medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Impact of the use of cannabis as a medicine in pregnancy, on the unborn child: a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol.

Alexa Ulana Annette Dinant, Yvonne Ann Bonomo [1,2], Rachel Canaway [3], Christine Mary Hallinan [3,*]

[1] Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia

[2]Department of Addiction Medicine, St. Vincent's Hospital, Fitzroy, VIC 3065, Australia

[3] Health and Biomedical Research Information Technology Unit (HaBIC R[2]), Department of General Practice and Primary Care, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia

* Correspondence: Dr Christine Mary Hallinan

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Introduction:

The use of cannabis for medicinal purposes is on the rise. As more people place their trust in the safety of prescribed alternative plant-based medicine and find it easily accessible, there is a growing concern that pregnant women may be increasingly using cannabis for medicinal purposes to manage their pregnancy symptoms and other health conditions. The aim of this review is to investigate the use of cannabis for medicinal purposes during pregnancy, describe the characteristics of the demographic population, and to measure the impact on the unborn child and up to twelve months postpartum.

Methods and analyses:

Research on pregnant women who use cannabis for medicinal purposes only and infants up to one year after birth who experienced in utero exposure to cannabis for medicinal purposes will be included in this review. Reviews, randomised controlled trials, case–control, cross-sectional and cohort studies, that have been peer reviewed and published between 1996 and April 2024 as a primary research paper that investigates prenatal use of cannabis for medicinal purposes on foetal, perinatal, and neonatal outcomes, will be selected for review. Excluding cover editorials, letters, commentaries, protocols, conference papers and book chapters. Effects of illicit drugs use, alcohol misuse and nicotine exposure on neonate outcome will be controlled by excluding studies reporting on the concomitant use of such substances with cannabis for medicinal purposes during pregnancy.

All titles and abstracts will be reviewed independently and in duplicate by at least two researchers. Records will be excluded based on title and abstract screening as well as publication type. Where initial disagreement exists between reviewers regarding the inclusion of a study, team members will review disputed articles' status until consensus is gained. Selected studies will then be assessed by at least two independent researchers for risk bias assessment using validated tools. Data will be extracted and analysed following a systematic review and meta-analysis methodology. The statistical analysis will combine three or more outcomes that are reported in a consistent manner. The systematic review and meta-analysis will follow the PRISMA guidelines to facilitate transparent reporting (Page et al., 2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Background

Cannabis for medicinal purposes originates from the plant *Cannabis sativa* and *Cannabis indica* and is composed of two main pharmacologically active compounds, cannabidiol (CBD), and tetrahydrocannabinol (THC). Cannabis used for medicinal purposes is referred to in a variety of ways, including medicinal cannabis, medical cannabis, cannabis as medicine, medical marijuana, pharmaceutical cannabis, prescribed cannabis, dispensed cannabis (Sabmeethavorn et al., 2022), cannabinoids and CBD oil. For the purposes of this review, we will use *cannabis for medicinal purposes* as a general term to denote all products including self-prescribed cannabis used for the treatment or relief of health-related symptoms.

Cannabis for medicinal purposes was first legalised in a number of jurisdictions in the United States in the 1990's. These legislative changes, approving the use of cannabis for medicinal purposes under pre-specified conditions, were echoed across the globe with Israel and Canada in 2001, the Netherlands in 2003, Austria in 2008, Switzerland in 2011, Uruguay and Czechia in 2013, Croatia in 2015, Colombia and Australia in 2016, Germany in 2017, and Luxemburg, Portugal and the United Kingdom in 2018 (Cubillos-Sánchez, 2021; de Hoop et al., 2018; EMCDDA, 2019; Hallinan et al., 2021; Lipnik-Stangelj & Razinger, 2020; Paut Kusturica et al., 2019). Legislative conditions for the medical prescription of cannabis products for specified conditions are regulated by authorities such as the Australian Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA), the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the European Medicines Agency (EMA). Whilst drug approval by a medical authority conveys safety and effectiveness for both patient and doctor, the prescription of cannabis for medicinal purposes under specified conditions potentially provides patients with the perception of relative safety. These regulatory changes have shown to increase the accessibility of cannabis for medicinal purposes for patients (Hallinan & Bonomo, 2022) leading to emerging preparations made available online and over the counter (Hallinan et al., 2022).

