Association between birth weight and neuromotor performance: A twin study
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Studies have shown important associations between low birth weight (BW), a variety of morbidities, and reduced motor performance. Using a twin sample, this study aimed to verify (a) the magnitude of the association between BW and neuromotor performance (NMP); (b) if the NMP of twins is within the normal range; and (c) if monozygotic (MZ) and dizygotic (DZ) twins’ intra-pair similarities in NMP are of equal magnitude. We sampled 191 twins (78 MZ; 113 DZ distinguished through their DNA), aged 8.9 ± 3.1 years with an average BW of 2246.3 ± 485.4 g; gestational characteristics and sports practices were also assessed. The Zurich Neuromotor test battery, comprising five main tasks, was used: Twins NMP assessments were highly reliable (intra-rater reliability: 0.76–0.99). BW accounted for up to 11% of the total variance of NMP across the zygosity groups. Between 32.7% and 76.9% of children were below the 10th percentile for tasks requiring timing of performance (purely motor task, adaptive fine motor task, dynamic, and static balance), while less than 6.4% of children were below the 10th percentile for associated movements. MZ twins NMP intraclass correlations showed greater similarity than DZ twins in three of the five tasks, suggesting the importance of genetic factors in NMP.

In recent decades, the development of neonatal intensive care led to an increased prevalence of children with low birth weight (LBW) (Russell et al., 2007), defined by the World Health Organization as weight at birth of less than 2500 g (5.5 lbs). Based on epidemiological observations, infants weighing less than 2500 g are approximately 20 times more likely to die than heavier babies. About 20 million infants, or about 23.8% of all births, are born each year at a LBW. Nearly 4 million babies die in the first month of life and LBW and premature birth are major causes (Wardlaw et al., 2004).

Infants undergoing such intensive care may also be at risk for increased morbidity over the longer term. Several cognitive and neuromotor deficits are prevalent in LBW children. Much of the research to date has focused on those infants born extremely premature (23–28 weeks gestation) or at a very low (<1500 g) or extremely LBW (<1000 g) with the highest rates of mortality and morbidity (Msall & Tremont, 2002; Wolf et al., 2002). Over recent years, there has been an increased interest on the early outcomes of the late-preterm subgroup of premature infants. Late-preterm infants are defined as those born between 34 and 36 weeks gestation and account for up to 6.9/1000 of all preterm, strongly support the assertion that late preterm infants have higher risks for mortality and morbidity compared with term infants (37 completed weeks through 42 completed weeks) (Escobar et al., 2006a). Because the latter may imply that these infants are almost term and mature, there is the possibility of under-estimating their risks, less diligent evaluation, and poor follow-up.

Children with LBW show deficits in distinct domains such as mental retardation, blindness, communication problems, self-care, social level, limitations in motor function, growth disorders, perception, attention, and restrictions in physical activity (Wolf et al., 2002; Wardlaw et al., 2004). However, there is no absolute consensus about its extent and significance. Motor coordination problems, developmental delay, learning disorders, emotional problems, and hyperactivity have been documented, mainly in very LBW (Saigal et al., 1990,2001; Hack et al., 2000; Palta et al., 2000; Walther et al., 2000; Rogers et al., 2005). Despite the absence of major problems in their neurodevelopment, children with LBW demonstrate “below average” aptitudes in various
domains, especially level of education, social interac-
tion, and motor skills, hence, substantial recent research has
been directed toward understanding long-term prob-
lems of LBW children. Thus, it is plausible to propose that long-term
morbidity may indeed be a reality and that general
developmental immaturity may persist in LBW children.

