

**Breaking the Habit: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Pregnancy-Related Smoking Cessation Randomized Controlled Trials**

INPLASY202530054

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2025.3.0054

Received: 12 March 2025

Published: 12 March 2025

**Corresponding author:**

Omnia Elseifi

oelseifi@ut.edu.sa

**Author Affiliation:**

Department of Family and  
Community Medicine, Faculty of  
Medicine, University of Tabuk,  
Tabuk, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Elseifi, OS; Younis, FE; Mirza, IM; Alhewiti, A; Abd-Elhady, NMS;  
Mortada, EM.

**ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**

**Support** - This research was funded by Princess Nourah bint Abdulrahman University Researchers Supporting Project number (PNURSP2025R90), Princess Nourah bint Abdulrahman University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

**Review Stage at time of this submission** - Completed but not published - Since we had to publish the findings as soon as possible and were dedicated to applying for promotion, we were unable to file for prospective registration which takes a long time. At the same time, we were unaware of INPLASY's existence, which facilitates quick registration and supports researchers.

**Conflicts of interest** - None declared.

**INPLASY registration number:** INPLASY202530054

**Amendments** - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 12 March 2025 and was last updated on 12 March 2025.

**INTRODUCTION**

**Review question / Objective** The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to compare [pharmacological and behavioral interventions for smoking cessation during pregnancy] and [usual prenatal care, less intensive or different interventions, or a placebo] for [pregnant smokers] in terms of efficacy and acceptability in the [smoking cessation and pregnancy outcomes] to better inform clinical practice. To this end, the proposed systematic review will address the following question: Which is the best choice to reduce [smoking in pregnancy and adverse pregnancy outcomes] in [pregnant smokers], [pharmacological and behavioral interventions] or [usual prenatal care, less intensive or different interventions, or a placebo] ?”.

**Rationale** Pregnancy-related tobacco smoking is linked to major consequences for both the mother and the fetus [1-3]. Many pregnant women still smoke despite the tremendous efforts made to increase knowledge of the negative effects of tobacco use on pregnancy outcomes [4]. A 2018 meta-analysis found that maternal smoking prevalence was 1.7% globally, 5.9% in the United States, and 8% in Europe, with almost half of smoking women continuing to smoke during pregnancy [5]. There are several therapies to encourage quitting smoking during pregnancy. This study aims to resolve the discrepancies in the evidence about the efficacy of utilizing different interventions to quit smoking during pregnancy. As far as we are aware, this study is among the few that examine various smoking cessation strategies and their effects on quitting smoking and pregnancy outcomes.

**Condition being studied** Preterm labor, ectopic pregnancy, placental abruption, stillbirth, and low birth weight, are among the severe maternal and fetal outcomes linked to tobacco use during pregnancy [1-3]. There are several strategies to help pregnant women stop smoking. Pharmacological interventions, such as nicotine replacement therapy (NRT), and antidepressants like bupropion and varenicline (Chantix) [6]. Alternative behaviorally based interventions for expectant mothers have evolved as a result of the uncertainty surrounding pharmaceutical therapies. They come in a variety of forms, including financial incentives, physical activity programs, digital interventions through digital platforms, and cognitive therapy [7-10].

## METHODS

**Search strategy** PubMed, Google Scholar, Science Direct, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), and the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (World Health Organization) were among the resources that the authors explored from January 2010 until December 30, 2024. "Smoking OR cigarette OR tobacco OR nicotine" AND "cessation OR quitting OR stopping OR giving up" AND "interventions OR programs OR trials OR strategies" AND "pregnancy OR pregnant OR gestation OR antenatal OR prenatal OR maternal" were the search terms used.

**Participant or population** Pregnant women at least eighteen years old who were actively smoking cigarettes and got any type of smoking cessation program.

**Intervention** Smoking cessation interventions include pharmacological interventions, such as nicotine replacement therapy (NRT), and bupropion. As well as alternative behaviorally based interventions in a variety of forms, including financial incentives, physical activity programs, text message interventions, and cognitive behavioral counseling.

**Comparator** Pregnant women at least eighteen years old who were actively smoking cigarettes and got standard prenatal care, less intensive interventions, or a placebo in pharmacological studies.