Despite only four cannabis products being approved for therapeutic use worldwide (Potenza et al., 2023), the use of cannabis for medicinal purposes is on the rise internationally. While Cannabis shows some levels of evidence for therapeutic benefits in the area of chronic pain, chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting, spasticity associated with multiple sclerosis and sleep disturbance (Abrams, 2018) it is most commonly prescribed for the management of chronic pain and anxiety (TGA, 2023). The use of cannabis for medicinal purposes during pregnancy is not recommended (FDA, 2019; Kennedy et al., 2016; Lawson et al., 2022; Obstetrician-gynecologists, 2017; TGA, 2017; Vanstone et al., 2021), yet, cannabis use in pregnancy is increasing (Carr, 2023; Towobola et al., 2023; Volkow et al., 2019), despite clinical evidence showing that its use may be associated with low birth weight (El Marroun et al., 2009; English et al., 1997; Fergusson et al., 2002; Hatch & Bracken, 1986; Vanstone et al., 2021), preterm birth (Vanstone et al., 2021) and childhood neurodevelopmental deficits

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

(Huizink, 2014; Linn et al., 1983; Obstetrician-gynecologists, 2017; Vanstone et al., 2021). In addition, data collected from social media platforms regarding pregnancy and cannabis is showing three main online search trends: 1) safety and cannabis use during pregnancy, 2) the management of pregnancy-related symptoms including morning sickness, nausea, vomiting, headaches, pain, stress, and fatigue with cannabis use, and 3) cannabis use in the postpartum period (Hallinan et al., 2023) which suggests an increased popularity in the community.

It appears that the legalisation of cannabis for medicinal purposes, the prevalence of positive messages found online and the lack of reporting of adverse events may be contributing to the perception that the use of cannabis for medicinal purposes carries little or no risk (Carr, 2023; Khademi et al., 2023). An article from L. Carr published this year suggests *women perceived legalization to mean greater access and exposure to cannabis, increased acceptance of its use, and more trust in cannabis retailers* (Carr, 2023). In addition, there is a common perception of safety around herbal medicines and a perception that plant-based medicines are safe during pregnancy (Kennedy et al., 2016).

Evidence of impact of prenatal use of cannabis on the developing child.

Recent evidence on the prenatal use of cannabis highlights the potential negative impact of cannabis on the unborn child. These effects include low birth weight and neonatal length, increased risk of admission in neonatal intensive care unit (NICU), smaller head circumference, earlier gestation age, and greater likelihood of preterm birth (Gunn et al., 2016). The most reported outcome on infants who experienced in utero exposure to cannabis is low birth weight (Gunn et al., 2016). One study showed an increased risk of low birth weight and reduced head circumference when cannabis was used in early pregnancy and over a shortened period of exposure (El Marroun et al., 2009). However, in this study 85% of the cannabis using mothers also reported prenatal use of tobacco, which is also associated with low birth weight (El Marroun et al., 2009). Notwithstanding potential effects of concomitant use of tobacco, three other studies on prenatal cannabis exposure have reported decreased low birth weight that appeared to be associated with frequency of use (English et al., 1997; Hatch & Bracken, 1986; Zuckerman et al., 1989), which may suggest a dose response relationship.

Other reported outcomes for infants exposed to cannabis in utero, compared to those non-exposed, include a decreased birth length of 0.5cm (Zuckerman et al., 1989) and decreased gestational length (Fried et al., 1984; Gibson et al., 1983). Furthermore, a study evaluating infant behaviour between newborns exposed to different levels of cannabis in utero, compared to no exposure, reported significant behavioural differences, including decreased response to visual stimulus, inability to self-quiet and increased tremors and startles (Fried, 1980).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Rationale

To date there is a lack of review that systematically assess cannabis used for medicinal purposes in pregnancy. In this systematic review the effects of prenatal cannabis exposure on newborns will be critically assessed, to deliver evidence of effects on foetal and infant development up to one year of age. Specifically, this review will focus on the explicit use of cannabis for medicinal purposes for the management of the effects of pregnancy including but not limited to hyperemesis gravidarum, nausea and vomiting, sleep disorder, morning sickness and restless legs syndrome, and for the ongoing management of pre-existing health conditions, and co-existing cannabinoids use disorders.

