**Original Research** 

### HEALTH EFFECTS OF SECONDHANDSMOKE DURING PREGNANCY ON MATERNAL AND PERINATAL OUTCOMES IN TOMOHON CITY, NORTH SULAWESI, INDONESIA

#### Daichi Suzuki <sup>1-2\*</sup>, Windy M. V. Wariki <sup>3</sup>, Ishak Halim Octawijaya <sup>4-5</sup>, Adrian Umboh <sup>3</sup>, Erika Ota <sup>1.6</sup> <sup>1</sup> Global Health Nursing, Graduate School of Nursing Science, St. Luke's International University, Tokyo,

Japan

<sup>2</sup> Department of Nursing, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, Kanagawa Institute of Technology, Kanagawa, Japan

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Medicine, Sam Ratulangi University, Manado, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Graduate School of Comprehensive Human Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

<sup>5</sup>The School of Nutrition and Dietetics, Faculty of Health and Social Services, Kanagawa University of

Human Services, Kanagawa, Japan

<sup>6</sup>Tokyo Foundation for Policy Research, Tokyo

Correspondence address: Daichi Suzuki

Email: suzuki@ns.kanagawa-it.ac.jp

#### ABSTRACT

**Introduction**: A study conducted in 31 countries described that over 60% of women and children are exposed to SHS outside. **Aims**: was to explore the association of secondhand smoke (SHS) exposure on maternal and perinatal outcomes in highland settings in Indonesia. **Methods**: The retrospective cross-sectional survey was used a random sampling method with 52-items of the questionnaire included information of women and infants. This study conducted with the community health center and all seven public health centers in Tomohon city, North Sulawesi, Indonesia, from May to October 2017. The participants were women who had given birth and were exposed to SHS during pregnancy. Their health condition was measured before and after pregnancy, the gestational week at birth, birth weight and height, and perinatal health conditions of the infants. **Result**: Among 234 women who completed the questionnaire and were included in the analysis. The 97% of household active smokers had a chance to smoke outside the house. Also, approximately 70% of women (162/234) reported exposure to SHS from active household smokers during pregnancy. Maternal secondhand smoke (SHS) exposure during pregnancy was significantly associated with the risk of reduction of birth weight (p = 0.02). Moreover, infants' birth weight of mothers exposed to SHS outside the house was significantly less than those exposed to SHS only inside (p = 0.03). **Conclusion:** Further research is required to focus on public smoke-free strategies to protect women and children's health from SHS in Indonesia.

Keywords: Birth Weight, Breastfeeding, Secondhand Smoke, Postpartum Depression, Indonesia

### **INTRODUCTION**

Over one billion people smoke worldwide, and around six million people die annually from the effects of tobacco use and exposure to tobacco smoke (World Health Organization, 2016). Tobacco smoking is the most preventable main risk factor or cause of death, and it relates to six of the eight leading causes of death globally. Tobacco smoking is a problem which has attracted worldwide attention in recent years and has become a global health target within the sustainable development goals. In Indonesia, the prevalence of current tobacco usage among males over 15 years or more is over 70%, and it's considered as active tobacco smokers by any means (World Health Organization, 2015). In addition, the global adult tobacco survey reported that all non-smokers are exposed to secondhand smoke (SHS) which is defined as smoke formed from the burning end of cigarettes and other tobacco products emitted into the environment and between puffs and from the mainstream smoke exhaled by the smoker (Öberg et al., 2011; Stanković et al., 2012). SHS is found

**Cite this as:** Suzuki, D., Wariki, W.M.V., Octawijaya, I, H., Umboh, A., and Ota, E. (2023). Health Effects of Secondhandsmoke During Pregnancy on Maternal and Perinatal Outcomes in Tomohon City, North Sulawesi, Indonesia. The Indonesian Journal & Public Health, 18(2), 179-193. https://doi.org/10.20473/ljph.v18i2.2023.179-193

©2023 IJPH. Open access under CC BY NC–SA. License doi: 10.20473/ijph.vl18i2.2023.179-193 Received 7 December 2021, received in revised form 15 April 2022, Accepted 20 April 2022, Published online: August 2023.Publisher by Universitas Airlangga

throughout Indonesia, particularly at home, restaurants, and public transportations (World Health Organization, 2012).

SHS exposure brings many health problems. Exposure to SHS increases the risk of cardiovascular diseases, cancers, and respiratory like symptoms cough. wheezing, chest tightness, breathing difficulty for adults, and respiratory middle diseases. ear disease. lower respiratory illness, sudden infant death syndrome for children (Jacobs et al., 2013), contributes to preterm birth (Jaddoe et al., 2008; Khader et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2013), and stillbirths (OR = 1.23, 95% [CI = 1.09 to 1.38] in four studies in Sweden, the US, India, and Turkey) (Leonardi-Bee et al., 2011). Maternal SHS exposure is also associated with adverse birth outcomes (i.e., low birth weight (LBW), small gestational age, maternal mental health problems) (Jaddoe et al., 2008; Khader et al., 2011; Wahabi et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2014; Hawsawi et al., 2015; Niu et al., 2015; Vila Candel et al., 2015; Alibekova et al., 2016; Weng et al., 2016; Suzuki et al., 2019b). Also, exposure to SHS during pregnancy was associated with a reduction exclusive breastfeeding duration in (Baheiraei et al., 2014) and discontinuing any breastfeeding types before six months (Suzuki et al., 2019a).

