

This is a repository copy of *Associations Between Maternal Depression, Antidepressant Use During Pregnancy, and Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes: An Individual Participant Data Meta-analysis*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/178311/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Vlenterie, R, van Gelder, M, Anderson, H et al. (41 more authors) (2021) Associations Between Maternal Depression, Antidepressant Use During Pregnancy, and Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes: An Individual Participant Data Meta-analysis. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*. ISSN 1873-233X

<https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000004538>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

21-85R1 Vlenterie

6-7-21v3

1

1 **Associations Between Maternal Depression, Antidepressant Use During**  
 2 **Pregnancy, and Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes: An Individual Participant Data**  
 3 **Meta-analysis**

4  
 5 Richelle Vlenterie, PhD,<sup>a</sup> Marleen M.H.J. van Gelder, PhD,<sup>a,b</sup> H. Ross Anderson, MD,<sup>c</sup> Liselott  
 6 Andersson, PhD,<sup>d</sup> Birit F.P. Broekman, PhD,<sup>e</sup> Gal Dubnov-Raz, PhD,<sup>f</sup> Hanan El Marroun, PhD,<sup>g,h</sup> Ema  
 7 Ferreira, MSc,<sup>i</sup> Emma Fransson, PhD,<sup>j,k</sup> Frank M.M.A. van der Heijden, PhD,<sup>l</sup> Claudia B. Holzman,  
 8 PhD,<sup>m</sup> J. Jo Kim, PhD,<sup>n</sup> Ali S. Khashan, PhD,<sup>o</sup> Betty R. Kirkwood, PhD,<sup>p</sup> Harold J.H. Kuijpers, MD,<sup>q</sup>  
 9 Marius Lahti-Pulkkinen, PhD,<sup>r</sup> Dan Mason, PhD,<sup>s</sup> Dawn Misra, PhD,<sup>t</sup> Maria Niemi, PhD,<sup>u</sup> Hedvig M.E.  
 10 Nordeng, PhD,<sup>v</sup> Janet L. Peacock, PhD,<sup>w</sup> Kate E. Pickett, PhD,<sup>x</sup> Stephanie L. Prady, PhD,<sup>x</sup> Shahirose S.  
 11 Premji, PhD,<sup>y</sup> Katri Räikkönen, PhD,<sup>r</sup> Christine Rubertsson, PhD,<sup>k</sup> Mine Sahingoz, MD,<sup>z</sup> Kiran Shaikh,  
 12 PhD,<sup>aa</sup> Richard K. Silver, MD,<sup>n</sup> Jaime Slaughter-Acey, PhD,<sup>ab</sup> Seyi Soremekun, PhD,<sup>p</sup> Dan J Stein, PhD,<sup>ac</sup>  
 13 Inger Sundström-Poromaa, PhD,<sup>k</sup> Anne-Laure Sutter-Dallay, PhD,<sup>ad</sup> Henning Tiemeier, PhD,<sup>g,ae</sup> Faruk  
 14 Uguz, MD,<sup>z</sup> Pinelopi Varela, MSc,<sup>af</sup> Tanja G.M. Vrijkkotte, PhD,<sup>ag</sup> Ursula Winterfeld, PhD,<sup>ah</sup> Heather J.  
 15 Zar, PhD,<sup>ac</sup> Iannis M. Zervas, PhD,<sup>af</sup> Judith B. Prins, PhD,<sup>ai</sup> Monica Pop-Purceleanu, PhD,<sup>aj</sup> and Nel  
 16 Roeleveld, PhD<sup>a</sup>

17

18 <sup>a</sup> Department for Health Evidence, Radboud Institute for Health Sciences, Radboud university medical  
 19 center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

20 <sup>b</sup> Radboud REshape Innovation Center, Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen, The  
 21 Netherlands

22 <sup>c</sup> Environmental Research Group, King's College, London, United Kingdom

23 <sup>d</sup> Department of Clinical Science, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

24 <sup>e</sup> Singapore Institute for Clinical Sciences, Singapore

25 <sup>f</sup> Edmond and Lily Safra Children's Hospital, Sheba Medical Center, Tel Hashomer, Israel

26 <sup>g</sup> Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The  
 27 Netherlands

28 <sup>h</sup> Department of Psychology, Education and Child Studies, Erasmus School of Social and Behavioral  
 29 Sciences, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; Department of Pediatrics,  
 30 Erasmus, University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

31 <sup>i</sup> Departments of Pharmacy (Centre IMAGE), Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Sainte-Justine and  
 32 Faculté de Pharmacie, Université de Montréal, Montreal, Canada

21-85R1 Vlenterie

6-7-21v3

2

- 33 <sup>j</sup> Division of Reproductive and Perinatal Health, Department of Women's and Children's Health,  
34 Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- 35 <sup>k</sup> Department of Health Science, Medical Faculty, Lund university, Lund, Sweden
- 36 <sup>l</sup> Vincent van Gogh Institute for Psychiatry, Venlo, The Netherlands
- 37 <sup>m</sup> Michigan State University, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, East Lansing, MI, USA
- 38 <sup>n</sup> Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, NorthShore University HealthSystem, Chicago; University  
39 of Chicago Pritzker School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA
- 40 <sup>o</sup> School of Public Health, University College Cork; Irish Centre for Fetal and Neonatal Translational  
41 Research (INFANT), University College Cork, Cork, Ireland
- 42 <sup>p</sup> London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom
- 43 <sup>q</sup> Elisabeth TweeSteden Hospital (ETZ), Tilburg, The Netherlands
- 44 <sup>r</sup> Department of Psychology and Logopedics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
- 45 <sup>s</sup> Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Bradford, United Kingdom
- 46 <sup>t</sup> Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA
- 47 <sup>u</sup> Karolinska Institutet, Department of Public Health Science, Stockholm, Sweden
- 48 <sup>v</sup> PharmacoEpidemiology & Drug Safety Research Group, School of Pharmacy, University of Oslo, ;  
49 Department of Child Health and Development, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway
- 50 <sup>w</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Hanover, NH, US
- 51 <sup>x</sup> University of York, York, United Kingdom
- 52 <sup>y</sup> York University, Faculty of Health, School of Nursing, Toronto, Canada
- 53 <sup>z</sup> Department of Psychiatry, University of Necmettin Erbakan, Meram Faculty of Medicine, Konya,  
54 Turkey
- 55 <sup>aa</sup> Aga Khan University, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Karachi, Pakistan
- 56 <sup>ab</sup> Division of Epidemiology and Community Health, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota,  
57 MN, USA
- 58 <sup>ac</sup> Department of Psychiatry and Mental Health, University of Cape Town; South African Medical  
59 Research Council, Unit on Risk and Resilience in Mental Disorders, Cape Town, South Africa
- 60 <sup>ad</sup> Charles Perrens Hospital, Bordeaux; Bordeaux Population Health Center, INSERM 1219, Bordeaux  
61 University, Bordeaux, France
- 62 <sup>ae</sup> Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Boston,  
63 MA, USA
- 64 <sup>af</sup> "Alexandra" General Hospital of Athens, Greece
- 65 <sup>ag</sup> Department of Public and Occupational Health, Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute,  
66 Academic Medical Center - University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- 67 <sup>ah</sup> STIS and Clinical Pharmacology Service, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois, Lausanne,  
68 Switzerland
- 69 <sup>ai</sup> Department of Medical Psychology, Radboud Institute for Health Sciences, Radboud university  
70 medical center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
- 71 <sup>aj</sup> Department of Psychiatry, Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

72  
73

74 *Corresponding author:* Dr. Marleen van Gelder, Department for Health Evidence (HP 133), Radboud  
75 university medical center, P.O. Box 9101, 6500 HB Nijmegen, The Netherlands. Telephone: +31-24-  
76 3666126. E-mail: Marleen.vanGelder@radboudumc.nl.

77

78

21-85R1 Vlenterie

6-7-21v3

3

79 Funding:

80 This research was supported by the Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development  
81 (ZonMw) Programme Rational Pharmacotherapy (grant number 836011020). The funder played no  
82 role in the design of the study, analysis or interpretation of findings, or drafting the manuscript and  
83 did not review or approve the manuscript prior to submission. Janet L. Peacock is supported by the  
84 National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre based at Guy's and St  
85 Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London, UK. Henning Tiemeier was supported by  
86 the Dutch Medical Research Council (NWO grant 016 VICI.170.200). The work of Shahirose S. Premji  
87 and Kiran Shaikh was funded by Alberta Center for Child, Family and Community Research and the  
88 Aga Khan University School of Nursing Student Fund.