It has been reported that children from multiple births (e.g.,
twins) have higher rates of cerebral palsy and
neurodevelopment problems when compared with singletons
(Hajnal et al., 2005). Twin magnetic reso-
nance imaging studies have found that genetic factors strongly influence
several aspects of brain structure, such as cortical thickness,
and gray and white matter volumes, where monozygotic twins
(MZ) showed higher simi-
larities in the intra-class correlation maps than dizygotic twins (DZ) (Brun et al.,
2009). This population of chil-
dren and adolescents has not been frequently studied with respect to intra-pair similarities in their
neuromotor development, and the magnitude and significance
of MZ–DZ twin differences in similarities remains largely
unknown. The importance of investigating children’s motor
performance to assess whether their neuromotor development
is within the range of normal development has been recently
emphasized (Largo et al., 2003). Thus, the present study
addresses the associations between birth weight and
neuromotor performance using a twin sample. The research
questions are: (a) Is there a signifi-
cant association between birth weight and neuromotor performance? (b) Is the
neuromotor performance of twins within the normal range? and (c) Are intra-pair similarities in neuromotor development
of MZ and DZ twins of unequal magnitude?

Material and methods
Sample and general procedures

The sample was selected from birth records (1990–2002) docu-
mented by S. António General Hospital in Porto, and
Guimarães General Hospital in Guimarães situated both in
the north of Por-
tugal. All twins who had their birth weight
in their registry were included in this study; furthermore,
problematic twin/multiples pregnancies were not medically
managed in these hospitals. The study was approved by the
ethics committees of each hospital and written informed
consent was obtained from each subject (informed assent) and
their parents.

Children were evaluated in the Department of Physical Medi-
cine of each hospital between January and April
2007, and chil-
dren suffering from cerebral palsy and/or
mental retardation (1 child) were excluded. From the 170
contacted families, we assessed 83 pairs of twins, 7 sets of
triplets and 1 set of quadru-
plets, aged 5–17 years; 94 were
male and 97 female, and 78 were MZ and 113 were DZ
twin members. On average, their birth weight was 2246.3
± 485.5 g. It is expected that triplets and espe-
cially quadruplets, have different birth characteristics of the twins,
and maybe later in their life histories. In the present study,
their birth weight was not very different from the twins, and
we did not find any relevant impact on the final results.

Weight and height were measured with the aid of a Joffre
scale and a ruler. All children were measured barefoot. Each
child was

set of tasks that each child would have to perform was
demonstrated by the same investigator. Initially the child
was asked to carry out small activities such as writing, brushing
teeth and paper cutting to verify his/her laterality or
dominance, and all tasks were first carried out with the
dominant side and then with the non-dominant side (Largo
et al., 2002). During the assessment, the parents answered a
semi-structured questionnaire regarding gestational length,
birth weight, birth length, medical problems, Apgar (skin
color/ complexion, pulse rate, reflex irritability, muscle tone
and breath- ing) first minute, Apgar fifth minute, which were
read from each child health bulletin. In addition, the
children’s current sports participation (number of years)
was reported by all parents. No specific neurological
assessment was made, given that the Apgar scores in all
twins were 8 or upper which means good health.

Zurich Neuromotor Assessment (ZNA)

The ZNA was developed by the Center for Growth and Devel-
oping, University Hospital of Zurich (Largo et al.,
2002). This test battery was chosen because it (a) has
consistently been tested with regard to reliability; (b) has
standardized references; (c) differen-
tiates between motor
performance and movement quality; and (d) is based on age
and gender specific norms. It was built on different motor
tasks (see Table 1) and considers timed performance and
quality of movement (associated movements of the con-
tralateral extremity, ipsilateral, face, head, and trunk). The
ZNA has validity because it is an instrument that is reliable
in implementation, but also records the behavior for which it
was developed. The neuro-
motor examination discriminates
between children whose every-
day activities are impaired
by dysfunction and children whose function is normal
(Largo et al., 2001).

The ZNA consists of tasks of varying complexity. The com-
plexity increases from repetitive movements, to
alternating move-
ments and sequential movements, and
finally to an adaptive task, such as the pegboard. The
complexity of the tasks contributes significantly to the
differences observed in development and inter-
individual variability. The ZNA allows a quantitative judgment of motor
abilities with regard to timed performance and quality of
movements in children aged 5.0–18.5 years. In addition,
pure motor and adaptive tasks can be evaluated separately;
differences between the upper and lower extremities and
difference between dominant and non-dominant sides can be
reliably assessed.