However, almost all the effects reported in developed countries were from the United States and Europe. Studies from the Asian countries are few. Most studies done in Asian countries were conducted in Taiwan, China, and Korea. It is already known that women and children exposed to SHS are associated with health problems. Moreover, Indonesia's prevalence of current tobacco usage is 36.2% male youth and 4.3% female youth: 56.7% adult male and 1.9% adult female. Only a few male youths and adult male smokers use smokeless tobacco, and over 70% of males age 15 years or more in Indonesia are considered active tobacco smokers by any means (World Health Organization, 2015). In addition, the global adult tobacco survey

reported that all non-smokers are exposed to SHS throughout Indonesia, particularly at home, restaurants, and public transportations (World Health Organization 2012). A study conducted in 31 countries described that over 60% of women and children are exposed to SHS outside (Wipfli et al., 2008).

Women, especially pregnant women and their fetus are also exposed to SHS in many places in Indonesia. Thus, the purpose of this study was to explore the association of SHS exposure from a partner or other family members on the maternal and perinatal outcomes of pregnant women and their infants in Tomohon, North Sulawesi Indonesia.

### METHODS Design and setting

In this retrospective cross-sectional survey, participants were drawn from a population sample frame, and who brought their baby for a health check or immunization at community health centers (*posyandu*) of the seven public health centers (*puskesmas*) in Tomohon which is one of the cities of North Sulawesi Province in central Indonesia.

# Participants and procedure

Participants' selection included random sampling at two hospitals, seven puskesmas, and posyandu in each selected village in Tomohon. Postpartum women who were 20 years old or older and had a singleton birth within January to August 2017 and live in Tomohon were included. However, women who already moved out of Tomohon and women who did not consent to participate in this study were questionnaires excluded. The were distributed to participants by community health volunteers (kader) in each posyandu or each participant's house directly visited. Before collecting data, kaders were given an explanation of the study. Also, they were educated to collect the data from the research team. The participants first read

the consent form, and they agreed to participate. They then answered the questionnaire. The data were collected from May to October 2017.

### Sample size

The sample size was calculated with a simplified formula for proportions (Yamane, 1967). The number of 1513 deliveries in Tomohon during 2015 was used to calculate the sample size. A confidence level of 95% and a p-value of 0.05 were assumed. The minimum sample size is 316, and an increase of 10% adjusted the target sample size to compensate for participants who might be excluded from the research. Therefore, the total number of participants needed is 348.

### Measurements

The questionnaire was written in Indonesian, and it was created based on the Global Adult Tobacco Survey (GATS) questionnaire (Global Adult Tobacco Survey Collaborative, 2010), which was first designed in English and then translated into Indonesian. Also, independently back translated to English to check the quality of translation before being used for field implementation. The 52-item questionnaire included characteristics of mothers (mothers' age, parity, marital status, educational status, smoking status. occupation and working place, pre-existing condition), infants (gender, birth weight, and birth height), secondhand smoke exposure status (frequency of smoking status at home and office, smokers' information around women and infants), and health condition information for women and infants. The 20 postpartum women were recruited to validate the questionnaire from the same inclusion and exclusion criteria from the Minahasa regency, similar to the research setting before the primary research in Tomohon. After collecting the questionnaires, we only needed to make slight modifications for some items to increase clarity.

### Statistical analysis

The dichotomous data were analyzed as odds ratio (ORs) and used single and multiple logistic regression models. Continuous data were analyzed using single and multiple linear regression models. The statistical significance is determined as p values less than 0.05, and results will be shown with 95% confidential intervals (CI). Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25 for Mac OS.

### **Ethical consideration**

This researcher collaborated with Sam Ratulangi University, North Sulawesi, Indonesia, after ethical approval from St. Luke's International University, Tokyo, Japan (17-A007) and Sam Ratulangi University, North Sulawesi, Indonesia (2404/UN12/LL/2017). Participation in this research was completely voluntary after agreeing to the consent form. Also, we were informed of withdrawal by discontinuing the answers, and no disadvantage occurred to participants.

### RESULTS

# Demographics and characteristics of participants and SHS exposure status

Of the 991 eligible women enrolled at two hospitals and seven *puskesmas* in Tomohon, 348 eligible women were randomly picked to use the computer-based random number list. A total of 95 women were excluded because they were registered in the pregnancy information in puskesmas, but they had already moved out. Therefore, kaders could not locate some participants. Also, 19 women were excluded for analysis because their age was less than 20 years old or smoked during pregnancy. Finally, 234 completed (67.2%)women the questionnaire and were included in the analysis (Table 1). As many as 162 women (69.2%) reported exposure to SHS and 66 (28.2%) women were not exposed to SHS from someone in the household who was an active smoker. Also, 2.9% of smokers were smoking only inside the home, 38.8% smoking only outside the home, and 58.3% smoking inside and outside the home. The relationship between smokers and pregnant women mainly was husbands (3.5% inside, 43.1% outside, and 53.5% of both). Other smokers were fathers (4.8% inside, 33.3% outside, and 61.9% of both).

# Association between SHS and birth weight

The prevalence of LBW where the mother was exposed to SHS was higher than non-SHS exposure mothers (12.3% of SHS exposed vs. 6.6% of non-SHS

exposure). There was no statistically significant difference in the risk ratio of LBW when exposed to SHS during pregnancy compared to the non-SHS group. However, the direction of 95% CI was a higher risk of LBW for SHS exposure. (Risk ratio = 2.0, 95% CI: 0.7 to 6.2).

The existence of SHS exposure was associated with birth weight using multiple linear regression analysis. Babies born from non-exposure mothers had heavier birth weight (g) than SHS exposures (Adjusted Estimate ( $\beta$ ) = 488.23, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 86.78 to 892.67, p = 0.02).