89

90

91 Short title:

92 Maternal Depression and Adverse Birth Outcomes

93

94 **Financial Disclosure**

95 *Hanan El Marroun disclosed that she received a NARSAD Young Investigator Grant 27853*  
96 *from the Brain & Behavior Research Foundation. Money was paid to her institution under*  
97 *grant agreement 733206 (LifeCycle) from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and*  
98 *Innovation Program and from Erasmus University Rotterdam Fellowship 2014. They also*  
99 *disclosed receiving funding from Stichting Volksbond Rotterdam, ongoing, paid to the*  
100 *institution. Frank M.M.A. van der Heijden disclosed receiving funding from Janssen-Cilag and*  
101 *Recordati. J. Jo Kim disclosed their institution received funding from the Patient-Centered*  
102 *Outcomes Research Institute and the National Institute of Mental Health. Marius Lahti-*  
103 *Pulkkinen received funding from the Academy of Finland. Dawn Misra disclosed receiving*  
104 *funding from the NIH. Kate E. Pickett disclosed that money was paid to her institution from*  
105 *UKRI and Wellcome Trust. Henning Tiemeier disclosed money was paid to their institution*  
106 *from the Dutch Research Medical Council. Heather J. Zar disclosed that money was paid to*  
107 *her institution from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the SA MRC. The other authors*  
108 *did not report any potential conflicts of interest.*

109

110 *Each author has confirmed compliance with the journal's requirements for authorship.*

111

112 Disclaimer:

21-85R1 Vlenterie

6-7-21v3

4

113 The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the

114 Department of Health.

21-85R1 Vlenterie

6-7-21v3

5

115 **PRÉCIS:**

116 Depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression during pregnancy are associated with

117 preterm birth and low Apgar scores, even without exposure to antidepressants.

118 **ABSTRACT**

119 **Objective:** To evaluate the associations of depressive symptoms and antidepressant use during  
120 pregnancy with the risks of preterm birth, low birth weight, small-for-gestational age (SGA), and low  
121 Apgar scores.

122 **Data Sources:** MEDLINE, EMBASE, ClinicalTrials.gov, and PsycINFO up to June 2016.

123 **Methods of Study Selection:** Data were sought from studies examining associations of depression,  
124 depressive symptoms, or use of antidepressants during pregnancy with gestational age, birth weight,  
125 SGA, or Apgar scores. Authors shared the raw data of their studies for incorporation into this  
126 individual participant data meta-analysis.

127 **Tabulation, Integration, and Results:** We performed one-stage random-effects meta-analyses to  
128 estimate odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). The 215 eligible articles resulted in  
129 402,375 women derived from 27 study databases. Increased risks were observed for preterm birth  
130 among women with a clinical diagnosis of depression during pregnancy irrespective of  
131 antidepressant use (OR 1.6, 95% CI 1.2-2.1) and among women with depression who did not use  
132 antidepressants (2.2, 1.7-3.0), as well as for low Apgar scores in the former (1.5, 1.3-1.7), but not the  
133 latter group. Selective serotonin-reuptake inhibitor use was associated with preterm birth among  
134 women who used antidepressants with or without restriction to women with depressive symptoms  
135 or a diagnosis of depression (1.6, 1.0-2.5 and 1.9, 1.2-2.8, respectively), as well as with low Apgar  
136 scores among women in the latter group (1.7, 1.1-2.8).

137 **Conclusion:** Depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression during pregnancy are  
138 associated with preterm birth and low Apgar scores, even without exposure to antidepressants.  
139 However, selective serotonin-reuptake inhibitors may be independently associated with preterm  
140 birth and low Apgar scores.

141 **Systematic review registration:** PROSPERO, CRD42016035711.

142 Word count: 262

143

144 **INTRODUCTION**

145           Depression is a prevalent medical conditions during pregnancy with average prevalence rates  
146 around 10%.<sup>1,2</sup> As it has been associated with decreased quality of life,<sup>3</sup> postpartum depression,<sup>4</sup> and  
147 adverse pregnancy outcomes,<sup>5-7</sup> pharmacological treatment might be recommended.<sup>8</sup> Consequently,  
148 antidepressant use among pregnant women increased substantially with prevalence estimates of 1-  
149 8%.<sup>9-12</sup> This increase led to concerns about safety of antidepressant use for pregnant women and  
150 unborn children, as some systematic reviews and meta-analyses showed associations with adverse  
151 pregnancy outcomes, including preterm birth, low birth weight, and low Apgar scores.<sup>13-15</sup> Most  
152 results remain inconclusive,<sup>16-22</sup> however, as methodological shortcomings, including retrospective  
153 designs, small sample sizes, poor exposure assessment, and lack of adjustment for the underlying  
154 disorder, may hamper interpretation. Meta-analyses of individual participant data (IPD) can  
155 overcome some of these shortcomings and have been recognized as gold standard approach.<sup>23,24</sup> The  
156 main advantage is that individual participant data enable standardisation of analyses across studies  
157 independent of presentation of the data in the original publications. Thus, IPD meta-analyses are  
158 potentially more reliable than aggregate data meta-analyses, and the two approaches may lead to  
159 different conclusions.<sup>24</sup>

160

161           The aim of this IPD meta-analysis is to provide insight into the independent effects of non-  
162 pharmacologically managed depression and antidepressant use during pregnancy on the risks of  
163 preterm birth, low birth weight, small-for-gestational age (SGA), and low Apgar scores. It was  
164 performed according to a protocol designed a priori and registered prospectively with the PROSPERO  
165 International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews number CRD42016035711 following the  
166 PRISMA guidelines for protocols (PRISMA-P).<sup>25</sup> Reporting follows all aspects recommended in the  
167 PRISMA-IPD guidelines.<sup>26</sup>

168

169 **SOURCES**



170 Studies were identified through a systematic literature search of MEDLINE, EMBASE,  
171 ClinicalTrials.gov, and PsycINFO from database inception until June 4, 2016, and systematic reviews  
172 were hand-searched for additional articles.<sup>5-7,13-22</sup> The complete search strategy is provided in  
173 Appendix 1, available online at <http://links.lww.com/xxx>.

174

## 175 **STUDY SELECTION**

176 Two authors (RV and MvG) independently screened titles and abstracts obtained from the literature  
177 search (Figure 1). No language or publication year restrictions were applied. Studies were included if  
178 they examined associations of depression, depressive symptoms, or use of antidepressants during  
179 pregnancy with gestational age, birth weight, SGA, or Apgar scores. The full texts of all potentially  
180 eligible studies were examined independently by the same authors. Articles not written in English  
181 were translated online. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion with a third reviewer (NR).

182

183 The corresponding authors or principal investigators of all eligible studies were invited to  
184 share their raw data according to the study protocol. When published studies used the same  
185 database, only the most recent study was included to prevent duplicate data. All databases obtained  
186 were checked for inconsistencies, formatted and recoded into the same data format, and entered  
187 into one common database.

188

189 We requested continuous exposure data on depressive symptoms collected via self-  
190 completed questionnaires, including the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale,<sup>27</sup>  
191 Edinburgh Postpartum Depression Scale also called Edinburgh Depression Scale,<sup>28</sup> General Health  
192 Questionnaire,<sup>29</sup> Patient Health Questionnaire-9,<sup>30</sup> Primary Care Evaluation of Mental Disorders  
193 Patient Questionnaire,<sup>31</sup> Brief Symptom Inventory,<sup>32</sup> and Hopkins Symptoms Check list.<sup>33</sup>  
194 Standardized instrument-specific cut-off values were used to dichotomize these data for presence or  
195 absence of depressive symptoms. Although not synonymous with a diagnosis of depression, these

196 questionnaires were validated worldwide to signal a state with relevant clinical symptoms. Data on  
197 clinical diagnoses of depression and antidepressant use were delivered dichotomously. The exposure  
198 time windows were divided into trimesters of pregnancy and the types of antidepressants into:  
199 selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), tricyclic antidepressants, and mirtazapine.

200

201 Preterm birth was defined as delivery before 37 weeks of gestation, low birth weight as  
202 <2500 grams, and low Apgar score as <7 at 5 minutes. SGA was dichotomized conform the national  
203 standards of the country of origin for sex and gestational age. Data on multiple potential  
204 confounders were obtained, including race/ethnicity retaining the classifications used in the original  
205 studies (Table 1). Multiple pregnancies were excluded as these are known to have increased risks of  
206 the selected pregnancy outcomes.