**Study designs to be included** Randomized Control Trials (RCTs).

**Eligibility criteria** Inclusion criteria for the studies: Only free-whole text RCTs in English that the researchers took into consideration.

Exclusion criteria: Research published in languages other than English, studies involving pregnant nonsmokers or passive smokers, manuscripts that are not RCTs, and studies that are not original research.

**Information sources** PubMed, Google Scholar, Science Direct, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), and the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (World Health Organization) were among the resources that the authors explored.

**Main outcome(s)** The main outcome was smoking cessation at the end of pregnancy which was biochemically validated.

**Additional outcome(s)** The secondary outcomes were pregnancy outcomes such as birth weight, stillbirth or miscarriage, premature birth, Apgar score <7 (5 min), and the rate of cesarean sections.

**Data management** Three reviewers independently examined the literature, gathered information, and assessed the included study for possible bias: O.S.E., F.E.Y., and E.M.M. If an argument came up, it was addressed and resolved, taking into consideration the opinion of 4th reviewer "N.M.S.A". The three reviewers searched through the literature, looking at each paper's abstract and title to eliminate any that were inappropriate, and then scanning the full document to locate the study that fit.

The degree of certainty of the included studies was evaluated using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) technique [11]. Data were analyzed utilizing RevMan (Version 5.4.1; Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, United Kingdom).

### Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis

Implementing the Cochrane risk of bias instrument for randomized trials (RoB 2) version 2 [11], three reviewers (O.S.E., F.E.Y., and N.M.S.A.) evaluated the risk of bias in the selected studies. The quality assessment of the included studies was evaluated using (GRADE) technique [12]. GRADE ratings of confidence are generated by taking into account five domains: indirectness, publication bias, inconsistency, imprecision, and risk of bias. The selected studies were categorized according to the four categories for the level of certainty: very low, low, moderate, and high.

**Strategy of data synthesis** RevMan (Version 5.4.1; Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, United Kingdom) was used to evaluate the continuous and categorical dichotomous data to calculate the pooled relative risk (RR) of different smoking cessation strategies among pregnant smokers. To assume study-specific genuine effects based on heterogeneity, a model with random effects was used for the meta-analysis. I<sup>2</sup> values of more than 50% are considered to indicate significant heterogeneity [13]. P values less than 0.05, were considered significant.

**Subgroup analysis** Subgroup analysis was conducted for subtypes of pharmacological intervention “bupropion and NRT” and behavioral interventions “text messages, financial incentives, cognitive-behavioral counseling, and physical activity to determine their effect on the outcomes.

**Sensitivity analysis** A sensitivity analysis was performed in order to ascertain the potential impact of excluding any intervention on the pooled effect estimates. Additionally, bias in publications was evaluated using funnel plots [14], and the results were confirmed using Egger's regression asymmetry test [15].

**Language restriction** Only randomized clinical trials published in English will be considered for inclusion.

**Country(ies) involved** Saudi Arabia.

#### **Other organizational affiliations**

- Department of Pediatric, College of Medicine, King Faisal University, Alahsa, Saudi Arabia  
- Family and Community Medicine Department, College of Medicine, Princess Nourah bint Abdulrahman University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

**Keywords** smoking; pregnancy; behavioral approaches; pharmacological therapies; RCT.

**Dissemination plans** This systematic review and meta-analysis will be published in a relevant scientific journal.

#### **Contributions of each author**

Author 1 - Omnia Elseifi - Conceptualization, methodology, software, validation, formal analysis, writing original draft preparation, writing—review, and editing of the final study report.

Email: oelseifi@ut.edu.sa

Author 2 - Faten Younis - Conceptualization, methodology, software, validation, formal analysis, writing original draft preparation, writing—review, and editing of the final study report.

Email: fa.younes@ut.edu.sa

Author 3 - Iman Mirza - investigation, writing original draft preparation, writing—review, and editing of the final study report.

Email: imirza@ut.edu.sa

Author 4 - Abdullah Alhewiti - investigation, writing original draft preparation, writing—review, and editing of the final study report.

Email: aalhewiti@ut.edu.sa

Author 5 - Nahla Abd-Elhady - validation, writing original draft preparation, writing—review, and editing of the final study report.

Email: nabelgawad@kfu.edu.sa

Author 6 - Eman Mortada - methodology, software, validation, resources, formal analysis, writing original draft preparation, writing—review, and editing of the final study report, project administration.