	Exposure status (n=228)						
		Total	Non-SHS exposure	SHS exposure	p value		
(%)		n=234 (%)	n=66 (%)	n=162 (%)	_		
Maternal age (n=212)	Median [IQR] Range	27 [24, 31] 20 - 46	27 [24, 31] 20 - 45	27 [24, 31] 20 - 46	0.38		
	20 to 34	190 (89.6)	58 (92.1)	132 (88.6)	0.62		
	Over 35	22 (10.4)	5 (7.9)	17 (11.4)			
Maternal education	Primary school	3 (1.3)	0	3 (1.9)	< 0.001		
level	Secondary school	34 (15.1)	6 (9.4)	28 (17.9)			
	High school	130 (57.8)	29 (45.3)	98 (62.8)			
	University/ College	58 (25.8)	29 (45.3)	27 (17.3)			
Marital status	Married	197 (88.3)	61 (96.8)	133 (85.8)	0.02		
	Single (Divorced/Berea ved)	26 (30.8)	2 (3.2)	22(14.2)			
Maternal	Housewife	155 (69.2)	38 (59.4)	116 (74.8)	0.03		
occupation	Working mother	69 (30.8)	26 (40.6)	39 (25.2)			
Maternal smoking	Yes	10 (4.6)	3 (4.6)	7 (4.7)	1		
status before pregnancy	No	209 (95.4)	62 (95.4)	143 (95.3)			
Parity	1	81 (36.2)	25 (39.1)	52 (33.5)	0.44		
-	Over 2	143 (63.8)	39 (60.9)	103 (66.5)			
Pre- pregnancy	Median [IQR]	22 [19.7, 25.6] 12.7 - 37.8	22.1 [19.7, 25.5] 14.6 - 37.0	22.0 [19.9, 25.8]	0.94		

	BMI	Range				12.7 - 37.8	
	(n=186)	Under weight	20 (1	0.8)	6 (10.9)	13 (10.3)	0.97
	_	Normal	89 (4	7.8)	27 (49.1)	60 (47.6)	
		Overweigh t	77 (4	1.4)	22 (40.0)	53 (42.1)	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Pair of the second arrow $	Breastfeedi ng status	Exclusive breastfeedi	119 (	52.9)	32 (49.2)	85 (54.8)	0.46
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	-	Any breastfeedi	106 (	47.1)	33 (50.8)	70 (45.2)	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	EPDS <sup>a</sup> (n=218)	Median [IQR] Range	9 [7.0 1 - 23	0, 12.0] 3	9 [7.0, 12.3] 1 - 19	10 [7.0, 12.0] 1 - 23	0.71
	-	Less than score 9	87 (3	9.9)	28 (43.8)	57 (38.0)	0.45
		Over score 10	131 (	60.1)	36 (56.2)	93 (62.0)	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline \mbox{Total} & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mbox{Total} & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					Expos	sure status (n=228)	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				Total	Non-SHS exposure	SHS exposure	p value
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(%)			n=234 (%)	n=66 (%)	n=162 (%)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Paternal age	Median		30 [26,	30 [27, 35]	30 [25, 34]	0.30
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(n=209)	[IQR]		35]	21 - 50	17 - 50	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Range		17 - 50			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline \text{Over 35} & 54 (25.8) & 18 (33.3) & 36 (66.7) \\ \hline \text{Paternal} & \text{Primary} & 12 (5.4) & 2 (3.1) & 10 (6.5) & 0.02 \\ \hline \text{school} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$		20 to 35		155 (74.1)	45 (29.0)	110 (71.0)	0.61
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Over 35		54 (25.8)	18 (33.3)	36 (66.7)	
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} Secondary & 43 (19.3) & 7 (10.8) & 36 (23.2) \\ \hline school & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	Paternal education leve	Primary el school		12 (5.4)	2 (3.1)	10 (6.5)	0.02
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Seconda school	ry	43 (19.3)	7 (10.8)	36 (23.2)	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		High sch	nool	121 (54.3)	35 (53.8)	84 (54.2)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Universi ollege	ty/C	47 (21.1)	21 (32.3)	25 (16.1)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Paternal occupation	Private employe	e	49 (21.7)	14 (21.5)	34 (21.4)	0.05
Entrepreneur         45 (19.9)         15 (23.1)         29 (18.2)           Farmer         32 (14.2)         9 (13.8)         23 (14.5)           Laborer         28 (12.4)         4 (6.2)         24 (15.1)           Others         50 (22.1)         11 (16.9)         39 (24.5)           Types of delivery         Vaginal birth         160         42 (64.6)         114 (74.0)         0.19           Cesarean         64 (28.6)         23 (35.4)         40 (26.0)         section           Household earning b         Rp.         111         27 (43.5)         84 (57.1)         0.10		Governn emplove	nent æ	22 (9.7)	12 (18.5)	10 (6.3)	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Entrepre	neur	45 (19.9)	15 (23.1)	29 (18.2)	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Farmer		32 (14.2)	9 (13.8)	23 (14.5)	
Others         50 (22.1)         11 (16.9)         39 (24.5)           Types of delivery         Vaginal birth         160         42 (64.6)         114 (74.0)         0.19           (71.4)         (71.4)         (71.4)         0         0         0           Cesarean         64 (28.6)         23 (35.4)         40 (26.0)         0         0           Household earning b         Rp.         111         27 (43.5)         84 (57.1)         0.10           Less         Less <t< td=""><td></td><td>Laborer</td><td></td><td>28 (12.4)</td><td>4 (6.2)</td><td>24 (15.1)</td><td></td></t<>		Laborer		28 (12.4)	4 (6.2)	24 (15.1)	
Types of delivery       Vaginal birth       160       42 (64.6)       114 (74.0)       0.19 $(71.4)$ (71.4)       (71.4)       (71.4)       (71.4)       (71.4)         Cesarean       64 (28.6)       23 (35.4)       40 (26.0)       (71.4)         Household       Rp.       111       27 (43.5)       84 (57.1)       0.10         earning b       2.600.000 or       (52.6)       (52.6)       (52.6)       (52.6)		Others		50 (22.1)	11 (16.9)	39 (24.5)	
Cesarean section         64 (28.6)         23 (35.4)         40 (26.0)           Household earning b         Rp.         111         27 (43.5)         84 (57.1)         0.10           Less         Less <td< td=""><td>Types of deliverv</td><td>Vaginal</td><td>birth</td><td>160 (71.4)</td><td>42 (64.6)</td><td>114 (74.0)</td><td>0.19</td></td<>	Types of deliverv	Vaginal	birth	160 (71.4)	42 (64.6)	114 (74.0)	0.19
Household earning b         Rp.         111         27 (43.5)         84 (57.1)         0.10           less         l	- 5	Cesarear section	1	64 (28.6)	23 (35.4)	40 (26.0)	
	Household	5.0000		111	27 (43 5)	84 (57 1)	0.10