207

208 The study population was divided into four partly overlapping cohorts: 1) depression cohort –  
209 all women with information on the presence of depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of  
210 depression; 2) restricted depression cohort – depression cohort, excluding women who used  
211 antidepressants during pregnancy and those for whom no information was available about  
212 antidepressant use; 3) antidepressant use cohort – all women with information on antidepressant  
213 use; and 4) restricted antidepressant use cohort – antidepressant use cohort, excluding women  
214 without depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression (Figure 2). Descriptive statistics  
215 were performed for maternal characteristics and absolute risks were calculated for the three  
216 exposures of interest separately for all four adverse pregnancy outcomes.

217

218 One-stage random-effects logistic regression analyses were performed for the depression  
219 and antidepressant use cohorts to estimate odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Clustering of  
220 participants within studies was preserved and presence of clinical and statistical heterogeneity  
221 among studies was taken into account. Adjusted odds ratios were estimated from multivariable

222 models initially including all relevant potential confounders for which data were available from most  
223 studies, using manual backward elimination to retain only confounders that changed the effect  
224 estimate >10% upon removal. The same method of analysis was used to study the secondary  
225 outcomes: effects of timing of exposure and individual antidepressants with >40 exposures. As these  
226 data were not available for all women, the secondary analyses were based on smaller numbers. To  
227 account for confounding-by-indication, similar analyses were performed in the depression cohort  
228 restricted to women without use of antidepressants and in the antidepressant use cohort restricted  
229 to women with depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression. As we used complete case  
230 analyses, the number of women included in each meta-analysis differed due to variation in data  
231 availability. All statistical analyses were performed using Stata Version 13 (Stata Corporation, College  
232 Station, TX, USA).

233

## 234 **RESULTS**

235 The 215 eligible studies led to a total study population of 402,375 women with singleton pregnancies  
236 derived from 27 different databases (Figure 1).<sup>34-60</sup> In Appendices 2 and 3, available online at  
237 <http://links.lww.com/xxx>, cohort-specific data of the studies included are provided. The median  
238 population size was 872 pregnant women per database, with large variety in study size and country.

239

240         Of the 375,269 pregnant women with data available on mental health in the depression  
241 cohort, 28,395 (7.6%) women had depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression. Of the  
242 118,097 women with data available on antidepressant use, 2,624 (2.2%) women reported  
243 antidepressant use during pregnancy. Among the restricted depression cohort of pregnant women  
244 not using antidepressants (N = 99,459), 10,817 (10.9%) women had depressive symptoms or a clinical  
245 diagnosis of depression, while 2,624 out of 13,441 (19.5%) women reported antidepressant use in  
246 the cohort restricted to women with depressive symptoms or a clinically diagnosed depression (Table

247 1).

248

249           Among women without depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression, the risks  
250 were 9.4% for preterm birth, 6.9% for low birth weight, 6.2% for SGA, and 1.6% for low 5 minute  
251 Apgar score, based on the largest numbers of participants from 26, 25, 11, and 22 studies,  
252 respectively. Higher absolute risks for preterm birth (10.4%), low birth weight (8.2%), SGA (7.8%),  
253 and low 5 minute Apgar scores (2.3%) were observed among women with depressive symptoms or a  
254 clinically diagnosed depression in the depression cohort. These risks varied among the four cohorts  
255 and different subgroups studied (Tables 2 and 3).

256

257           Having depressive symptoms during pregnancy (adjusted odds ratio 1.2, 95% confidence interval  
258 1.1-1.4) or a clinical diagnosis of depression (1.6, 1.2-2.1) were both associated with preterm birth in  
259 the depression cohort (Table 2). When restricting the analyses to women without antidepressant  
260 use, the adjusted odds ratio for a clinical diagnosis of depression increased to 2.2 (1.7-3.0). A similar  
261 odds ratio was observed for low birth weight in the restricted cohort, but with a much wider  
262 confidence interval (1.9, 0.8-4.7). No substantially increased odds ratios were seen for SGA, whereas  
263 having a clinically diagnosed depression was associated with a low 5 minute Apgar score (1.5, 1.3-  
264 1.7). However, this association disappeared when restricting the analyses to women without  
265 antidepressant use (1.0, 0.2-4.5).

266

267           In the antidepressant use cohort, any antidepressant use during pregnancy was associated  
268 with preterm birth (1.4, 1.1-1.8), particularly the use of SSRIs (1.9, 1.2-2.8) (Table 3). When we  
269 restricted the cohort to women with depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression, the  
270 effect for any antidepressant use all but disappeared, while the odds ratio for SSRI use was slightly  
271 lower (1.6, 1.0-2.5). Antidepressant use during pregnancy was neither associated with low birth  
272 weight nor with SGA, but associations with a low 5 minute Apgar score were observed for any

273 antidepressant use during pregnancy (1.6, 1.1-2.5), particularly the use of SSRIs (1.7, 1.1-2.8), in the  
274 antidepressant use cohort. We observed similar associations in the antidepressant use cohort  
275 restricted to women with depressive symptoms or a clinically diagnosed depression, but with wider  
276 confidence intervals (1.6, 0.9-2.8 and 1.4, 0.8-2.4, respectively)

277

278 Depressive symptoms in the first trimester (1.4, 1.0-1.8), second trimester (1.3, 1.1-1.4), and  
279 third trimester of pregnancy (1.5, 1.2-1.8) all seemed to be associated with preterm birth in the  
280 depression cohort. In the restricted depression cohort, however, these effects disappeared for the  
281 most part, except for third trimester exposure (1.5, 1.1-2.2) (Appendix 4, available online at  
282 <http://links.lww.com/xxx>). First trimester depressive symptoms were not associated with low birth  
283 weight, SGA, or a low 5 minute Apgar score in either of the two cohorts, but depressive symptoms in  
284 the second trimester seemed to be associated with low birth weight and SGA in the depression  
285 cohort, whereas third trimester depressive symptoms were associated with low birth weight in the  
286 restricted cohort (1.6, 1.0-2.6) and with a low Apgar score in the depression cohort (1.8, 1.2-2.7) and  
287 possibly in the restricted depression cohort (1.4, 0.9-2.1).

288

289 We did not observe increased risks of preterm birth, low birth weight, SGA, or low 5 minute  
290 Apgar scores for exposure to antidepressants in specific parts of pregnancy (Appendix 5, available  
291 online at <http://links.lww.com/xxx>). When we analyzed individual antidepressants (Appendix 6,  
292 available online at <http://links.lww.com/xxx>), increased risks of preterm birth were found for the use  
293 of fluoxetine (1.9, 1.1-3.3) and sertraline (2.2, 1.2-4.3) in the antidepressant use cohort. When  
294 restricting the antidepressant use cohort to women with depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis  
295 of depression, the odds ratios for fluoxetine (1.6, 1.0-2.7) and sertraline use (2.0, 0.9-4.3) were  
296 slightly lower with unity included in the 95% confidence interval. The odds ratios for tricyclic  
297 antidepressant use were in the same order of magnitude, but with wider confidence intervals, as  
298 only 4 studies could be included. Possibly increased risks of low 5 minute Apgar scores were also

299 observed for fluoxetine (2.4, 1.0-5.5) and paroxetine use (2.4, 0.7-7.8) in the antidepressant use  
300 cohort.

301

## 302 **DISCUSSION**

303 In this IPD meta-analysis, we observed increased risks of preterm birth and low Apgar scores for  
304 women with depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression during pregnancy. In the  
305 restricted analyses, excluding women with confirmed or unknown antidepressant use from the  
306 depression cohort, increased risks were observed for preterm birth only. Women with depressive  
307 symptoms in the third trimester seemed to have the highest risk of preterm birth and low birth  
308 weight in this restricted cohort. Antidepressant use during pregnancy was also associated with  
309 preterm birth and low Apgar scores, with the highest risks observed for fluoxetine and sertraline.

310 These findings indicate that depressive symptoms, especially in the third trimester, and a clinical  
311 diagnosis of depression are associated with preterm birth and low Apgar scores and possibly with low  
312 birth weight, while the use of SSRIs during pregnancy, especially fluoxetine and sertraline, is  
313 associated with preterm birth and low Apgar scores as well. Depressive symptoms, a clinical  
314 diagnosis of depression, and antidepressant use during pregnancy are at best weakly associated with  
315 low birth weight and SGA.