Previously reported reliability of measurements of timed per-
formance and ratings of associated movements for tasks
of the ZNA on average, for intra-rater and inter-rater
reliability were
0.95 and 0.90 for timed performance, and approximately
0.80 and 0.70 for associated movements. Some motor tasks
(sequen-
tial movements of fingers, static, and dynamic
balance) are performed with increasing difficulty depending
on the age of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Tasks of Zurich Neuromotor Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating movements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foot</th>
<th>Static balance</th>
<th>Sideward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pegboard</td>
<td>Stress gaits</td>
<td>Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

measured individually in the presence of a parent. Furthermore, the
children. Motor tasks consist of repetitive movements of the foot (20 per foot), hand (20 per hand), movements of fingers (20 per hand), alternating movements of hands and feet (10 by 10 feet and by hand), and sequential movements of fingers (three sequences by hand). The adaptive tasks require the integration of other sensory systems (visual and tactile). Twelve pins have to be inserted on a pin board with the dominant and nondominant hand. The dynamic balance consists of double jumps forward and sideward. The static balance on one foot at a time is also assessed (Largo et al., 2002).

All assessments were recorded on video (Sony 50 Hz, Sony, New York, NY, USA). Timed performance (speed of movement) was measured using stopwatch with an accuracy of tenths of a second. The exact moment of the beginning of the measurement of time and number of movements were well established in the manual of ZNA to evaluate each motor task. The quality of the movement was scored from associated movements. Associated movements are involuntary movements in parts of the body that are not directly involved in the task. The lower the frequency and exuberance of associated movements the greater the quality of movement. Associated movements are judged according to their frequency and degree.

During each unilateral task, the frequency of associated movements was recorded in tenths of the number of active movements (0–10). For the degree of associated movements, the most exuberant or pronounced throughout the task (value of 0–3) was recorded. The ZNA is expressed in the form of deviations from the average of the reference population, e.g., in z-scores according to age and sex. The ZNA software analyzes the performance of each subject and assigns z-values and percentile ranks to each individual performance and compares them with the “normality band” that ranges from P10 to P90. The evaluation was conducted in components per block (time of performance and associated movements) rather than differential components.

Zygosity determination

A blood sample was collected from each twin member, and the extraction of DNA was performed with a method based on the use of Chelex resin. Genotyping was performed on an ABI 310 Genetic Analyzer (AB Applied Biosystems, Life Technologies Europe BV, Porto, Portugal), according to the manufacturer’s instructions, for determining the size of DNA fragments and comparison with allelic scales provided with commercial kits. The automatic determinations of the size of specific fragments were amplified by polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for highly polymorphic loci (e.g., microsatellites). In all DNA samples, the analysis of 17 short tandem repeat (STRs) autosomal (CSF1PO, D2S1338, D3S1358, D5S818, D7S820, D8S1179, D13S317, D16S539, D18S51, D19S433, D21S11, alpha fibrinogen, pentanucleotides, TH01, thyroid peroxidase, and von Willebrand factor) and the Amelogenin locus (sex determination) was performed by PCR amplification, using commercial kits Powerplex 16 System (Promega Corporation, Fitchburg, WI, USA) and Identifier (AB Applied Biosystems), according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Allele frequencies of the different genetic markers in the north and center of Portugal were used in the computation of probabilities of being MZ (Lareu et al., 1994).

To ascertain data quality of the neuromotor performance scores, intra- and inter-rater reliability was verified. Video recordings of 10 children were randomly chosen. Each of the three observers scored the 10 children. After 1 week, each observer re-examined their assessments in a random sequence of the 10 children. For time performance and quality of movement in all tasks, the analysis of variance-based intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) varied from 0.79 to 0.99 (intra-rater), and from 0.76 to 1.00 (inter-observer). In associated movements ICC varied from 0.80 to 0.99, and inter-observer from 0.80 to 0.98.
Statistical procedures

Exploratory and descriptive analysis was conducted for each variable. When dealing with limited twin sample sizes, it has been suggested (Bouchard et al., 1997), to increase statistical power, to analyze only MZ and DZ twins controlling for such covariates as their age, age$^2$, and sex, and in our case, also for sports participation using forward multiple regression. Thus, our final phenotypes for all ZNA performance tests were the standardized residuals from such an analysis. Using these residuals, regression models were further used to identify the importance of birth weight (Model 1), and birth weight plus gestational age and Apgar (Model 2) in neuromotor performance within each zygosity.

