 8) nor impact fat mass percentage (MD − 0.27, 95% CI − 0.65, 0.1%; I² 10%; two studies; n = 130; Fig. 9). Qualitatively, the two studies that followed up offspring after birth did not indicate any significant impact of prenatal exercise on weight [62, 92] or fat mass [62, 92] at 17 days or 6 months old. No RCT reported on offspring blood pressure, blood glucose, or blood lipids.

### Discussion

Exercise is an established cornerstone for optimizing women’s metabolic health, and prenatal exercise is safe...
for mothers and fetus [103]. As evidence is accumulating that in utero exposures have a major influence on the fetus’ future cardiometabolic health [10], the positive maternal impacts of exercise on women’s cardiometabolic health have recently been posited to extend to exposed fetuses [23]. Although recent meta-analyses stated prenatal exercise might prevent giving birth to larger babies [18, 19, 22], we found contrasting results from both high quality observational cohorts and RCTs which indicated that prenatal exercise does not impact average birth weight in a significant manner. None of the included cohort studies found a clinically relevant birth weight difference (i.e., ≥ 300 g [104]) after exposure to various kinds of prenatal exercise. Thus, even though the methodological differences made it difficult to compare the studies and explain their opposing results (prenatal exercise increasing vs. decreasing birth weight), none of the reviewed cohorts reported clinically relevant impacts of prenatal exercise on birth weight. As few cohorts followed children into childhood or measured other variables than weight, the long-term impact of maternal exercise on offspring cardiometabolic health remains unclear. Long-term follow-up of pregnancy cohorts is needed to discern the influence of exercise in pregnancy and child health. Similar to results observed by prospective cohorts, we did not find a clinically relevant effect of prenatal aerobic and/or strength training interventions on child birth weight, LGA status, or birth fat mass. Although prenatal exercise led to statistically significant birth weight reduction in some sub-group analyses, the mean effect varied from $-0.5$ to $-84$ g, which are clinically negligible impacts [104]. We were limited in our ability to examine the impact of prenatal exercise on other important health outcomes (childhood blood pressure, glucose, lipids, and fat mass) because they were not measured or reported by the trials, therefore the long-term impact of exposure to prenatal exercise on cardiometabolic health of offspring could not be assessed.

| Study or Subgroup | Exercise | No exercise | Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) [g] | Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI) [g] |
|-------------------|----------|-------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Barakat 2009 [64] | 3.165    | 411.8       | -2.303                                 | 3.232                                  |
| Barakat 2014 [14] | 3.186    | 404.7       | 107                                    | 3.261                                 |
| Barakat 2015 [14] | 3.252    | 438.8       | 382                                    | 3.218                                 |
| Cappo 2009 [69]  | 3.600    | 900.2       | 22                                     | 3.430                                  |
| Colton 2014 [80]  | 3.324    | 433.1       | 156                                    | 3.256                                 |
| Daly 2017 [51]    | 3.532    | 477.1       | 44                                     | 3.534                                 |
| de Oliveira Mac 2012 [53] | 3.279 | 453.1       | 54                                     | 3.378                                 |
| Erkan 2016 [14]   | 3.568    | 308.2       | 23                                     | 3.496                                 |
| Gartner 2015 [75] | 3.719    | 695.3       | 36                                     | 3.912                                 |
| Kong 2014 [64]    | 3.650    | 475.1       | 18                                     | 3.765                                 |
| Murta et al. 2014 | 3.250    | 465.3       | 30                                     | 3.373                                 |
| Nascimento 2016 [68] | 3.267.4  | 700.4       | 40                                     | 3.228                                 |
| Odoom 2012 [69]   | 3.524    | 591.5       | 52                                     | 3.352                                 |
| Parales 2016 [70] | 3.183    | 448.0       | 83                                     | 3.232                                 |
| Patel 2014 [71]   | 3.561    | 452.3       | 39                                     | 3.521                                 |
| Price 2017 [73]   | 3.329    | 519.3       | 31                                     | 3.308                                 |
| Ruiz 2017 [79]    | 3.234    | 453.4       | 481                                    | 3.239                                 |
| Santos 2008 [41]  | 3.363    | 504.7       | 37                                     | 3.368                                 |
| Wang 2017 [77]    | 3.345    | 397.0       | 112                                     | 3.457                                 |

Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.37$ (P = 0.71)

**Fig. 5** Forest plot of pooled mean differences for birth weight after exposure to prenatal exercise vs. no exercise; sub-grouping by timing of intervention: first half of pregnancy (< 20 gestational weeks) vs. second half of pregnancy (≥ 20 gestational weeks)