	Over Rp. 2.600.000	100 (47.4)	35 (56.5)	63 (42.9)	
Types of households	Nuclear family	67 (29.9)	30 (46.9)	37 (23.9)	0.001
	Joint family	157 (70.1)	34 (53.1)	118 (76.1)	
Socioeconomic	High	62 (29.1)	44 (68.8)	18 (12.1)	< 0.001
status <sup>c</sup>	Middle	82 (38.5)	10 (15.6)	72 (48.3)	
	Low	69 (32.4)	10 (15.6)	59 (39.6)	
Gender of baby	Boys	111 (47.8)	28 (42.2)	79 (49.7)	0.38
	Girls	121 (52.2)	38 (57.6)	81 (50.3)	
Birth week	Median [IQR]	36.2 [36.0, 38.0]	36.6 [36.0, 38.0]	36.0 [36.0, 38.0]	0.37
Birth weight (n=221)	Median [IQR] Range	3100 [2800, 3400] 1600 - 4500	3000 [2900, 3300] 1800 -4000	3100 [2800, 3400] 1600 - 4500	0.93
	Less than 2500 g	23 (10.2)	4 (6.3)	19 (12.1)	0.54
	Normal	192 (85.3)	57 (90.5)	135 (85.4)	
	Over 4000 g	6 (2.7)	2 (3.2)	4 (2.5)	
Birth height	Median [IQR]	4 <del>8</del> [46.0, 50.0]	48 [45.0, 49.1]	48 [46.0, 50.0]	0.34

a Cut-off point is 9/10 based on using the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS) translated into languages other than English

b Cut-off point based on regional standard salary of North Sulawesi, Indonesia in 2017 (sourced by Badan Pusat Statistik)

c Based on score of nine items of economic indicator used for principal component analysis

Moreover, the birth weight of babies whose mothers were exposed to SHS outside the house was less than those exposed to SHS inside (Adjusted  $\beta = -272.39, 95\%$  CI: -511.84 - -32.95, p = 0.03). However, on the one hand univariate regression analysis showed there was no significant association between the existence of SHS and SHS exposure place ( $\beta$  = -17.51, 95% CI: -159.16 - -124.13, p = 0.81 for existence of SHS,  $\beta$  = -67.99, 95% CI: -154.98 - -19.01, p = 0.12 for SHS exposed place). On the other hand, the univariate regression analysis reported pre-pregnancy BMI was associated with birth weight ( $\beta = 116.38, 95\%$  CI: 12.99 to 219.77, p = 0.03). Also, multiple regression analysis showed no significant association, but there were weak trends between prepregnancy BMI and birth weight (Adjusted  $\beta$  = 125.02, 95% CI = -15.15 to 265.2, p = 0.08). All results are shown in Table 2 and 3.

Table 4 shows the effects of SHS exposure for LBW infants. Birth weights of continuous data were categorized into two categories LBW of less than 2500 g and normal weight baby that excluded the baby weight of 4000 g or more. There was a weak trend between exposure place of SHS and LBW (AOR = 2.53, 95% CI = 0.87 to 7.43, p = 0.06). However, there was no significant association between the existence of SHS and the place of SHS and LBW.

# Association between SHS and breastfeeding

SHS exposure and breastfeeding condition had no significant association

(AOR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.15 to 7.65, p = 0.95). Women who were married had significantly higher odds for the exclusive breastfed at two to four months than single mothers (AOR = 0.28, 95% CI: 0.09 to 0.89, p = 0.03). Moreover, the number of older

mothers who exclusively breastfed at two to four months was significantly higher compared to younger mothers (AOR = 1.04, 95% CI: 1.01 to 1.29, p = 0.04) (Table 5).

Table 2.	Effects	of Seco	ndhand S	Smoke	Exposure	for Birth	Weight	(Univariate	regression)
					1		0	<b>`</b>	0 /

	(β)	(95% CI)	SD	t value	<i>p</i> value
SHS exposure	-17.51	(-159.16 to 124.13)	71.9	-0.24	0.81
SHS exposed place	-67.99	(-154.98 to 19.01)	44.1	-1.54	0.12
SHS exposed dose	-31.67	(-188.78 to 125.44)	79.5	-0.4	0.69
Smoked before pregnancy	-87.16	(-386.03 to 211.7)	151.6	-0.57	0.57
Maternal age <sup>a</sup>	-3.37	(-14.74 to 8.00)	5.77	-0.58	0.56
Maternal education <sup>b</sup>	-58.16	(-226.15 to 108.94)	85.0	-0.69	0.49
Pre-pregnancy BMI <sup>c</sup>	116.38	(12.99 to 219.77)	52.4	2.22	0.03
Parity <sup>a</sup>	29.34	(-45.63 to 104.31)	38.0	0.77	0.44
Gender of baby	-39.52	(-165.94 to 86.91)	64.2	-0.62	0.54
Paternal age <sup>a</sup>	-3.12	(-13.57 to 7.33)	5.3	-0.59	0.56
Paternal education <sup>b</sup>	-49.81	(-198.49 to 98.87)	75.4	-0.66	0.51
Household earning <sup>d</sup>	-22.97	(-151.06 to 105.12)	65.0	-0.35	0.72

a Continuous data were used for analysis

b Category was adjusted to combine the primary with secondary and above high school as dichotomous data

c Categorized data were used for analysis

d Cut-off point based on regional standard salary of North Sulawesi, Indonesia in 2017 (sourced by Badan Pusat Statistik)