316

317

318 An important strength of this IPD meta-analysis was the large study population, enabling us to  
319 compare women who used antidepressants during pregnancy to an untreated control group  
320 suffering from depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression, and to conduct the analyses  
321 separately for specific trimesters during pregnancy and for several individual antidepressants. Even in  
322 this large IPD meta-analysis, however, the power was too low to draw meaningful conclusions for  
323 some subgroups. Another strength was the availability of data on potential confounders which  
324 enabled us to adjust for several factors appropriately. Due to missing confounder data in some

325 studies, however, the study population decreased slightly for certain analyses as we applied  
326 complete case analyses. We decided not to use multiple imputations for the missing confounder data  
327 as imputation of variables in one-stage random-effect models is not always recommended.<sup>61</sup> Residual  
328 confounding may still influence our results, as we did not have any information on pregnancy-related  
329 risk factors for the outcomes, such as thyroid problems and hypertensive disorders, or on  
330 concomitant use of psychotropic medication other than antidepressants, such as anxiolytics and  
331 antipsychotic medication.

332

333 As no registry exists for observational studies, we included published databases only to avoid  
334 selection, but we could obtain data from only 27 databases out of the 215 eligible studies identified.  
335 Therefore, we examined the risk of participation bias within this IPD meta-analysis by performing a  
336 ‘traditional’ meta-analysis on the databases included. We compared the results with recently  
337 published meta-analyses focusing on the same exposures and perinatal outcomes: maternal  
338 depression in association with preterm birth and low birth weight,<sup>62</sup> and antidepressant use in  
339 association with preterm birth,<sup>14,19</sup> low birth weight,<sup>19,63</sup> SGA,<sup>67</sup> and 5 minute Apgar score.<sup>13</sup> We did  
340 not identify meta-analyses based on more than 4 studies on the associations between depression  
341 and SGA and Apgar scores. The results of our meta-analysis on the 27 included databases were in line  
342 with the published meta-analyses for all four perinatal outcomes. Therefore, we conclude that  
343 participation bias was limited.

344

345 IPD meta-analyses of observational studies are generally more difficult to perform than those of  
346 randomized controlled trials,<sup>23</sup> among others due to large amounts of heterogeneity. Observational  
347 studies can differ widely in their study design, study population, control group, and availability of  
348 confounders. Despite using one-stage random-effect models in the analyses, this may be an  
349 important limitation of this IPD meta-analysis in which we pooled many cohort studies that differed  
350 in design and availability of data on exposure, confounders, and outcome measures, as well as on

351 timing of the assessment of depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression. For example,  
352 the assessment of depressive symptoms was conducted with self-completed questionnaires in some  
353 studies, whereas other databases contained data from telephone or face-to-face interviews  
354 performed by health care professionals. Clinical interviews are believed to be the most reliable  
355 assessment of depressive symptoms.<sup>64</sup> As interviews are usually not feasible in large observational  
356 studies, however, we used validated cut-off values that were proven to be reliable in previous  
357 research for all self-completed questionnaires.<sup>27-33</sup> These questionnaires often assess symptoms of  
358 depression as well as anxiety, so the depression cohort may include many women with symptoms of  
359 anxiety alongside depressive symptoms. However, women with only anxiety without depression  
360 were excluded from the analyses. Many studies did not have data available on the pregnancy  
361 outcome SGA, which resulted in lower power in the sub-analyses for this outcome. Therefore, the  
362 results for SGA should be interpreted with caution.

363

364 Exposure assessment of antidepressant use during pregnancy also differed among the included  
365 studies. Some studies based their exposure data on registries, such as birth registries, health  
366 registries, or claims databases, whereas others used pharmacy data or self-completed questionnaires  
367 to assess antidepressant use. By combining data from different studies, exposure misclassification  
368 resulting from both underreporting (self-reported methods of data collection)<sup>65</sup> and over-reporting  
369 due to non-adherence (registry and pharmacy data)<sup>66</sup> may have occurred. If this misclassification was  
370 non-differential, it may have resulted in underestimation of the effect estimates for the adverse  
371 pregnancy outcomes studied. Furthermore, most databases did not contain information on the  
372 dosages of the antidepressants used or on the severity of depression. To minimize treatment bias,  
373 we also performed the analyses within the restricted antidepressant use cohort, excluding all women  
374 who did not have a diagnosis of depression or depressive symptoms and could therefore not have  
375 been treated for depression. Still, women with less severe depression may not have been treated  
376 pharmacologically in the same amount as women with severe depression, so some treatment bias



377 may still have occurred. Regarding the specific analyses for the timing of exposure, it was not  
378 possible to rule out that women may also have been exposed in other trimesters, which may have  
379 led to over- or underestimation of the trimester-specific effects estimates.

380

381 Our results are supported by several systematic reviews performed previously. Grigoriadis et al.  
382 concluded that depression during pregnancy must not be left untreated, as the potential for negative  
383 effects of depression on the newborn are not negligible.<sup>67</sup> Ross et al. found increased risks of preterm  
384 birth, low birth weight, and low Apgar scores among infants exposed to antidepressant medication in  
385 utero.<sup>13</sup> Although these results were statistically significant, the absolute effects identified were  
386 small. Eke et al. found an increased risk of preterm birth among women who received SSRIs during  
387 pregnancy.<sup>14</sup> In the current IPD meta-analysis, the highest risks were also observed for SSRI use  
388 during pregnancy. Huybrechts et al. concluded that the findings from their systematic review showed  
389 an association between antidepressant use during pregnancy and preterm birth, although the  
390 possibility of residual confounding by depression could not be completely ruled out.<sup>15</sup> All of these  
391 conclusions are in line with the results found in this IPD meta-analysis. However, the precise etiology  
392 and the biological mechanisms underlying adverse effects on pregnancy outcomes as a result of  
393 depressive symptoms or a clinical depression in pregnant women are still not fully understood.  
394 Therefore, this should be considered an important topic for future research to facilitate  
395 implementation of preventive measures.

396

397 From the results of this IPD meta-analysis, we venture to conclude that a clinical diagnosis of  
398 depression during pregnancy should not be left untreated. Most risks observed were still seen when  
399 the analyses were restricted to women without antidepressant use, ruling out the possibility that  
400 these associations were driven by pharmacological treatment alone. Although other treatments may  
401 be preferred, pharmacological treatment might be an option for women suffering from a clinically  
402 diagnosed moderate to severe depression. SSRI use, especially fluoxetine and sertraline use,

403 however, was also associated with increased risks of preterm birth and low Apgar scores. These  
404 associations remained, albeit with wider confidence intervals, when we restricted the analyses to  
405 women with depressive symptoms or a clinical diagnosis of depression, at least partly ruling out  
406 confounding-by-indication. This information is important for health care professionals when  
407 pharmacological treatment is indicated during pregnancy and decisions need to be made on which  
408 antidepressant to prescribe. The timing of the use of antidepressants throughout pregnancy did not  
409 seem to influence the risks of adverse pregnancy outcomes.

410

411 The results of this IPD meta-analysis may help health care professionals and pregnant women in  
412 making evidence-based decisions on whether the beneficial effects of pharmacological treatment of  
413 maternal depression outweigh the possible risks for the unborn child. Health care professionals  
414 should be aware of the risks of the underlying disorder itself and provide pregnant women with  
415 appropriate pharmacological treatment when necessary.

416

## 417 REFERENCES

- 418 1. Bennett HA, Einarson A, Taddio A, Koren G, Einarson TR. Prevalence of depression during  
419 pregnancy: systematic review. *Obstet Gynecol* 2004;103:698-709. DOI:  
420 10.1097/01.AOG.0000116689.75396.5f
- 421 2. Gavin NI, Gaynes BN, Lohr KN, Meltzer-Brody S, Gartlehner G, Swinson T. Perinatal  
422 depression: a systematic review of prevalence and incidence. *Obstet Gynecol* 2005;106:1071-  
423 83. DOI: 10.1097/01.AOG.0000183597.31630.db
- 424 3. Lancaster CA, Gold KJ, Flynn HA, Yoo H, Marcus SM, Davis MM. Risk factors for depressive  
425 symptoms during pregnancy: a systematic review. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2010;202:5-14. DOI:  
426 10.1016/j.ajog.2009.09.007
- 427 4. Serati M, Redaelli M, Buoli M, Altamura AC. Perinatal major depression biomarkers: a  
428 systematic review. *J Affect Disord* 2016;193:391-404. DOI: 10.1016/j.jad.2016.01.027