To do this we will undertake a systematic review of published research from 1996 to April 2024 to answer the following questions:

- What are the characteristics of the population?
- What impacts are reported on neonate and up to one year after birth?

Objectives

The objective is to summarise and critically assess evidence concerning the effects in utero of cannabis used in pregnancy for medicinal purposes, measured on the unborn child and up to one year after birth.

Method and Analysis:

The review will be completed by November 2024 and will use the below PICOS framework:

Population	Pregnant women above 18 years of age and below 40 years of age
Intervention	Using cannabis to treat pregnancy symptoms, other health condition and cannabis addiction
Comparison	Usual care
Outcomes	• Population characterisation • Impact on foetus and up to 1 year postpartum
Studies	Reviews, randomised controlled trials, case–control, cross-sectional and cohort studies

The research question will be addressed using a systematic review and meta-analysis approach.

This systematic review was prospectively registered on PROSPERO (ID 428865) and will be reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (Page et al., 2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Search method:

A comprehensive search will be conducted across multiple databases from 1996 to April 2024, including PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase and CINAHL. In addition, we will read through the list of references in each selected articles for other potential articles that may qualify for inclusion. Google scholar will be used to search the citing articles of each study. The search criteria for PubMed can be found in appendix A. An identical keyword search will be applied to all four databases, the search will be translated for each database using Polyglot Search Translator (Clark et al., 2020).

Study selection:

Research relating to pregnant women who use cannabis for medicinal purposes and infants up to one year after birth who experienced in utero exposure to cannabis for medicinal purposes will be included in this review. Reviews, randomised controlled trials (RCTs), case–control, cross-sectional and cohort studies, that have been peer reviewed and published between 1996 and April 2024 as a primary research paper that investigates the effects of prenatal use of cannabis for medicinal purposes and foetal, perinatal, and neonatal outcomes will be included. Due to the study population being pregnant women, for ethical reasons we do not expect the search to yield any RCTs, however, for completeness we have added this study type to the inclusion criteria.

The literature search will start from 1996, which corresponds to the year cannabis was first legalised for medical purposes in the United States (California). Only published studies in English and French will be included. The inclusion of the French language is intended to capture relevant literature from Canada and Europe. Excluded literature are editorials, letters, commentaries, conference papers, protocols and book chapters. There will be no restriction on geographic location, however, restriction will apply on maternal age. Participants will need to be at least 18 years old for the treatment to be accessible on their own, and under 40 years of age to remove potential pregnancy complications associated with increasing maternal age. To better assign evidence to the use of cannabis for medicinal purposes, studies reporting on concomitant use of illicit substances (cocaine, methamphetamine, heroin, other), alcohol misuse and nicotine will be excluded. In addition, studies or information related to cannabis preparations used solely for recreational purposes will be excluded from the analysis, as this study focuses on the use of cannabis for medicinal purposes only. The study will also exclude evidence related to the use of synthetic cannabis due to its different pharmacological and epidemiological profiles (Darke et al., 2020).

All titles and abstracts will be reviewed independently and in duplicate by two researchers. Records will be excluded based on title and abstract screening as well as publication type. AD will critique all articles, YB, RC, and CH will review a selection of articles, to ensure the literature is reviewed independently and in duplicate by at least two researchers. Where

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

initial disagreement exists between reviewers regarding the inclusion of a study, team members will review the article's status until consensus is gained.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Study outcomes:

Study outcomes were identified based on previous literature.
One of the following outcomes must be reported in the selected literature, outcomes can be measured in utero, at birth and up to one year of age:
Foetal length, head circumference, foetal growth deficit, intrauterine growth restriction, birth weight, low birth weight (LBW), birth length, gestational length/age, preterm birth (PTB), APGAR score (1 and 5 min), smaller diameter of the aorta, Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) stay, infant length, delay growth, slow growth, tremor and startle, delay in visual stimulation (NBAS), sleep pattern, ability to self-quiet.

Data collection & Analysis

Two independent researchers will critique data from eligible studies using standard data extraction forms. Refer to Appendix B for the data collection form.