Test for subgroup differences: $Ch^2 = 4.36$, df = 1 (P = 0.04), I² = 77.1%
Birth weight is a very common marker of infant health due to its ease of measurement and its historically frequent association with future health outcomes [105]. Nonetheless, recent work in the field of developmental origins of health and disease indicate that weight is only a crude marker of health. For example, some studies indicate that offspring born small for gestational age are leaner later in life [106, 107] while others found that these offspring were at increased risk of obesity [108–110]. Likewise, some studies found increased markers of cardiometabolic risk in LGA offspring [111, 112] while others did not find evidence of increased risk [113–115]. Thus, in order to adequately assess the potentially protective effects of prenatal exercise on offspring cardiometabolic health, it is imperative to measure other relevant markers (e.g., body composition, blood glucose, and lipids) at birth and later in childhood. Our unexpected null results provide cautionary evidence that exercise by itself is not sufficient to impact birth weight, as some have argued [28, 116]. On the other hand, they suggest that women can safely participate in the type of activity they prefer (aerobic or resistance) at the intensity and frequency that suits them, which might increase adherence.

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths of this systematic review include isolating the causal impact of prenatal exercise (vs. other interventions like dietary modifications); restricting to high-quality designs to reduce bias (prospective cohorts and RCTs); considering outcomes other than weight to assess the impact of prenatal exercise on offspring health; considering maternal and training variables not assessed by previous reviews (timing, intensity and frequency of intervention, maternal BMI, country of origin); using random effect models for all analyses; and using a protocol established a priori. Despite these strengths, the review has some limitations. First, only studies assessing aerobic and/or strength...
Fig. 7 Forest plot of pooled mean differences for birthweight after exposure to prenatal exercise vs. no exercise; sub-grouping by frequency of the exercise: Less than 3 times per week and At least 3 times per week.

Fig. 8 Forest plot of pooled risk ratios for large-for-gestational-age (LGA) status.
training were included, discarding studies where other forms of prenatal exercise (e.g., yoga [117]) were measured. This choice was made because current recommendations [118, 119] are focused on those two types of exercise. However, as > 80% of active pregnant women report engaging in some kind of aerobic training [120], we are confident our results are representative of real-life prenatal exercise habits and are therefore relevant for clinicians and researchers. Second, our predefined sub-groups addressed only one variable at a time (e.g., maternal BMI, timing of exercise). It is possible that evaluating the interaction by grouping according to many parameters (e.g., among women with a BMI > 25, those who started exercising < 20 gestational weeks) through a meta-regression might be more informative. However, such analyses were not planned a priori so another study would be needed to answer this limitation. Third, there was marked heterogeneity in research designs, assessments of exercise dose (frequency, intensity, duration, adherence), and reports of offspring outcomes, making direct comparisons between studies difficult. Accordingly, we refrained from pooling results that we considered too heterogeneous and were careful in not over-interpreting the results.

Evidence Gaps

It is imperative that future trials report determinants of offspring cardiometabolic health other than birth weight, such as adiposity, plasma glucose and lipids, and blood pressure early in life and ideally at multiple times throughout childhood to define the long term impact of exposure to prenatal exercise on offspring cardiometabolic health. Indeed, there are indications that higher blood pressure [121], glycemia [5], and dyslipidemia [122] early in life are related to metabolic syndrome, diabetes, and cardiovascular diseases, whereas birth weight is a crude marker [113, 123]. Follow up of data for these parameters in childhood would provide important tools to public health authorities to help determine if and how prenatal exercise improves offspring cardiovascular risk factors in both the short and long term. Indeed, assessing offspring fat and lean mass might be more informative than only weight. Additionally, offspring should be periodically reassessed as there is a dearth of longitudinal data concerning offspring exposed to exercise interventions in the literature. A sample size calculation based on the RCTs included indicate that matched groups of at least 268 participants (536 participants total) are needed to detect a birth weight difference between groups at 90% power and with a 0.05 double-sided $\alpha$. However based on our analyses, future interventions should include components other than exercise (such as a dietary intervention) if the intent is to have an impact on birth weight. Finally, more diverse participants in terms of pre-pregnancy activity level and body composition are needed in future studies to understand how exercise interventions in pregnancy modulate the relationship between maternal physiology, offspring body composition, and cardiometabolic health. Clinicians looking to counsel their clients might want to highlight that while prenatal exercise is perfectly safe for the baby, the best evidence currently available indicates it is not sufficient by itself to protect the child against cardiometabolic diseases.

Conclusion

In summary, high-quality studies analyzed with conservative statistics show that the impact of prenatal exercise on birth weight is not clinically relevant. This impact might be more important in previously less active women and when the exercise program has light to moderate intensity and starts in the second half of pregnancy. Due to the scarcity of studies collecting parameters other than birth weight and/or following up offspring in childhood, there is limited evidence about the relationship between prenatal exercise and long-term offspring cardiometabolic health. Thus, there is a great need for the collection of data other than weight and for the long-term follow up of offspring exposed to exercise to better define the impact of prenatal exercise on offspring cardiometabolic risk throughout life. Researchers and clinicians intending to impact the health of the future generations should consider adding other components (such as dietary components) to their exercise interventions.
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