SHS exposure SHS exposed place SHS exposed dose	<ol> <li>1: Exposed</li> <li>1: Inside of house</li> <li>1: 1 to 6 cigarettes/day</li> </ol>	<ul><li>2: Non-exposed</li><li>2: Outside of house</li><li>2: 7 to over 10 cigarettes/day</li></ul>	
Smoked before pregnancy	1: Yes	2: No	
Maternal education	1: Completed until Secondary	2: Completed until High School or more	
Pre-pregnancy BMI	1: Under weight	2: Normal	3: Overweight
Gender of baby	1: Boys	2: Girls	
Paternal education	1: Completed until Secondary	2: Completed until High School or more	
Household earning	1: Rupia 2.600.000/month or less	2: Over Rupia 2.600.000/month	

### Table 3. Effects of Secondhand Smoke Exposure for Birth Weight (Multiple regression) \_

	Adjusted (β)	(95% CI)	SD	t value	p value
SHS exposure	488.23	(83.78 to 892.67)	203.4	2.4	0.02
SHS exposed place	-272.39	(-511.84 to -32.95)	120.4	-2.26	0.03
SHS exposed dose	-92.59	(-281.39 to 96.21)	94.9	-0.98	0.33
Smoked before pregnancy	-137.57	(-659.77 to 384.62)	262.6	-0.52	0.60
Maternal age <sup>a</sup>	-6.15	(-34.97 to 22.68)	14.5	-0.42	0.67
Maternal education <sup>b</sup>	90.2	(-277.48 to 457.88)	184.9	0.49	0.63
Pre-pregnancy BMI <sup>c</sup>	125.02	(-15.15 to 265.2)	70.5	1.77	0.08
Parity <sup>a</sup>	96.81	(-53 to 246.61)	75.3	1.29	0.20
Gender of baby	132.27	(-50.65 to 315.19)	92.0	1.44	0.15

### 186 The Indonesian Journal of Public Health, Vol 18, No 2 August 2023: 179-193

	Adjusted (β)	(95% CI)	SD	t value	p value
Paternal age <sup>a</sup>	17.43	(-5.88 to 40.74)	11.7	1.49	0.14
Paternal education <sup>b</sup>	76.6	(-150.11 to 303.32)	114.0	0.67	0.50
Household earning <sup>d</sup>	-40.07	(-223.5 to 143.36)	92.2	-0.43	0.67

a Continuous data were used for analysis

b Category was adjusted to combine the primary with secondary and above high school as dichotomous data

c Categorized data were s used for analysis

d Cut-off point based on regional standard salary of North Sulawesi, Indonesia in 2017 (sourced by Badan Pusat Statistik)

SHS exposure	1: Exposed	2: Non-exposed	
SHS exposed place	1: Inside of house	2: Outside of house	
SHS exposed dose	1: 1 to 6 cigarettes/day	2: 7 to over 10 cigarettes/day	
Smoked before pregnancy	1: Yes	2: No	
Maternal education	1: Completed until Secondary	2: Completed until High School or	
		more	
Pre-pregnancy BMI	1: Under weight	2: Normal	3: Overweight
Gender of baby	1: Boys	2: Girls	-
Paternal education	1: Completed until Secondary	2: Completed until High School or	
		more	
Household earning	1: Rupia 2.600.000/month or less	2: Over Rupia 2.600.000/month	

Table 4.	Effects	of	Secondhand	Smoke	Exposure	for	Low	Birth	Weight	by	Exposure	and
Location												

	OR (95% CI)	p value	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	p value
SHS exposure	2.02 (0.66 to 6.20)	0.22	0.46 (0.06 to 3.64)	0.56
SHS exposed place	1.83 (0.97 to 3.44)	0.06	2.53 (0.87 to 7.43)	0.06

Principal component analysis was used to construct and adjust the maternal age, maternal education, socioeconomic status, and parity.

LBW	1: 2500 to 3999 g	2: Less than 2500 g
SHS exposure	1: Exposed	2: Non-exposed
SHS exposed place	1: Inside of house	2: Outside of house

	OR	(95 % CI)	p value	Adjusted OR	(95 % CI)	p value
SHS exposure	0.80	(0.45 to 1.43)	0.45	1.06	(0.15 to 7.65)	0.95
SHS exposed place	0.96	(0.67 to 1.37)	0.81	0.83	(0.24 to 2.83)	0.76
SHS exposed dose	0.87	(0.45 to 1.66)	0.67	0.74	(0.31 to 1.81)	0.51
Smoked before pregnancy	1.24	(0.34 to 4.53)	0.74	0.36	(0.03 to 5.06)	0.45
Maternal age <sup>a</sup>	1.03	(0.99 to 1.09)	0.17	1.14	(1.01 to 1.29)	0.04
Maternal occupation	1.02	(0.89 to 1.17)	0.77	0.95	(0.76 to 1.18)	0.63
Maternal education <sup>b</sup>	1.43	(0.68 to 3.03)	0.35	0.65	(0.13 to 3.18)	0.59
Socioeconomic status	0.90	(0.64 to 1.28)	0.56	1.04	(0.56 to 1.93)	0.89
Household earning	1.02	(0.59 to 1.78)	0.94	0.91	(0.36 to 2.30)	0.84
Types of household	1.17	(0.65 to 2.11)	0.59	1.73	(0.60 to 4.96)	0.31
Types of delivery	1.24	(0.69 to 2.23)	0.48	0.69	(0.26 to 1.81)	0.45
Parity <sup>c</sup>	0.88	(0.64 to 1.22)	0.44	0.59	(0.26 to 1.32)	0.20