- 429 5. Grigoriadis S, VonderPorten EH, Mamisashvili L, Tomlinson G, Dennis CL, Koren G, et al. The  
430 impact of maternal depression during pregnancy on perinatal outcomes: a systematic review  
431 and meta-analysis. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2013;74:e321-41. DOI: 10.4088/JCP.12r07968
- 432 6. Grote NK, Bridge JA, Gavin AR, Melville JL, Iyengar S, Katon WJ. A meta-analysis of depression  
433 during pregnancy and the risk of preterm birth, low birth weight, and intrauterine growth  
434 restriction. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2010;67:1012-24. DOI: 10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2010.111
- 435 7. Staneva A, Bogossian F, Pritchard M, Wittkowski A. The effects of maternal depression,  
436 anxiety, and perceived stress during pregnancy on preterm birth: a systematic review.  
437 *Women Birth* 2015;28:179-93. DOI: 10.1016/j.wombi.2015.02.003
- 438 8. Yonkers KA, Wisner KL, Stewart DE, Oberlander TF, Dell DL, Stotland N, et al. The  
439 management of depression during pregnancy: a report from the American Psychiatric  
440 Association and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. *Gen Hosp  
441 Psychiatry* 2009;31:403-13. DOI: 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2009.04.003
- 442 9. Alwan S, Reefhuis J, Rasmussen SA, Friedman JM. Patterns of antidepressant medication use  
443 among pregnant women in a United States population. *J Clin Pharmacol* 2011;51:264-70.  
444 DOI: 10.1177/0091270010373928
- 445 10. Munk-Olsen T, Gasse C, Laursen TM. Prevalence of antidepressant use and contacts with  
446 psychiatrists and psychologists in pregnant and postpartum women. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*  
447 2012;125:318-24. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.2011.01784.x
- 448 11. Mitchell AA, Gilboa SM, Werler MM, Kelley KE, Louik C, Hernández-Díaz S. Medication use  
449 during pregnancy, with particular focus on prescription drugs: 1976-2008. *Am J Obstet  
450 Gynecol* 2011;205:51.e1-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajog.2011.02.029
- 451 12. Huybrechts KF, Palmsten K, Mogun H, Kowal M, Avorn J, Setoguchi-Iwata S, et al. National  
452 trends in antidepressant medication treatment among publicly insured pregnant women.  
453 *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2013;35:265-71. DOI: 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2012.12.010

- 454 13. Ross LE, Grigoriadis S, Mamisashvili L, Vonderporten EH, Roerecke M, Rehm J, et al. Selected  
455 pregnancy and delivery outcomes after exposure to antidepressant medication: a systematic  
456 review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2013;70:436-43. DOI:  
457 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.684
- 458 14. Eke AC, Saccone G, Berghella V. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI) use during  
459 pregnancy and risk of preterm birth: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJOG*  
460 2016;123:1900-7. DOI: 10.1111/1471-0528.14144
- 461 15. Huybrechts KF, Sanghani RS, Avorn J, Urato AC. Preterm birth and antidepressant medication  
462 use during pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e92778. DOI:  
463 10.1371/journal.pone.0092778
- 464 16. Udechuku A, Nguyen T, Hill R, Szego K. Antidepressants in pregnancy: a systematic review.  
465 *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2010;44:978-96. DOI: 10.3109/00048674.2010.507543
- 466 17. Simoncelli M, Martin BZ, Bérard A. Antidepressant use during pregnancy: a critical systematic  
467 review of the literature. *Curr Drug Saf* 2010;5:153-70. DOI: 10.2174/157488610790936114
- 468 18. Fenger-Gron J, Thomsen M, Andersen KS, Nielsen RG. Paediatric outcomes following  
469 intrauterine exposure to serotonin reuptake inhibitors: a systematic review. *Dan Med Bull*  
470 2011;58:A4303.
- 471 19. Huang H, Coleman S, Bridge JA, Yonkers K, Katon W. A meta-analysis of the relationship  
472 between antidepressant use in pregnancy and the risk of preterm birth and low birth weight.  
473 *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2014;36:13-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2013.08.002
- 474 20. Lattimore KA, Donn SM, Kaciroti N, Kemper AR, Neal CR Jr, Vazquez DM. Selective serotonin  
475 reuptake inhibitor (SSRI) use during pregnancy and effects on the fetus and newborn: a meta-  
476 analysis. *J Perinatol* 2005;25:595-604. DOI: 10.1038/sj.jp.7211352
- 477 21. Gentile S. Untreated depression during pregnancy: short- and long-term effects in offspring.  
478 A systematic review. *Neuroscience* 2017;342:154-66. DOI:  
479 10.1016/j.neuroscience.2015.09.001

- 480 22. McDonagh MS, Matthews A, Phillipi C, Romm J, Peterson K, Thakurta S, et al. Depression  
481 drug treatment outcomes in pregnancy and the postpartum period: a systematic review and  
482 meta-analysis. *Obstet Gynecol* 2014;124:526-34. DOI: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000000410
- 483 23. Stewart LA, Clarke MJ. Practical methodology of meta-analyses (overviews) using updated  
484 individual patient data. *Cochrane Working Group. Stat Med* 1995;14:2057-79. DOI:  
485 10.1002/sim.4780141902
- 486 24. Riley RD, Lambert PC, Abo-Zaid G. Meta-analysis of individual participant data: rationale,  
487 conduct, and reporting. *BMJ* 2010;340:c221. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.c221
- 488 25. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting  
489 items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst*  
490 *Rev* 2015;4:1. DOI: 10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
- 491 26. Stewart LA, Clarke M, Rovers M, Riley RD, Simmonds M, Stewart G, et al. Preferred Reporting  
492 Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses of individual participant data: the PRISMA-  
493 IPD Statement. *JAMA* 2015;313:1657-65. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2015.3656
- 494 27. Radloff LS. The CES-D scale: a self report depression scale for research in the general  
495 population. *Appl Psychol Meas* 1977;1:385-401. DOI: 10.1177/014662167700100306
- 496 28. Cox JL, Holden JM, Sagovsky R. Detection of postnatal depression. Development of the 10-  
497 item Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale. *Br J Psychiatry* 1987;150:782-6. DOI:  
498 10.1192/bjp.150.6.782
- 499 29. Goldberg DP. The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire: a technique for the  
500 identification and assessment of non-psychotic psychiatric illness. *Maudsley Monograph No.*  
501 *21. Oxford University Press; 1972.*
- 502 30. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams, JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity  
503 measure. *J Gen Intern Med* 2001;16:606-13. DOI: 10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x

- 504 31. Spitzer RL, Williams JB, Kroenke K, Linzer M, deGruy FV 3rd, Hahn SR, et al. Utility of a new  
505 procedure for diagnosing mental disorders in primary care: the PRIME-MD 1000 study. JAMA  
506 1994;272:1749-56.
- 507 32. Derogatis LR, Melisaratos N. The Brief Symptom Inventory: an introductory report. Psychol  
508 Med 1983;13:595-605.
- 509 33. Fink P, Ørbøl E, Hansen MS, Søndergaard L, De Jonge P. Detecting mental disorders in general  
510 hospitals by the SCL-8 scale. J Psychosom Res 2004;56:371-5. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-  
511 3999(03)00071-0
- 512 34. Andersson L, Sundström-Poromaa I, Wulff M, Aström M, Bixo M. Neonatal outcome  
513 following maternal antenatal depression and anxiety: a population-based study. Am J  
514 Epidemiol 2004;159:872-81. DOI: 10.1093/aje/kwh122
- 515 35. Broekman BFP, Chan YH, Chong YS, Kwek K, Cohen SS, Haley CL, et al. The influence of anxiety  
516 and depressive symptoms during pregnancy on birth size. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol  
517 2014;28:116-26. DOI: 10.1111/ppe.12096
- 518 36. Dubnov-Raz G, Hemilä H, Vurembrand Y, Kuint J, Maayan-Metzger A. Maternal use of  
519 selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors during pregnancy and neonatal bone density. Early  
520 Hum Dev 2012;88:191-4. DOI: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2011.08.005
- 521 37. Dubnov-Raz G, Juurlink DN, Fogelman R, Merlob P, Ito S, Koren G, et al. Antenatal use of  
522 selective serotonin-reuptake inhibitors and QT interval prolongation in newborns. Pediatrics  
523 2008;122:e710-5. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2008-0658
- 524 38. El Marroun H, Jaddoe VW, Hudziak JJ, et al. Maternal use of selective serotonin reuptake  
525 inhibitors, fetal growth, and risk of adverse birth outcomes. Arch Gen Psychiatry  
526 2012;69:706-14. DOI: 10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.2333
- 527 39. Ferreira E, Carceller AM, Agogué C, Martin BZ, St-André M, Francoeur D, et al. Effects of  
528 selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors and venlafaxine during pregnancy in term and  
529 preterm neonates. Pediatrics 2007;119:52-9. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2006-2133