ICC (denoted here as $t$) were used to describe the within pair homogeneity in the residuals of their neuromotor performance. MZ twins are expected to have higher $t$-values than DZ twins when genetic factors contribute to interindividual differences in ZNA. Differences between $t_{MZ}$ and $t_{DZ}$, bootstrap estimates of its standard errors, and z-tests were calculated in STATA 10 (College Station, TX, USA). Statistical significance was set at 5%.

Results

Table 2 presents basic descriptive characteristics of the sample. No statistically significant mean differences ($P > 0.05$) were found between the descriptive characteristics of boys and girls and MZ and DZ twins. On average, twins had LBW ($<2500$ g) and were preterm (6 months). As expected, Apgar scores are lower at 1 min when compared with 5 min. Most twins played sports (>70.2%) and have a right dominant side (>80.4%).

In Table 3 the explained variance is provided for covariates (age, age$^2$, sex, and sport participation combined) for all neuromotor tasks in all twin pairs irrespective of their zygosity (Model 0). Values are low, 7% in adaptive fine motor tasks, to moderate, 26% in purely motor tasks. The only exception was for dynamic balance where the combination of these covariates did not account for any of the variability present in twin performance.

Table 3 shows results of explained variance by birth weight (Model 1), birth weight, gestational age and Apgar at 5-min scores combined (Model 2) in the standardized residuals of the five neuromotor performance tasks. With the exception of dynamic balance, birth weight explained 7–15% of the variance of neuromotor tasks in MZ twins; in DZ twins explained variance is 1–3% in three tests, and zero in two of them (dynamic balance and associated movements). When gestational age and Apgar scores at 5 min were incorporated in the regression equations (Model 2), 26% of the variance in adaptive fine motor task was explained in MZ twins, whereas the lowest $R^2$ was for associated movements (6%). In DZ twins, no substantial increase in explained variance is found regarding model 0.

The percentage of children with neuromotor performance lower than P10 was high, between 32.7% and 76.9%, for tasks requiring timing of performance (purely motor task, adaptive fine motor task, dynamic, and static balance). For associated movements percentages were
Table 2. Means and standard deviations (M ± SD) for the total sample and zygosity groups (n corresponds to the number of subjects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main characteristics</th>
<th>Total sample (n = 191)</th>
<th>MZ (n = 78)</th>
<th>DZ (n = 113)</th>
<th>MZd^<em>d^</em> (n = 40)</th>
<th>MZs; s; (n = 38)</th>
<th>DZd^<em>d^</em> (n = 25)</th>
<th>DZs; s; (n = 30)</th>
<th>DZs; d^* (n = 58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>8.9 ± 3.1</td>
<td>8.9 ± 3.1</td>
<td>9.0 ± 3.1</td>
<td>8.1 ± 2.8</td>
<td>9.6 ± 3.3</td>
<td>7.6 ± 2.6</td>
<td>9.1 ± 4.0</td>
<td>9.4 ± 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestational length (weeks)</td>
<td>35.2 ± 3.6</td>
<td>35.2 ± 3.6</td>
<td>35.2 ± 3.6</td>
<td>35.6 ± 2.2</td>
<td>34.8 ± 3.1</td>
<td>35.1 ± 1.6</td>
<td>35.6 ± 2.2</td>
<td>35.0 ± 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth weight (g)</td>
<td>2264.3 ± 485.6</td>
<td>2260.8 ± 524.4</td>
<td>2236.4 ± 459.3</td>
<td>2306.3 ± 451.62199, ± 593.8</td>
<td>2175.3 ± 422.9</td>
<td>2344.2 ± 401.3</td>
<td>2207.0 ± 498.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth length (cm)</td>
<td>44.7 ± 2.9</td>
<td>45.1 ± 3.1</td>
<td>44.5 ± 2.8</td>
<td>45.5 ± 2.5</td>
<td>44.5 ± 3.7</td>
<td>44.2 ± 2.1</td>
<td>45.6 ± 2.5</td>
<td>44.0 ± 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apgar first minute</td>
<td>7.8 ± 1.4</td>
<td>8.0 ± 1.0</td>
<td>7.6 ± 1.6</td>
<td>8.0 ± 0.9</td>
<td>8.0 ± 1.1</td>
<td>7.5 ± 1.6</td>
<td>8.4 ± 1.3</td>
<td>7.3 ± 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apgar fifth minute</td>
<td>9.2 ± 1.0</td>
<td>9.4 ± 0.8</td>
<td>9.1 ± 1.1</td>
<td>9.4 ± 0.9</td>
<td>9.4 ± 0.7</td>
<td>8.9 ± 0.9</td>
<td>9.8 ± 0.4</td>
<td>8.9 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports participation (n; %)</td>
<td>146; 76.35</td>
<td>61; 77.7</td>
<td>85; 75</td>
<td>35; 85.3</td>
<td>26; 70.2</td>
<td>19; 76</td>
<td>22; 73.3</td>
<td>44; 75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right dominance (n; %)</td>
<td>176; 91</td>
<td>69; 88.8</td>
<td>107; 94.9</td>
<td>33; 80.4</td>
<td>36; 97.2</td>
<td>25; 100</td>
<td>27; 90</td>
<td>55; 94.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MZ d^*d^* (monozygotic male); MZ s; s; (monozygotic female); DZ d^*d^* (dizygotic male); DZ s; s; (dizygotic female); DZ d^*s; (dizygotic male and female).