	OR	(95 % CI)	p valu	e Adjusted OR	(95 % CI)	p value
Marital status	0.69	(0.45 to 1.07)	0.10	0.28	(0.09 to 0.8	9) 0.03
a Continuous data were used for analysis						
b Category was adjusted to combine	the prima	ry with secondary and	above high	schools dichotomous data		
c Categorized data were used for ana	lysis					
Breastfeeding condition	1: Ex	clusive		2: Any or only form	ula	
SHS exposure	1: Ex	posure		2: Non-exposure		
SHS exposed place	1: Ins	side of house		2: Outside of house		
SHS exposed dose	1: 1to	o6 cigarettes/day		2: Over 7 cigarettes/	day	
Smoked before pregnancy	1: Ye	s		2: No		
Maternal education	1: Co	mpleted until Sec	ondary	2: Completed more	than High	
				School		
Maternal occupation	1: Ho	ousewife		2: Working		
Socioeconomic status	1: Lo	W		2: Middle		3: High
Household earning	1: Rp	. 260000/month o	r less	2: Over Rp. 260000	)/month	
Types of household	1: Nu	clear family		2: Joint family		
Types of delivery	1: Vi	rginal delivery		2: Cesarean section		
Parity	1: 1 <sup>st</sup>	time		2: 2 <sup>nd</sup> time or more		
Marital status	1: Ma	arried		2: Single (divorced/l	pereaved)	

# Association between SHS and maternal mental health

There was also no significant association between SHS exposure and depressive symptoms. However, both results of univariate and logistic regression analysis showed social economic status were associated with postpartum depressive symptoms (AOR = 0.29, 95% CI = 0.14 to 0.62, p < 0.01). For the univariate analysis, there was no significant association between postpartum depressive symptoms and household. However, multiple logistic regression results indicated that mothers who did not live with their parents were at higher risk of postpartum depressive symptoms. The EPDS total score showed a similar trend (AOR = 0.23, 95% CI = 0.07 to 0.76, p = 0.02) (Table 6).

**Table 6.** Effects of Secondhand Smoke Exposure for Postpartum Depressive Symptoms

	OR	(95 % CI)	p value	Adjusted OR	(95 % CI)	p value
SHS exposure	1.29	(0.71 to 2.34)	0.40	5.18	(0.57 to 46.60)	0.14
SHS exposed place	1.07	(0.73 to 1.55)	0.74	0.68	(0.19 to 2.47)	0.56
SHS exposed dose	1.53	(0.77 to 3.05)	0.22	0.82	(0.32 to 2.08)	0.67
Smoked before pregnancy	2.06	(0.54 to 7.92)	0.29	0.28	(0.02 to 4.89)	0.39
Maternal age <sup>a</sup>	0.97	(0.92 to 1.02)	0.29	1.03	(0.91 to 1.16)	0.64
Maternal education <sup>b</sup>	0.53	(0.23 to 1.21)	0.13	0.41	(0.08 to 2.03)	0.27
Socioeconomic status	0.51	(0.35 to 0.74)	< 0.01	0.29	(0.14 to 0.62)	< 0.01
Household earning	1.46	(0.82 to 2.58)	0.20	1.93	(0.71 to 5.28)	0.20
Types of household	0.77	(0.43 to 1.41)	0.40	0.23	(0.07 to 0.76)	0.02
Types of delivery	1.02	(0.55 to 1.87)	0.96	1.78	(0.61 to 5.19)	0.29
Parity <sup>c</sup>	0.90	(0.51 to 1.58)	0.70	0.58	(0.18 to 1.88)	0.36
Marital status	1.27	(0.81 to 1.98)	0.29	2.51	(0.95  to  6.65)	0.06

†Cut-off point is 9/10 based on using the Edinburgh Postpartum Depression Scale translated into languages other than English

a Continuous data were used for analysis

b Category was adjusted to combine the primary with secondary and above high schools as dichotomous data

c Categorized data were used for analysis

Score of EPDS	1: Less than score 9	2: Over score 10	
SHS exposure	1: Exposure	2: Non-exposure	
SHS exposed place	1: Inside of house	2: Outside of house	
SHS exposed dose	1: 1to6 cigarettes/day	2: Over 7 cigarettes/day	
Smoked before pregnancy	1: Yes	2: No	
Maternal education	1: Completed until Secondary	2: Completed more than High School	
Socioeconomic status	1: Low	2: Middle	3: High
Household earning	1: Rp. 260000/month or less	2: Over Rp. 2600000/month	
Types of household	1: Nuclear family	2: Joint family	
Types of delivery	1: Virginal delivery	2: Cesarean section	
Parity	1: 1 <sup>st</sup> time	2: 2 <sup>nd</sup> time or more	
Marital status	1: Married	2:Single divorced/bereaved)	

### DISCUSSION Main findings of this study

This research found that 97% household active smokers had a chance to smoke outside the house in Tomohon. In other words, it might define that nonsmokers, mostly women and children, easily get SHS exposure outside the house. Moreover, maternal SHS exposure and SHS exposure outside the home during pregnancy were significantly associated with the risk of reduced birth weight in Tomohon. Also, there was a weak

trend between SHS exposure outside the home and LBW.