- 530 40. Fransson E, Ortenstrand A, Hjelmstedt A. Antenatal depressive symptoms and preterm birth:  
531 a prospective study of a Swedish national sample. *Birth* 2011;38:10-6. DOI: 10.1111/j.1523-  
532 536X.2010.00441.x
- 533 41. Gavin AR, Holzman C, Siefert K, Tian Y. Maternal depressive symptoms, depression, and  
534 psychiatric medication use in relation to risk of preterm delivery. *Womens Health Issues*  
535 2009;19:325-34. DOI: 10.1016/j.whi.2009.05.004
- 536 42. Hannerfors A-K, Hellgren C, Schijven D, Iliadis SI, Comasco E, Skalkidou A, et al. Treatment  
537 with serotonin reuptake inhibitors during pregnancy is associated with elevated  
538 corticotropin-releasing hormone levels. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 2015;58:104-13. DOI:  
539 10.1016/j.psyneuen.2015.04.009
- 540 43. Hoffman MC, Mazzone SE, Wagner BD, Laudenslager ML, Ross RG. Measures of maternal  
541 stress and mood in relation to preterm birth. *Obstet Gynecol* 2016;127:545-52. DOI:  
542 10.1097/AOG.0000000000001287
- 543 44. Khashan AS, Everard C, McCowan LM, Dekker G, Moss-Morris R, Baker PN, et al. Second-  
544 trimester maternal distress increases the risk of small for gestational age. *Psychol Med*  
545 2014;44:2799-2810. DOI: 10.1017/S0033291714000300
- 546 45. Loomans EM, van Dijk AE, Vrijkotte TG, van Eijsden M, Stronks K, Gemke RJ, et al.  
547 Psychosocial stress during pregnancy is related to adverse birth outcomes: results from a  
548 large multi-ethnic community-based birth cohort. *Eur J Public Health* 2013;23:485-91. DOI:  
549 10.1093/eurpub/cks097
- 550 46. Männistö T, Mendola P, Kiely M, O'Loughlin J, Werder E, Chen Z, et al. Maternal psychiatric  
551 disorders and risk of preterm birth. *Ann Epidemiol* 2016;26:14-20. DOI:  
552 10.1016/j.annepidem.2015.09.009
- 553 47. Michielsen LA, van der Heijden FMMA, Janssen PKC, Kuijpers HJH. Effects of maternal  
554 psychotropic drug dosage on birth outcomes. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat* 2014;10:13-8. DOI:  
555 10.2147/NDT.S53430

- 556 48. Misra D, Strobino D, Trabert B. Effects of social and psychosocial factors on risk of preterm  
557 birth in black women. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 2010;24:546-54. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-  
558 3016.2010.01148.x
- 559 49. Niemi M, Falkenberg T, Petzold M, Chuc NT, Patel V. Symptoms of antenatal common mental  
560 disorders, preterm birth and low birthweight: a prospective cohort study in a semi-rural  
561 district of Vietnam. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2013;18:687-95. DOI: 10.1111/tmi.12101
- 562 50. Nordeng H, van Gelder MMHJ, Spigset O, Koren G, Einarson A, Eberhard-Gran M. Pregnancy  
563 outcome after exposure to antidepressants and the role of maternal depression: results from  
564 the Norwegian Mother and Child Cohort Study. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2012;32:186-94. DOI:  
565 10.1097/JCP.0b013e3182490eaf
- 566 51. Peacock JL, Bland JM, Anderson HR. Preterm delivery: effects of socioeconomic factors,  
567 psychological stress, smoking, alcohol, and caffeine. *BMJ* 1995;311:531-5. DOI:  
568 10.1136/bmj.311.7004.531
- 569 52. Pesonen AK, Lahti M, Kuusinen T, Tuovinen S, Villa P, Hämäläinen E, et al. Maternal prenatal  
570 positive affect, depressive and anxiety symptoms and birth outcomes: the PREDO Study.  
571 *PLoS One*. 2016;11:e0150058. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0150058
- 572 53. Shaikh K, Premji SS, Rose MS, Kazi A, Khowaja S, Tough S. The association between parity,  
573 infant gender, higher level of paternal education and preterm birth in Pakistan: a cohort  
574 study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2011;11:88. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2393-11-88
- 575 54. Straub H, Adams M, Kim JJ, Silver RK. Antenatal depressive symptoms increase the likelihood  
576 of preterm birth. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2012;207:329.e1-4. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajog.2012.06.033
- 577 55. Sutter-Dallay AL, Bales M, Pambrun E, Glangeaud-Freudenthal NM, Wisner KL, Verdoux H.  
578 Impact of prenatal exposure to psychotropic drugs on neonatal outcome in infants of  
579 mothers with serious psychiatric illnesses. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2015;76:967-73. DOI:  
580 10.4088/JCP.14m09070



- 581 56. Traviss GD, West RM, House AO. Maternal mental health and its association with infant  
582 growth at 6 months in ethnic groups: results from the Born-in-Bradford birth cohort study.  
583 PLoS One 2012;7:e30707. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0030707
- 584 57. Uguz F, Sahingoz M, Sonmez EO, Karsidag C, Yuksel G, Annagur BB, et al. The effects of  
585 maternal major depression, generalized anxiety disorder, and panic disorder on birth weight  
586 and gestational age: a comparative study. J Psychosom Res 2013;75:87-9. DOI:  
587 10.1016/j.jpsychores.2013.02.008
- 588 58. Varela P, Spyropoulou AC, Kalogerakis Z, Moraitou M, Zervas IM. Limited depressive and  
589 anxiety symptoms late in pregnancy are not related to neonatal outcomes. Nurs Midwifery  
590 Stud 2015;4:e29308. DOI: 10.17795/nmsjournal29308
- 591 59. Weobong B, ten Asbroek AH, Soremekun S, Manu AA, Owusu-Agyei S, Prince M, et al.  
592 Association of antenatal depression with adverse consequences for the mother and newborn  
593 in rural Ghana: findings from the DON population-based cohort study. PLoS One  
594 2014;9:e116333. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0116333
- 595 60. Winterfeld U, Klinger G, Panchaud A, Stephens S, Arnon J, Malm H, et al. Pregnancy outcome  
596 following maternal exposure to mirtazapine: a multicenter, prospective study. J Clin  
597 Psychopharmacol 2015;35:250-9. DOI: 10.1097/JCP.0000000000000309
- 598 61. Gomes M, Hatfield L, Normand SL. Handling incomplete correlated continuous and binary  
599 outcomes in meta-analysis of individual participant data. Stat Med 2016;35:3676-89. DOI:  
600 10.1002/sim.6969
- 601 62. Jarde A, Morais M, Kingston D, Giallo R, MacQueen GM, Giglia L, et al. Neonatal outcomes in  
602 women with untreated antenatal depression compared with women without depression: a  
603 systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Psychiatry 2016;73:826-37. DOI:  
604 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2016.0934

- 605 63. Zhao X, Liu Q, Cao S, Pang J, Zhang H, Feng T, et al. A meta-analysis of selective serotonin  
606 reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) use during prenatal depression and risk of low birth weight and  
607 small for gestational age. *J Affect Disord* 2018;241:563-70. DOI: 10.1016/j.jad.2018.08.061
- 608 64. Robins LN, Helzer JE, Croughan J, Ratcliff KS. National Institute of Mental Health Diagnostic  
609 Interview Schedule: its history, characteristics, and validity. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1981;38:381-  
610 9. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.1981.01780290015001
- 611 65. Van Gelder MMHJ, van Rooij IALM, de Walle HEK, Roeleveld N, Bakker MK. Maternal recall of  
612 prescription medication use during pregnancy using a paper-based questionnaire: a  
613 validation study in the Netherlands. *Drug Saf* 2013;36:43-54. DOI: 10.1007/s40264-012-0004-  
614 8
- 615 66. Andrade SE, Bérard A, Nordeng HME, Wood ME, van Gelder MMHJ, Toh S. Administrative  
616 claims data versus augmented pregnancy data for the study of pharmaceutical treatments in  
617 pregnancy. *Curr Epidemiol Rep* 2017;4:106-16. DOI: 10.1007/s40471-017-0104-1
- 618 67. Grigoriadis S, VonderPorten EH, Mamisashvili L, Tomlinson G, Dennis CL, Koren G, et al.  
619 Prenatal exposure to antidepressants and persistent pulmonary hypertension of the  
620 newborn: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2014;348:f6932. DOI:  
621 10.1136/bmj.f6932
- 622