The following data will be collected for each articles: name of first author, year of publication, location, study design, duration, sample size and, method of recruitment, study exclusion and inclusion criteria, possible confounding factors, other medication or supplements (e.g. folic acid) and method used to manage them, characteristics of participants, age, marital status, parity, ethnicity, income level, education level, if the use of cannabis for medicinal purposes was self-reported or biologically measured, preparation type, method of delivery and concentration, reason for use and usage rate, neonate/infant age at the time of the outcome measurement, outcome measured and study findings on the unborn child and up to twelve months after birth.

We anticipate that data will be reported in various formats, including precise counts, percentages, crude Odds Ratios, and standard errors. Documenting and understanding the baseline information about the participants will be essential in the evaluation of the outcome and the overall conclusions regarding the explicit use of cannabis for medicinal purposes for the management of the effects of pregnancy.
We will reach out to the authors to request missing data. In the event that the missing data cannot be obtained, the data will be excluded from any further analysis.
Risk assessment for bias will be performed by two independent researchers using the current validated tools, namely:

- the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Checklist for analytical cross sectional studies (JBI),
- the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme's (CASP) Making sense of evidence for case-control studies (CASP, 2018a) and,
- the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme's (CASP) Making sense of evidence for cohort studies (CASP, 2018b).
- the Revised Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (RoB2) for randomized trials (Cochrane, 2019).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Risk bias assessment results will be reported using a traffic light diagram for each assessment. A green light will indicate that the study addressed the appraisal question in a clear acceptable way or presented low risk bias. An orange light will indicate that the study was unclear in addressing the appraisal question or presented some concerning risk bias. A red light will indicate that the appraisal question was not addressed in the study or presented high risk bias.

Statistical data will be assessed in Stata 18 (StataCorp., 2023) for heterogeneity using the Cochran's Q-test and I^2 statistics (Higgins & Thompson, 2002). Statistical heterogeneity refers to the level of variation among the covariates, which can impact the interpretation of outcomes and, ultimately, the conclusion. Initially, the Q-test will be applied to assess the presence of statistical heterogeneity, with a p-value set to 0.10 for statistical significance. I^2 will then be calculated for any studies with a calculated p-value less or equal to 0.10 to evaluate the degree of heterogeneity. A 50% threshold will be used to determine whether heterogeneity is acceptable or not acceptable.

Given the anticipated heterogeneity of the data, the analysis will involve categorising the reported outcome into thematic groups to identify emerging themes or patterns using Covidence (*Covidence*). Results will be classified by themes and present the type of study, methodology, findings and limitations.

A meta-analysis will be performed on outcomes that have been reported in at least three different studies and have comparable statistical measures. A sub-group analysis will also be considered on the method of delivery, dosage and type of cannabis formulation if data permit. For continuous data, such as birthweight, we will extract information in the form of means or standard deviations. For dichotomous data, such as preterm birth, we will present the results in the form of Odds Ratio (OR) and corresponding 95% Confidence Interval (CI). The fixed-effects model will be used if the level of heterogeneity is found acceptable. In this model it is assumed that the effect size remains constant across all studies. In cases where the level of heterogeneity is found not acceptable, the random-effects model will be used. This model considers variations in outcome measurements among the different studies. Forest plots and funnel plots will be used to depict Odds Ratios and Mean differences and heterogeneity respectively. The meta-analysis will be done using Stata 18 statistical software package (StataCorp., 2023).

A sensitivity analysis will also be conducted to assess whether the study's outcomes are influenced by the inclusion or exclusion of studies with potential bias. If no significant variation is observed, the results will be presented with the inclusion of the studies. If significant variation is observed, we will highlight this as a limitation in the interpretation of the findings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

References:

Abrams, D. I. (2018). The therapeutic effects of Cannabis and cannabinoids: An update from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine report. *Eur J Intern Med*, *49*, 7-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejim.2018.01.003

Carr, L. (2023). Impact of cannabis legalization on prenatal marijuana use. *Contemporary OB/GYN*, *68*(3), 16-17.