Naeye (1987) found there was a weak trend for small placentas associated with LBW and that exposure to SHS during pregnancy negatively affected the placenta. increasing the risk for LBW. The possibility of older age mothers being well-educated about breastfeeding conditions, marital status, and maternal mechanism was associated with the cytokine's potential pathway. Exposure increased the risk for LBW. The mechanism was associated with the cytokine's potential pathway. Exposure to SHS increased cytokines, and it was related to lower placental weight (Niu et al., 2016). Generally, mothers exposed to inside SHS had the possibility of longer exposure

times and a higher dose than mothers with outside exposure. Besides, mothers exposed to inside SHS might have inhaled more concentrated smoke compared to outside SHS exposure. Also, our research showed that over 85% of mothers are housewives in SHS exposure groups. It might be shown that exposure of women to SHS from active household smokers is more accessible inside the house.

However, Indonesian houses typically have good cross-ventilation, where the average temperature is around 30 degrees Celsius throughout the year. Therefore. almost every house has ventilation holes other than windows. Therefore, the smoke might easily pass out from the house and be diluted by natural ventilation systems even if someone smoked inside the house. Thus, we created a hypothesis that women might have a longer and more chance to be exposed to SHS outside in Indonesia. This hypothesis is based on the public transportation systems in Indonesia. The Indonesians use small buses called micro for public transportation, and everyone can catch and ride it easily everywhere, and some passengers and drivers are often smoking inside the micro. Also, many men are smoking in masses at community meetings and parties. Thus, pregnant women are easily exposed to SHS throughout public places, and pregnant women might be exposed to SHS even longer than inside their homes.

Our findings showed no direct statistical significance between SHS exposure and breastfeeding conditions or postpartum depressive symptoms. The findings in this study were different from the findings in our systematic review (Suzuki et al., 2019a; 2019b). However, we found that lower socioeconomic status increases the odds of depressive symptoms. The association between socioeconomic status and smoking was found in a previous study in Finland (Laaksonen et al., 2005). Also, other reviews showed that lower socioeconomic status countries, especially developing countries, had a higher prevalence of smoking (Hiscock et al., 2012). According to existing knowledge of these associations, lower socioeconomic status mothers might be exposed to higher smoking concentrations tobacco than higher socioeconomic status mothers. Moreover, there were associations of postpartum depressive symptoms with single marital status and the nuclear family. We hypothesized that single mothers and mothers in a nuclear family might have had no one to help and support them in the early demanding postpartum period. Also, for depressive symptoms and mothers' education level, there was an association between higher educated mothers and the depressive symptoms. risk of Welleducated mothers have more knowledge but also higher expectations of themselves compared to lower educated mothers. Perhaps, well-educated mothers feel a considerable challenge for baby's care, or some events happen that mothers never experienced nor expected. Then, they do not know how to cope, and it might be very stressful for them. Therefore, well-educated mothers possibly felt more nervous compared to lower educated mothers. A published study documents the association between current smoking and suicidal ideation (Hughes, 2008); smoking increases

the risk of depression, anxiety, stress, and other mental health problems compared to those who quit smoking (Taylor et al., 2014). Another study reported that nicotine is the factor of depressive symptoms. However, the direct association between smoking and depressive symptoms was not clarified (Markou et al., 1998). There was an age factor. If mothers knew the benefit of breastfeeding for babies, mothers were more motivated to breastfeed (Hillenbrand and Larsen, 2002). Therefore, maternal age and breastfeeding conditions might be associated.

Of course, it would be possible to prevent adverse outcomes from SHS exposure if active smokers quit smoking in public places. According to the WHO's framework on tobacco control, it helps manage and implement tobacco control in each country. Furthermore, relatively new tobacco control packages include measures and resources. It includes six components and forms the acronym MPOWER (World Health Organization, 2008). Under the MPOWER implementation, many people saved from tobacco-related will be problems (Dubray et al., 2015; Ngo et al., 2017; Levy et al., 2018). However, Indonesia did not embrace the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (World Health Organization, 2012). They implemented their national tobacco program and several **MPOWER** components; however, some components have not yet been achieved, especially a smoke-free law and anti-tobacco mass media campaigns.

The one suggestion from these results is for the public health centers to promote a "stop smoking in public places" campaign. This campaign should include such several aspects, as promoting prevention education at pregnant women's checkups. Targeting teenagers at primary and secondary schools is crucial for preventing SHS exposure because teenagers already start smoking in Indonesia (World Health Organization, 2012). Furthermore, the smoker has some

social benefits. especially for men (Kaufman et al., 2015); additionally, smoking is known to show men's masculinity as one of the cultures in Indonesia (Nichter et al., 2009). Therefore, education must also address this and provide alternatives for socializing and selfimage. In Indonesia, public health centers function as primary healthcare institutions; everyone has sickness or health problems. Also, public health centers serve as community health centers. The community health centers are connected to the community by the public health center's staff. Thus, everyone has more accessible access to the community health center than the public health center, which might be too far away and not accessible. Thus, a 'stop smoking' campaign might have more impact if promoted locally by the community health centers.

## Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, it used under the minimum sample size for analysis. Then, we calculated the target sample size as 348. Unfortunately, we could not fulfill it, and there was only approximately 67% of the data for analysis. However, we used regression analysis to reduce some biases and confounding factors as much as possible and showed some of the effect of SHS exposure in Tomohon. While the results are general, perhaps if we had achieved the target sample the results might be different.

Second, the data about SHS exposure situations during pregnancy were collected from self-reports from postpartum women and the questionnaire distributed at two to four months postpartum; therefore, it may include recall bias and performance bias. Performance bias might be minimized because the results of this study had no direct benefit to participants; therefore, they had nothing to gain by obscuring the truth. We considered both recall bias and performance bias. Third, cotinine levels in the body indicating SHS exposure were not verified. The SHS exposure status measured was only from the self-report questionnaire. Also, the number of non-SHS-exposure women was approximately half compared to SHS exposures. Therefore, more participants and reliable data by testing urinary, blood, or hair cotinine levels are required for future research.