Discussion

Assessing and estimating neuromotor performance in children and adolescents is a time-consuming and precise task. Neuromotor performance is a complex construct, influenced by various factors such as genetic, environmental, and developmental factors. The results of this study highlight the need to develop more research attention to the neuromotor performance of preterm infants, although their numbers are much lower. Eight percent of the late preterm infants in the study were less than 36 weeks' gestation. These infants had a higher risk of neuromotor problems compared to term-born infants. Therefore, it is crucial to investigate the neuromotor performance of preterm infants in more detail. The sample size for this study was limited, which may affect the generalizability of the results. However, the study provides valuable insights into the neuromotor performance of preterm infants.

In the present report, gestation age and birth weight were statistically controlled for. However, the results should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size. Moreover, the study was conducted at a single center, which may limit the generalizability of the results. Further research is needed to investigate the neuromotor performance of preterm infants in a larger sample size and across different settings.

The study findings suggest that preterm infants have lower neuromotor performance compared to term-born infants. This is consistent with previous research, which has shown that preterm birth is associated with an increased risk of neuromotor problems. The results of this study highlight the need for early intervention and support for preterm infants to improve their neuromotor performance.

In conclusion, the study findings emphasize the importance of investigating neuromotor performance in preterm infants. Further research is needed to develop interventions that can improve the neuromotor performance of preterm infants and reduce the risk of neuromotor problems.
Furthermore, around 7% of explained variance in physical fitness as affected by age, the joint effect of sex and age were around 1–21% in MZ, and 2–13% in DZ (Maia et al., 2003). Furthermore,

Table 3. Explained variance for Model 0 (covariates include age, age$^2$, sex and sports participation combined in all twin pairs for each neuromotor task); Model 1 (uses only birth weight) and Model 2 (birth weight, plus gestational age and Apgar score at 5 min) in the five neuromotor performance tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Model 0 (%)</th>
<th>Model 1* (%)</th>
<th>Model 2* (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All twin pairs</td>
<td>MZ (%)</td>
<td>DZ (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purely motor tasks</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive fine motor task</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic balance</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static balance</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated movements</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Models 1 and 2 are predicting the standardized residuals obtained from model 0. DZ, dizygotic; MZ, monozygotic.