CASP. (2018a). *CASP Case Control Study Checklist*. https://casp-uk.net/images/checklist/documents/CASP-Case-Control-Study-Checklist/CASP-Case-Control-Study-Checklist-2018-fillable-form.pdf

CASP. (2018b). *CASP Cohort Study Checklist*. https://casp-uk.net/images/checklist/documents/CASP-Cohort-Study-Checklist/CASP-Cohort-Study-Checklist_2018.pdf

Clark, J. M., Sanders, S., Carter, M., Honeyman, D., Cleo, G., Auld, Y., Booth, D., Condron, P., Dalais, C., Bateup, S., Linthwaite, B., May, N., Munn, J., Ramsay, L., Rickett, K., Rutter, C., Smith, A., Sondergeld, P., Wallin, M., . . . Beller, E. (2020). Improving the translation of search strategies using the Polyglot Search Translator: a randomized controlled trial. *J Med Libr Assoc*, *108*(2), 195-207. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2020.834

Cochrane. (2019). https://www.riskofbias.info/welcome/rob-2-0-tool/current-version-of-rob-2

Covidence. https://www.covidence.org

Cubillos-Sánchez, P. A. (2021). Cannabis for medical and scientific purposes: the Colombian landscape. *Colombian Journal of Anestesiology*, *49*. http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0120-33472021000200600&nrm=iso

Darke, S., Duflou, J., Farrell, M., Peacock, A., & Lappin, J. (2020). Characteristics and circumstances of synthetic cannabinoid-related death. *Clin Toxicol (Phila)*, *58*(5), 368-374. https://doi.org/10.1080/15563650.2019.1647344

de Hoop, B., Heerdink, E. R., & Hazekamp, A. (2018). Medicinal Cannabis on Prescription in The Netherlands: Statistics for 2003-2016. *Cannabis Cannabinoid Res*, *3*(1), 54-55. https://doi.org/10.1089/can.2017.0059

El Marroun, H., Tiemeier, H., Steegers, E. A. P., Jaddoe, V. W. V., Hofman, A., Verhulst, F. C., van den Brink, W., & Huizink, A. C. (2009). Intrauterine cannabis exposure affects fetal growth trajectories: the Generation R Study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *48*(12), 1173-1181. https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181bfa8ee

EMCDDA. (2019). *Cannabis policy: status and recent developments*. European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction. https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/rapid-communications/medical-use-of-cannabis-and-cannabinoids-questions-and-answers-for-policymaking_en

English, D. R., Hulse, G. K., Milne, E., Holman, C. D., & Bower, C. I. (1997). Maternal cannabis use and birth weight: a meta-analysis. *Addiction*, *92*(11), 1553-1560. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9519497

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1360-0443.1997.tb02875.x?sid=nlm%3Apubmed

FDA. (2019). *What You Should Know About Using Cannabis, Including CBD, When Pregnant or Breastfeeding*. U.S Food and Drug Administration. https://www.fda.gov/consumers/consumer-updates/what-you-should-know-about-using-cannabis-including-cbd-when-pregnant-or-breastfeeding#:~:text=And%20if%20you%20are%20pregnant,during%20pregnancy%20or%20while%20breastfeeding.

Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., Northstone, K., Pregnancy, A. S. T. A. L. S. o., & Childhood. (2002). Maternal use of cannabis and pregnancy outcome. *BJOG*, *109*(1), 21-27. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0528.2002.01020.x

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Fried, P. A. (1980). Marihuana use by pregnant women: Neurobehavioral effects in neonates. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *6*(6), 415-424. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0376-8716(80)90023-X

Fried, P. A., Watkinson, B., & Willan, A. (1984). MARIJUANA USE DURING PREGNANCY AND DECREASED LENGTH OF GESTATION. *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY*, *150*(1), 23-27.

Gibson, G. T., Baghurst, P. A., & Colley, D. P. (1983). Maternal alcohol, tobacco and cannabis consumption and the outcome of pregnancy. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol*, *23*(1), 15-19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1479-828x.1983.tb00151.x

Gunn, J. K., Rosales, C. B., Center, K. E., Nunez, A., Gibson, S. J., Christ, C., & Ehiri, J. E. (2016). Prenatal exposure to cannabis and maternal and child health outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*, *6*(4), e009986. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009986

Hallinan, C. M., & Bonomo, Y. A. (2022). The Rise and Rise of Medicinal Cannabis, What Now? Medicinal Cannabis Prescribing in Australia 2017-2022. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, *19*(16). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19169853

Hallinan, C. M., Eden, E., Graham, M., Greenwood, L. M., Mills, J., Popat, A., Truong, L., & Bonomo, Y. (2022). Over the counter low-dose cannabidiol: A viewpoint from the ACRE Capacity Building Group. *J Psychopharmacol*, *36*(6), 661-665. https://doi.org/10.1177/02698811211035394