**Table 1.** Maternal characteristics of the individual patient data study population and sub-cohorts.

Characteristic <sup>a</sup>	Depression cohort		Depression cohort restricted to women without antidepressant use		Antidepressant use cohort		Antidepressant use cohort restricted to women with depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis of depression	
	No depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis of depression	Depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis of depression	No depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis of depression	Depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis of depression	No antidepressant use	Any antidepressant use	No antidepressant use	Any antidepressant use
	Total N= 346 874 N (%)	Total N= 28 395 N (%)	Total N= 88 642 N (%)	Total N= 10 817 N (%)	Total N= 115 473 N (%)	Total N= 2 624 N (%)	Total N= 10 817 N (%)	Total N= 2 624 N (%)
Maternal age (yrs)								
<30	189 571 (54.7)	15 437 (54.4)	34 555 (39.0)	5 098 (47.1)	42 985 (37.2)	963 (36.7)	5 098 (47.1)	963 (36.7)
30-34	89 990 (25.9)	7 151 (25.2)	30 370 (34.3)	3 221 (29.8)	36 069 (31.2)	763 (29.1)	3 221 (29.8)	763 (29.1)
≥35	53 560 (15.4)	4 536 (16.0)	13 232 (14.9)	1 779 (16.4)	16 237 (14.1)	601 (22.9)	1 779 (16.4)	601 (22.9)
Level of education								
Low	87 242 (25.2)	7 904 (27.8)	6 728 (7.6)	1 922 (17.8)	10 340 (9.0)	264 (10.1)	1 922 (17.8)	264 (10.1)
Moderate	136 070 (39.2)	11 163 (39.3)	25 615 (28.9)	3 947 (36.5)	33 470 (29.0)	604 (23.0)	3 947 (36.5)	604 (23.0)
High	104 006 (30.0)	7 211 (25.4)	50 756 (57.3)	4 340 (40.1)	63 836 (55.3)	739 (28.2)	4 340 (40.1)	739 (28.2)
Race/ethnicity								
Non-Hispanic white	187 640 (54.1)	17 104 (60.2)	74 540 (84.1)	7 991 (73.9)	94 450 (81.8)	2 174 (82.9)	7 991 (73.9)	2 174 (82.9)
Hispanic	88 040 (25.4)	3 903 (13.7)	724 (0.8)	596 (5.5)	1 384 (1.2)	47 (1.8)	596 (5.5)	47 (1.8)
Black	18 790 (5.4)	3 025 (10.7)	127 (0.1)	74 (0.7)	235 (0.2)	4 (0.2)	74 (0.7)	4 (0.2)
Asian	12 029 (3.5)	1 247 (4.4)	642 (0.7)	487 (4.5)	1 391 (1.2)	18 (0.7)	487 (4.5)	18 (0.7)
Non classifiable	22 625 (6.5)	1 751 (6.2)	8 401 (9.5)	1 253 (11.6)	11 285 (9.8)	155 (5.9)	1 253 (11.6)	155 (5.9)
Pre-pregnancy BMI <sup>b</sup>								
Underweight	10 578 (3.0)	782 (2.8)	2 475 (2.8)	373 (3.4)	3 392 (2.9)	74 (2.8)	373 (3.4)	74 (2.8)
Normal weight	137 549 (39.7)	9 909 (34.9)	55 004 (62.1)	5 403 (49.9)	69 857 (60.5)	919 (35.0)	5 403 (49.9)	919 (35.0)
Overweight	53 286 (15.4)	4 433 (15.6)	18 534 (20.9)	2 031 (18.8)	23 688 (20.5)	369 (14.1)	2 031 (18.8)	369 (14.1)
Obese	35 874 (10.3)	3 631 (12.8)	8 091 (9.1)	1 177 (10.9)	10 704 (9.3)	271 (10.3)	1 177 (10.9)	271 (10.3)
Parity								
0 previous live births	129 393 (37.3)	9569 (33.7)	35 885 (40.5)	4 490 (41.5)	43 091 (37.3)	1 062 (40.5)	4 490 (41.5)	1 062 (40.5)
≥1 previous live births	193 126 (55.7)	16 994 (59.8)	42 245 (47.7)	5 570 (51.5)	52 133 (45.1)	1 140 (43.4)	5 570 (51.5)	1 140 (43.4)
Alcohol use during pregnancy								
No	284 458 (82.0)	20 554 (72.4)	64 754 (73.1)	8 233 (76.1)	83 752 (72.5)	1839 (70.1)	8 233 (76.1)	1 839 (70.1)
Yes	18 137 (5.2)	2 750 (9.7)	12 251 (13.8)	1 493 (13.8)	15 084 (13.1)	324 (12.3)	1 493 (13.8)	324 (12.3)
Smoking during pregnancy								
No	288 521 (83.2)	19 043 (67.1)	78 185 (88.2)	8 428 (77.9)	87 689 (75.9)	1 686 (64.3)	8 428 (77.9)	1 686 (64.3)
Yes	22 762 (6.6)	4 947 (17.4)	7 841 (8.8)	2 064 (19.1)	10 423 (9.0)	582 (22.2)	2 064 (19.1)	582 (22.2)
Illicit drug use during pregnancy								
No	267 269 (77.1)	18 755 (66.1)	70 525 (79.6)	7 482 (69.2)	90 165 (78.1)	1 689 (64.4)	7 482 (69.2)	1 689 (64.4)
Yes	4 353 (1.3)	1 248 (4.4)	483 (0.5)	357 (3.3)	900 (0.8)	100 (3.8)	357 (3.3)	100 (3.8)
Folic acid use								

## 21-85R1 Venterie

6-7-21v3

27

No	31 330 (9.0)	3 423 (12.1)	28 954 (32.7)	2 974 (27.5)	36 103 (31.3)	445 (17.0)	2 974 (27.5)	445 (17.0)
Yes	39 295 (11.3)	3 960 (13.9)	35 292 (39.8)	3 412 (31.5)	41 492 (35.9)	526 (20.0)	3 412 (31.5)	526 (20.0)
Use of reproductive techniques								
No	83 741 (24.1)	9 875 (34.8)	76 778 (86.6)	8 384 (77.5)	100 272 (86.8)	1 319 (50.2)	8 384 (77.5)	1 319 (50.2)
Yes	4211 (1.2)	379 (1.3)	3 916 (4.4)	327 (3.0)	5 090 (4.4)	59 (2.2)	327 (3.0)	59 (2.2)
Chronic maternal illnesses								
Diabetes	4 776 (1.4)	367 (1.3)	388 (0.4)	55 (0.5)	486 (0.4)	10 (0.4)	55 (0.5)	10 (0.4)
Hypertension	8 504 (2.5)	936 (3.3)	2 467 (2.8)	385 (3.6)	3 042 (2.6)	56 (2.1)	385 (3.6)	56 (2.1)
Thyroid disorder	5 270 (1.5)	614 (2.2)	1 366 (1.5)	172 (1.6)	1 824 (1.6)	84 (3.2)	172 (1.6)	84 (3.2)
Asthma	21 330 (6.1)	2 676 (9.4)	4 378 (4.9)	563 (5.2)	5 617 (4.9)	151 (5.8)	563 (5.2)	151 (5.8)
Epilepsy	558 (0.2)	107 (0.4)	454 (0.5)	80 (0.7)	586 (0.5)	20 (0.8)	80 (0.7)	20 (0.8)
No or other illnesses	282 321 (81.4)	19 456 (68.5)	76 544 (86.4)	8 716 (80.6)	99 927 (86.5)	2 214 (84.4)	8 712 (80.6)	2 214 (84.4)

<sup>a</sup> For all variables, numbers of women within the strata do not add up to the total number of women due to missing values or data not being available in all databases included.

<sup>b</sup> Underweight: <18.5kg/m<sup>2</sup>, Normal weight: 18.5-24.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, Overweight: >25.0-29.9 (kg/m<sup>2</sup>), Obese: ≥30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>

**Table 2.** Risks and associations of depressive symptoms and a clinical diagnosis of depression with preterm birth, low birth weight, small-for-gestational age, and low 5 minute Apgar scores.