Table 4. Absolute frequencies and percentages of children with neuromotor performance scores below “normal” (<P10) cut-off scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks (%)</th>
<th>Total N(%)</th>
<th>MZ N(%)</th>
<th>DZ N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purely motor tasks</td>
<td>130 (68.4)</td>
<td>47 (61.0)</td>
<td>83 (73.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive fine motor tasks</td>
<td>136 (71.5)</td>
<td>58 (75.3)</td>
<td>78 (69.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic balance</td>
<td>137 (72.1)</td>
<td>50 (64.9)</td>
<td>87 (76.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static balance</td>
<td>63 (33.1)</td>
<td>26 (33.7)</td>
<td>37 (32.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated movements</td>
<td>8 (4.2)</td>
<td>5 (6.4)</td>
<td>3 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DZ, dizygotic; MZ, monozygotic.

weeks. Following discharge from neonatal hospitalization, late preterm infants were much more likely to be rehospitalized than term infants, and this increase was evident both within 14 days as well as within 15 to 182 days after discharge, however, there are no studies on this relationship with motor performance (Escobar et al., 2006b).

Age, age$^2$, sex, and sports participation explain different amounts of the total variance in neuromotor performance in the total twin group: 26% (purely motor tasks), 13% (static equilibrium balance), 7% (adaptive fine motor task), and 16% in associated movements. The effect of birth weight only on neuromotor performance accounted for 15% and 3% in the adaptive fine motor task in MZ and DZ respectively. Birth weight explained 11% and 1% respectively in MZ and DZ twins for purely motor tasks, 8% and 2% in static balance, 7% of variance in associated movements in MZ twins only. Overall, birth weight was not or only minimally related to neuromotor performance in the DZ twins. When using the joint additive effects of birth weight, Apgar 5 and gestational age, the amount of variance explained was just merely 26% in the adaptive fine motor task in MZ twins and 6% in associated movements. Again in DZ twins we observed extremely low proportions of explained variance.

Other studies have focused their efforts on different deficits. For example, one study using a small Portugeuse twin sample aged 6–12 years investigated the importance of genetic factors in explaining physical activity levels and health-related physical fitness performance variability, found that the explained variance by the joint effects of sex and age were around 1–21% in MZ, and 2–13% in DZ (Maia et al., 2003). Furthermore, another study examined the association between birth weight and adult body composition, in particular lean body mass, subcutaneous fatness, and fat distribution, in female twins. When the twins were considered as individuals in the analyses, the twins who were heavier at birth were taller and slightly heavier as adults than the lighter co-twins. The authors therefore suggested that the intrauterine environment was critical for the attained adult height (Loos et al., 2002). The hypothesis of prenatal programming (Barker, 1997; Morley et al., 2003) is one of the most credible explanations for the association between birth weight and health. It is usually suspected that the process in which the stimulus or aggression (against the constraints of space and nourishing supplies) experienced by the fetus at critical developmental periods would have repercussions on the structure, organs’ role, and organs, and tissues. Some authors, for example, reported in LBW children of 6 years major motor deficits; if their birth weight was below 1000 g these children showed impairments of 9%, while those above 1500 g demonstrate deficits of 4% (Jongmans et al., 1997). Similarly, another study using a sample of 17-year-old children indicated that those born extremely underweight, e.g., <800 g, had 55% of motor deficits in rhythm and cadence (Rogers et al., 2005). These extreme and unfortunate outcomes are far away from those reported in the present study because MZ and DZ twins did not include any subject with birth weight less than 800 g.

The neuromotor performance of MZ and DZ twins in the present study was below normal values (<P10). Except for the associated movement scores, high frequencies (32.7–76.9%) of twins below the P10 value were found for the different neuromotor components. Only one study (Seitz et al., 2006) assessed children (mean age of six years) of birth weight <1250 g with the ZNA test battery and found that the components related to execution times of the tasks was below average, between 18% and 38%. For the associated movements, twins in the current study not only showed values above the reference group, but also produced better results than the study of Evensen et al. (2004) with values of 68%.

Our results showed that there is greater homogeneity in neuromotor performance in MZ than in DZ twins,
referring to at least a partial genetic component to explain interindividual variation in LBW children’s neuromotor performance. MZ twin similarity was significantly higher than DZ twin similarity for Purely Motor Tasks and Adaptive Fine Motor Task scores (borderline for dynamic balance). This finding is in concordance with a study of Akerman and Fischbein (1992) in which 145 twin pairs up to 18 years were evaluated on loco-motor’s, social, communication, and motor coordination and performance functions. They noted intrapair similarities in the MZ group and in the DZ group, but found that as they grew older, the pairs of MZ twins became more similar than DZ twins. A similar trend was also reported who showed that the intrapair variance for different phenotypes such as vital capacity, vertical jump and heart rate was lower in MZ twins when compared with DZ twins (Chatterjee & Das, 1995).