Hallinan, C. M., Gunn, J. M., & Bonomo, Y. A. (2021). Implementation of medicinal cannabis in Australia: innovation or upheaval? Perspectives from physicians as key informants, a qualitative analysis. *BMJ Open*, *11*(10), e054044. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-054044

Hallinan, C. M., Khademi Habibabadi, S., Conway, M., & Bonomo, Y. A. (2023). Social media discourse and internet search queries on cannabis as a medicine: A systematic scoping review. *PLoS One*, *18*(1), e0269143. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0269143

Hatch, E. E., & Bracken, M. B. (1986). EFFECT OF MARIJUANA USE IN PREGNANCY ON FETAL GROWTH. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *124*(6), 986-993. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a114488

Higgins, J. P., & Thompson, S. G. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med*, *21*(11), 1539-1558. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186

Huizink, A. C. (2014). Prenatal cannabis exposure and infant outcomes: overview of studies. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry*, *52*, 45-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2013.09.014

JBI. *Checklist for analytical cross sectional studies* https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools

Kennedy, D. A., Lupattelli, A., Koren, G., & Nordeng, H. (2016). Safety classification of herbal medicines used in pregnancy in a multinational study. *BMC Complement Altern Med*, *16*, 102. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12906-016-1079-z

Khademi, S., Hallinan, C. M., Conway, M., & Bonomo, Y. (2023). Using Social Media Data to Investigate Public Perceptions of Cannabis as a Medicine: Narrative Review. *J Med Internet Res*, *25*, e36667. https://doi.org/10.2196/36667

Lawson, J., O'Brien, T., Graham, M., Renaud, E., Jones, D., Freeman, J., Lawn, N., & Martin, J. H. (2022). Expert advice for prescribing cannabis medicines for patients with epilepsy-drawn from the Australian clinical experience. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*, *88*(7), 3101-3113. https://doi.org/10.1111/bcp.15262

Linn, S., Schoenbaum, S. C., Monson, R. R., Rosner, R., Stubblefield, P. C., & Ryan, K. J. (1983). The association of marijuana use with outcome of pregnancy. *American Journal of Public Health*, *73*(10), 1161-1164. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.73.10.1161

Lipnik-Stangelj, M., & Razinger, B. (2020). A regulatory take on cannabis and cannabinoids for medicinal use in the European Union. *Arh Hig Rada Toksikol*, *71*(1), 12-18. https://doi.org/10.2478/aiht-2020-71-3302

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Obstetrician-gynecologists. (2017). Committee Opinion No. 722: Marijuana Use During Pregnancy and Lactation. *Obstet Gynecol*, *130*(4), e205-e209. https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000002354

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hrobjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., . . . Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed)*, *74*(9), 790-799. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rec.2021.07.010 (Declaracion PRISMA 2020: una guia actualizada para la publicacion de revisiones sistematicas.)

Paut Kusturica, M., Tomas, A., Sabo, A., Tomić, Z., & Horvat, O. (2019). Medical cannabis: Knowledge and attitudes of prospective doctors in Serbia. *Saudi Pharm J*, *27*(3), 320-325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsps.2018.11.014

Potenza, M. N., Bunt, G., & Khalsa, J. H. (2023). Addiction Medicine Physicians and Medicinal Cannabinoids. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *80*(7), 659-660. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2023.0731

Sabmeethavorn, Q., Bonomo, Y. A., & Hallinan, C. M. (2022). Pharmacists' perceptions and experiences of medicinal cannabis dispensing: A narrative review with a systematic approach. *Int J Pharm Pract*, *30*(3), 204-214. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpp/riac005

StataCorp. (2023). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 18.* In

TGA. (2017). *Guidance for the use of medicinal cannabis in Australia: Patient information*. https://www.tga.gov.au/resources/resource/guidance/guidance-use-medicinal-cannabis-australia-patient-information

TGA. (2023). *Medicinal Cannabis Access Data Dashboard*. https://www.tga.gov.au/products/unapproved-therapeutic-goods/medicinal-cannabis-hub/medicinal-cannabis-access-pathways-and-patient-access-data#dashboard