Email: emmortada@pnu.edu.sa

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, O.S.E. and F.E.Y.; methodology, O.S.E. and F.E.Y. and E.M.M.; software, O.S.E. and F.E.Y.; validation, O.S.E. and F.E.Y. and E.M.M. and N.M.S.A.; formal analysis, O.S.E. and F.E.Y.; investigation, A.A. and I.M.M.; resources, E.M.M.; writing—original draft preparation, O.S.E. and F.E.Y. and E.M.M. and N.M.S.A. and A.A. and I.M.M.; writing—review and editing, O.S.E. and F.E.Y. and E.M.M. and N.M.S.A. and A.A. and I.M.M.; project administration, E.M.M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

#### **References**

- 1- Pineles BL, Hsu S, Park E, Samet JM. Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses of Perinatal Death and Maternal Exposure to Tobacco Smoke During Pregnancy. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2016 Jul 15;184(2):87-97. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwv301.
- 2- Fernandez-Rodriguez B, Gomez AR, Jimenez Moreno BS, de Alba C, Galindo A, Villalain C, Pallás C, Herraiz I. Smoking influence on early and late fetal growth. *J Perinat Med.* 2021 Dec 17;50(2):200-206. doi: 10.1515/jpm-2021-0226.
- 3- Shobeiri F, Jenabi E. Smoking and placenta previa: a meta-analysis. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med.* 2017 Dec;30(24):2985-2990. doi: 10.1080/14767058.2016.1271405. Epub 2017 Jan 4. PMID: 27936997.
- 4- Connolly N, Kelly D, O'Donnell P, Hyde S. Effectiveness of smoking cessation interventions in pregnant women attending primary care: a scoping review. *BJGP Open.* 2024 Oct 29;8(3):BJGPO.2023.0185. doi: 10.3399/BJGPO.2023.0185.
- 5- Lange S, Probst C, Rehm J, Popova S. National, regional, and global prevalence of smoking during pregnancy in the general population: a systematic

---

review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018 Jul;6(7):e769-e776. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30223-7.

6- Cressman AM, Pupco A, Kim E, Koren G, Bozzo P. Smoking cessation therapy during pregnancy. *Can Fam Physician*. 2012 May;58(5):525-7. PMID: 22586193; PMCID: PMC3352787.

7- Filion KB, Abenhaim HA, Mottillo S, Joseph L, Gervais A, O'Loughlin J, Paradis G, Pihl R, Pilote L, Rinfret S, Tremblay M, Eisenberg MJ. The effect of smoking cessation counselling in pregnant women: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BJOG*. 2011 Nov;118(12):1422-8. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2011.03065.x.

8- Tombor I, Neale J, Shahab L, Ruiz M, West R. Healthcare Providers' Views on Digital Smoking Cessation Interventions for Pregnant Women. *Journal of Smoking Cessation*. 2015;10(2):116-123. doi:10.1017/jsc.2014.6

9- Ussher M, Lewis S, Aveyard P, Manyonda I, West R, Lewis B, Marcus B, Riaz M, Taylor A, Daley A, Coleman T. Physical activity for smoking cessation in pregnancy: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2015 May 14;350:h2145. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h2145.

10- Higgins ST, Washio Y, Lopez AA, Heil SH, Solomon LJ, Lynch ME, Hanson JD, Higgins TM, Skelly JM, Redner R, Bernstein IM. Examining two different schedules of financial incentives for smoking cessation among pregnant women. *Prev Med*. 2014 Nov;68:51-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.03.024.

11- Higgins JPT, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC. Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial [last updated October 2019]. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.5. Cochrane, 2024. Available from <http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook>.

12- Schünemann HJ, Higgins JPT, Vist GE, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Skoetz N, Guyatt GH. Chapter 14: Completing 'Summary of findings' tables and grading the certainty of the evidence [last updated August 2023]. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.5. Cochrane, 2024. Available from <http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook>.

13- Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D. Analyzing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions* version 5.0.0. Chichester: Wiley; 2008.

14- Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*.

2000 Jun;56(2):455-63. doi: 10.1111/j.0006-341x.2000.00455.x.

15- Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997 Sep 13;315(7109):629-34. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629.