	Depression cohort <sup>a</sup>					Depression cohort restricted to women without antidepressant use <sup>a</sup>				
	Index outcome No	Index outcome Yes	Risk (%)	Crude OR <sup>b</sup> (95% CI)	Adjusted OR <sup>b,c</sup> (95% CI)	No case	Cases	Risk (%)	Crude OR <sup>b</sup> (95% CI)	Adjusted OR <sup>b,c</sup> (95% CI)
<b>Preterm birth</b>										
Depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis (26 studies)										
No	293 718	30 617	9.4			64 031	3 388	5.3		
Yes	23 386	2 725	10.4	1.4 (1.1-1.7)	1.2 (1.1-1.4)	8 228	689	7.7	1.2 (0.9-1.8)	1.2 (0.9-1.7)
Depressive symptoms (18 studies)										
No	102 760	5 842	5.4			62 655	3 313	5.0		
Yes	13 608	1 018	7.0	1.3 (1.0-1.7)	1.2 (1.1-1.4)	7 073	564	7.4	1.2 (0.8-1.9)	1.2 (0.9-1.7)
Clinical diagnosis (10 studies)										
No	191 829	24 839	11.5			1 995	97	4.6		
Yes	9 805	1 710	14.9	1.4 (1.0-2.1)	1.6 (1.2-2.1)	1 164	125	9.7	1.8 (0.9-3.4)	2.2 (1.7-3.0)
<b>Low birth weight<sup>d</sup></b>										
Depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis (25 studies)										
No	292 888	21 837	6.9			64 597	1 947	2.9		
Yes	22 670	2 031	8.2	1.3 (1.1-1.6)	1.0 (0.9-1.1)	8 168	534	6.1	1.4 (1.0-2.0)	1.3 (0.9-1.9)
Depressive symptoms (17 studies)										
No	97 064	4 461	4.4			63 190	1 907	2.9		
Yes	12 521	799	6.0	1.2 (1.0-1.6)	1.1 (0.9-1.3)	7 065	361	4.9	1.3 (0.9-1.9)	1.2 (0.8-1.8)
Clinical diagnosis (10 studies)										
No	196 690	17 432	8.1			2 015	61	2.9		
Yes	10 177	1 234	10.8	1.4 (0.9-2.1)	1.0 (0.8-1.2)	1 112	173	13.5	1.9 (0.8-4.5)	1.9 (0.8-4.7)
<b>Small-for-gestational age</b>										
Depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis (11 studies)										
No	76 763	5 067	6.2			70 771	4 391	5.8		
Yes	9 552	805	7.8	1.1 (0.7-1.8)	1.1 (1.0-1.3)	7 826	652	7.7	1.1 (0.6-2.0)	1.1 (0.7-1.7)
Depressive symptoms (9 studies)										
No	75 451	5 048	6.3			69 466	4 371	5.9		
Yes	9 145	792	8.0	1.3 (0.8-2.1)	1.1 (1.0-1.3)	7 659	652	7.8	1.3 (0.8-2.2)	1.2 (0.7-1.9)
Clinical diagnosis (4 studies)										

21-85R1 Venterie

6-7-21v3

29

No	2 168	85	3.9			1 928	26	1.3		
Yes	434	16	3.6	0.4 (0.1-2.6)	0.1 (0.0-7.4)	176	0	0	-	-
<b>Low 5 minute Apgar score</b>										
Depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis (22 studies)										
No	302 372	4 768	1.6			74 607	916	1.2		
Yes	20 799	482	2.3	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	1.2 (1.0-1.5)	8 122	163	2.0	1.2 (0.9-1.7)	1.2 (0.9-1.6)
Depressive symptoms (15 studies)										
No	91 402	1 083	1.2			73 211	893	1.2		
Yes	10 640	202	1.9	1.2 (0.9-1.6)	1.1 (0.8-1.6)	7 576	149	1.9	1.2 (0.9-1.7)	1.2 (0.9-1.7)
Clinical diagnosis (9 studies)										
No	211 861	3 700	1.7			2 011	36	1.8		
Yes	10 187	281	2.7	1.6 (1.4-1.8)	1.5 (1.3-1.7)	555	14	2.5	1.4 (0.8-2.6)	1.0 (0.2-4.5)

<sup>a</sup> The subgroups (depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis; depressive symptoms; clinical diagnosis) are not mutually exclusive

<sup>b</sup> Based on one-stage random-effects logistic regression analyses in which clustering of participants within studies was preserved and heterogeneity among studies was taken into account

<sup>c</sup> Analysis adjusted for race/ethnicity, parity, and smoking during pregnancy

<sup>d</sup> Preterm births were not excluded from the low birth weight cases, so these two groups are not mutually exclusive.

**Table 3.** Risks and associations of antidepressant use with preterm birth, low birth weight, small-for-gestational age, and low 5 minute Apgar scores.

	Cohort antidepressant use <sup>a</sup>					Cohort antidepressant use restricted to women with depressive symptoms or clinical diagnosis of depression <sup>a</sup>				
	Index outcome No	Index outcome Yes	Risk (%)	Crude OR <sup>b</sup> (95% CI)	Adjusted OR <sup>b,c</sup> (95% CI)	No case	Cases	Risk (%)	Crude OR <sup>b</sup> (95% CI)	Adjusted OR <sup>b,c</sup> (95% CI)
<b>Preterm birth</b>										
Any antidepressant use (15 studies)										
No	74 651	4 385	5.5			8 228	689	7.7		
Yes	1 900	216	10.2	1.3 (0.9-1.9)	1.4 (1.1-1.8)	1 900	216	10.2	1.1 (0.8-1.6)	1.1 (0.9-1.5)
SSRI use (3 studies)										
No	55 823	3 267	5.5			5 184	468	8.2		
Yes	1 188	140	10.5	1.5 (1.0-2.3)	1.9 (1.2-2.8)	1 188	140	10.5	1.3 (0.8-2.0)	1.6 (1.0-2.5)
<b>Low birth weight<sup>d</sup></b>										
Any antidepressant use (14 studies)										
No	75 321	2 708	3.5			8 168	534	6.1		
Yes	1 924	160	7.7	1.4 (1.0-2.1)	1.1 (0.8-1.5)	1 924	160	7.7	1.1 (0.8-1.7)	0.9 (0.7-1.3)
SSRI use (3 studies)										
No	58 607	1 973	3.3			5 317	409	7.1		
Yes	1 237	94	7.1	1.3 (0.9-2.1)	0.9 (0.6-1.2)	1 237	94	7.1	1.1 (0.7-1.7)	0.7 (0.5-1.1)
<b>Small-for-gestational age</b>										
Any antidepressant use (8 studies)										
No	84 912	5 622	6.2			7 826	652	7.7		
Yes	1 375	96	6.5	1.1 (0.6-2.1)	0.9 (0.6-1.3)	1 375	96	6.5	0.8 (0.4-1.6)	0.9 (0.6-1.3)
SSRI use (1 study)										
No	66 650	4 535	6.3			4 305	362	7.8		
Yes	892	61	6.4	1.0 (0.3-2.8)	0.9 (0.6-1.4)	892	61	6.4	0.6 (0.3-1.5)	0.8 (0.5-1.3)
<b>Low 5 minute Apgar score</b>										
Any antidepressant use (14 studies)										
No	89 275	1 313	1.4			8 122	163	2.0		
Yes	1 891	54	2.8	1.7 (1.1-2.6)	1.6 (1.1-2.5)	1 891	54	2.8	1.6 (1.0-2.7)	1.6 (0.9-2.8)
SSRI use (3 studies)										
No	71 031	993	1.4			5 199	88	1.7		
Yes	1 254	35	2.7	1.6 (1.0-2.6)	1.7 (1.1-2.8)	1 254	35	2.7	1.4 (0.8-2.5)	1.4 (0.8-2.4)

SSRI, selective serotonin-reuptake inhibitor

<sup>a</sup>The subgroups (any antidepressant use and SSRI use) are not mutually exclusive

21-85R1 Vlenterie

6-7-21v3

31

<sup>b</sup> Based on one-stage random-effects logistic regression analyses in which clustering of participants within studies was preserved and heterogeneity among studies was taken into account

<sup>c</sup> Analysis adjusted for race/ethnicity, parity, and smoking during pregnancy

<sup>d</sup> Preterm births were not excluded from the low birth weight cases, so these two groups are not mutually exclusive.



21-85R1 Vlenterie

6-7-21v3

32

Figure 1. Flow diagram of the individual participant data meta-analysis.

Figure 2. Composition of depression cohorts (n=375,269) (**A**) and antidepressant use cohorts (n=118,097) (**B**).

21-85R1 Vlenterie

6-7-21v3

33

**PEER REVIEW HISTORY**

Received January 12, 2021. Received in revised form May 7, 2021. Accepted May 13, 2021. Peer reviews and author correspondence are available at <http://links.lww.com/xxx>.

Figure 1