Towobola, A., Towobola, B., Nair, B., & Makwana, A. (2023). The ethics and management of cannabis use in pregnancy following decriminalisation and licensing for medical use: narrative review. *BJPsych Bull*, *47*(1), 28-37. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjb.2021.102

Vanstone, M., Taneja, S., Popoola, A., Panday, J., Greyson, D., Lennox, R., & McDonald, S. D. (2021). Reasons for cannabis use during pregnancy and lactation: a qualitative study. *CMAJ*, *193*(50), E1906-E1914. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.211236

Volkow, N. D., Han, B., Compton, W. M., & McCance-Katz, E. F. (2019). Self-reported Medical and Nonmedical Cannabis Use Among Pregnant Women in the United States. *JAMA*, *322*(2), 167-169. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2019.7982

Zuckerman, B., Frank, D. A., Hingson, R., Amaro, H., Levenson, S. M., Kayne, H., Parker, S., Vinci, R., Aboagye, K., Fried, L. E., Cabral, H., Timperi, R., & Bauchner, H. (1989). Effects of Maternal Marijuana and Cocaine Use on Fetal Growth. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *320*(12), 762-768. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM198903233201203

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.14.24306797; this version posted July 9, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Appendix A

Search Criteria

The following databases will be searched from 1996 to April 2024: PubMed, MEDLINE/Ovid, Embase Classic+ Embase/Ovid and CINAHL Complete.
The below search describes the PubMed search strategy and will be translated for MEDLINE, Embase and CINAHL using Polyglot Search Translator.
Human only studies in English and French were applied in all four databases.

1. cannabis[Mesh]
2. cannabis[tw]
3. cannabis[all]
4. marijuana[all]
5. marihuana[all]
6. "medical marijuana"[Mesh]
7. "marijuana smoking"[Mesh]
8. "marijuana abuse"[Mesh]
9. "marihuana abuse"[tw]
10. cannabinoids[Mesh]
11. cannabidiol[Mesh]
12. cannabinol[Mesh]
13. bhang[tiab]
14. bhang[tw]
15. tetrahydrocannabinol[tw]
16. “cannabis sativa”[all]
17. "cannabis indica"[all]
18. delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol[tiab]
19. delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol[tw]
20. endocannabinoids[Mesh]
21. endocannabinoids[tw]
22. OR /1-21
23. therapeutic[tw]
24. medical[tw]
25. medicinal[tw]
26. compassionate[tw]
27. phytotherapy[Mesh]
28. prescrib*[tw]
29. prescrip*[tw]
30. OR /23-29
31 pregnancy[Mesh]
32. pregnancy[tw]
33. mother[Mesh]
34. maternal[tw]
35. prenatal[Mesh]
36. prenatal[tw]
37, "pregnant wom*"[tiab]
38. "breast feeding"[Mesh]
39. "maternal-child nursing"[Mesh]
40. OR /31-39
41. infant[Mesh]
42. newborn[Mesh]
43. child[Mesh]
44. "low birth weight"[tw]
45. "low birthweight"[tw]
46. "small for gestational age"[tw]
47. "premature birth"[tw]
48. NICU[tw]
49. pre-term[tw]
50. preterm[tw]
51. infant[tw]
52. fetal[tw]
53. fetus[tw]
54. foetus[tw]
55. neonate[all]
56. baby[tw]
57. babies[tw]
58. "fetal development"[Mesh]
59. "congenital abnormalities"[Mesh]
60. embryology[Mesh]
61. "infant mortality"[Mesh]
62. "prenatal injuries"[Mesh]
63. "child development"[Mesh]
64. OR /41-63
65. humans[Mesh]
64. AND /22, 30, 40, 64, 65

Appendix B

Data extraction form

Name of first author, year of publication, location	Study Design, duration and setting and sample size	Method (Recruitment, study exclusion/ inclusion)	Confounding factors and method of management (tobacco, alcohol, other drugs, other medication or supplements (e.g. folic acid))	Demographic characteristics (age, marital status, parity, ethnic origin, income level, education level)	Reporting method (Self-reported, biologically tested)	Intervention (preparation type, method of delivery, dosage)	Reason for use and usage rate	Infant age (unborn, at birth, follow up)	Outcomes	Study findings (precise counts, %, OR, p-value)