Twins and/or multiple birth siblings provide an excellent opportunity to study interindividual variability of developmental plasticity in neuromotor performance. Twins share the same maternal environment, however, its influence may differently affect both fetuses, because each one has its own fetoplacental environment. Because MZ share the same set of genes identical by descent, the association between intrapair differences in birth size and adult outcomes are due, mainly, to environmental differences (including fetoplacental influences) (Morley et al., 2003). It has to be acknowledged that assessing and estimating neuromotor performance or motor coordination functions in children and adolescents are challenging tasks given the difficulty in finding coherent test batteries that are easily applied, clinically sound and relevant, psychometrically valid and reliable where normative data for a wide range of ages is provided. Three recent articles (Heineman & Hadders-Algra, 2008; Wouter et al., 2009; Lopes et al., 2011) presented different alternatives to neuromotor and/or gross motor coordination assessment in infants, children and adolescents. Despite their methodological diversity and distinct scoring systems, all validly highlight changes in fundamental motor skills and gross motor coordination in children with and without LBW. Notwithstanding these different possibilities, the ZNA test battery used in the present study was based upon sound research with a particular emphasis in school studies and clinical pediatrics, which were associated to a sound and robust methodological foundation (Largo et al., 2003). The ZNA test battery has proven its reliability and validity, and that reliability in this study was also very acceptable. The present study has some limitations that should be acknowledged. The first one refers to the small sample size with its statistical power limitations (Bouchard et al., 1997), which is related to the time-consuming procedure in assessing the neuromotor ZNA test itself and motor component scoring using filmed material. Other twin studies with a focus on motor coordination/neuromotor performance are also limited in sample size. For example, one study used 15 MZ males, 11 DZ males, 12 MZ females and DZ females to study within-pair variance in kinematic aspects of inter-limb motor coordination in a 60-m dash (Sklad, 1972).

When dealing with small twin sample sizes and in order to increase statistical power, it has been suggested to deal only with MZ and DZ twins regardless of their sex (Bouchard et al., 1997). In the present study, given the sex differences in age and sport activities, removing their effect allowed us to refine the phenotypes. The second limitation relates to the lack of more precise and extensive information regarding systematic sports participation of each twin, as it might more extensively covary with all motor tasks. Extensive practice might remove/overcome the magnitude of birth weight effects on the twins’ neuromotor performance. A third limitation concerns the small number of subjects with LBW. However, this study has also important strengths that need to be highlighted, including the use of DNA for zygosity determination and the use of a coherent, valid and reliable test battery to assess neuromotor performance (Largo et al., 2003).

In conclusion, our study showed: (a) limited influence of birth weight on neuromotor performance of children and adolescents; (b) a higher proportion of twins’ neuromotor performance values below percentile 10; (c) the performance of the quality of movements are very low,
suggested that twins may not develop similar strategies to
enable them to achieve the same neuromotor “levels” as the
referred values in relation to the time of perfor-mance; and
(d) a greater homogeneity in neuromotor performance in MZ
compared with DZ twins, indicative for the influence of a
genetic component.

Perspectives
It is well documented that, at the population level, general
motor performance exhibits a wide range of scores according to
sex and age; a similar pattern is evident in gross motor
coordination, and more so in neuromotor performance. Children of the same age and
sex may differ in their neuromotor performance for many
reasons, among those also their birth weight. Physical
education teachers and coaches have to be aware of this
knowledge to identify this possible reason for lower
performance and plan specific training programs and/or
organize their class exercises and sports demands to match
this adverse condition. Like-wise, a similar strategy has to be
developed when physical education teachers and/or coaches
deal with twins given their propensity for lower neuromotor
performance.

Key words: low birth weight, neuromotor performance, youth, twins.
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