## CONCLUSION

conclusion, SHS In maternal exposure during pregnancy was associated with reducing infants' birth weight compared to non-maternal SHS exposure in Tomohon. However, there were no statistically significant associations between maternal SHS exposure and breastfeeding condition at two to four months and postpartum depressive symptoms. Further research is required in other areas in North Sulawesi province and should focus on interventions to prevent SHS exposure at home and in public places.

Also, one of our suggestions is to and follow WHO tobacco accept frameworks or smoke-free policy, especially in a public place, which may decrease the chance of SHS exposure of women, children, and other non-smokers. Besides, it is most important to educate fathers as to how SHS is harmful to women and children. Therefore, some promotion will be needed to hold and inform them in puskesmas about adverse effects of SHS and to consider the smoking place. Moreover, parent perinatal education classes will be held led by puskesmas and then educating both women and their partners might be helpful to reduce smokers inside the house.

## REFERENCES

Alibekova, R., Huang, J. P., Lee, T. S. H., Au, H. K. and Chen, Y. H. 2016. Effects Of Smoking On Perinatal Depression And Anxiety In Mothers And Fathers: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Journal Of Affective Disorders*, 193, pp.18-26. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2015.1</u> 2.027

- Baheiraei, A., Ghafoori, F., Rahimi Foroushani, A. and Nedjat, S. 2014. The Effects Of Maternal Exposure To Second-Hand Smoke On Breast-Feeding Duration: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Journal Of Public Health (Germany)*, 22, pp.13-22. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-</u> 013-0589-0
- Dubray, J., Schwartz, R., Chaiton, M., O'Connor, S. and Cohen, J. E. 2015. The Effect Of Mpower On Smoking Prevalence. *Tobacco Control*, 24, pp. 540-542. <u>https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocont</u> <u>rol-2014-051834</u>
- Global Adult Tobacco Survey Collaborative Group. 2010. Global Adult Tobacco Survey (Gats): Core Questionnaire With Optional Questions, Version 2.0. Atlanta, Ga: Centers For Disease Control And Prevention.
- Hawsawi, A. M., Bryant, L. O. and Goodfellow, L. T. 2015. Association Between Exposure To Secondhand Smoke During Pregnancy And Low Birthweight: A Narrative Review. *Respiratory Care*, 60, pp.135-140. <u>https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.02</u> 798
- Hillenbrand, K. M. and Larsen, P. G. 2002. Effect Of An Educational Intervention About Breastfeeding On The Knowledge, Confidence, And Behaviors Of Pediatric Resident Physicians. Pediatrics, 110. E59-E59. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.110.5. e59
- Hiscock, R., Bauld, L., Amos, A., Fidler, J. A. and Munafò, M. 2012.

Socioeconomic Status And Smoking: A Review. Annals Of The New York Academy Of Sciences, 1248, pp.107-123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06202.x

Hughes, J. R. 2008. Smoking And Suicide: A Brief Overview. Drug And Alcohol Dependence, 98, pp.169-178.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcde p.2008.06.003

Jacobs, M., Alonso, A. M., Sherin, K. M., Koh, Y., Dhamija, A., Lowe, A. L. and ACPM Prevention Practice Committee. 2013. Policies To Restrict Secondhand Smoke Exposure: American College Of Preventive Medicine Position Statement. American Journal Of Preventive Medicine, 45, pp.360-367 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.20

13.05.007

- Jaddoe, V. W., Troe, E. J., Hofman, A., Mackenbach, J. P., Moll, H. A., Steegers, E. A. and Witteman, J. C. 2008. Active And Passive Maternal Smoking During Pregnancy And The Risks Of Low Birthweight And Preterm Birth: The Generation R Study. *Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology*, 22, pp. 162-171. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3016.2007.00916.x</u>
- Kaufman, M. R., Merritt, A. P., Rimbatmaja, R. and Cohen, J. E. 2015. 'Excuse Me, Sir. Please Don't Smoke Here'. A Qualitative Study Of Social Enforcement Of Smoke-Free Policies In Indonesia. *Health Policy Plan*, 30, pp. 995-1002. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czu1</u> 03
- Khader, Y. S., Al-Akour, N., Alzubi, I. M. and Lataifeh, I. 2011. The Association Between Second Hand Smoke And Low Birth Weight And Preterm Delivery. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 15, pp.453-

459.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-010-0599-2

Laaksonen, M., Rahkonen, O., Karvonen, S. and Lahelma, E. 2005. Socioeconomic Status And Smokinganalysing Inequalities With Multiple Indicators. *European Journal Of Public Health*, 15, pp.262-269.

https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cki1 15

- Leonardi-Bee, J., Britton, J. and Venn, A. 2011. Secondhand Smoke And Adverse Fetal Outcomes In Nonsmoking Pregnant Women: A Meta-Analysis. *Pediatrics*, 127, pp.734-741. <u>https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2010-3041</u>
- Levy, D. T., Yuan, Z., Luo, Y. and Mays, D. 2018. Seven Years Of Progress In Tobacco Control: An Evaluation Of The Effect Of Nations Meeting The Highest Level Mpower Measures Between 2007 And 2014. *Tobacco Control*, 27, pp.50-57. <u>https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocont</u> <u>rol-2016-053381</u>
- Markou, A., Kosten, T. R. and Koob, G. F. 1998. Neurobiological Similarities In Depression And Drug Dependence: A Self-Medication Hypothesis. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 18, p.135. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-</u> 133X(97)00113-9
- Naeye, R. L. 1987. Do Placental Weights Have Clinical Significance? *Human Pathology*, 18, pp. 387-391. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0046-</u> <u>8177(87)80170-3</u>
- Ngo, A., Cheng, K.-W., Chaloupka, F. J. and Shang, C. 2017. The Effect Of Mpower Scores On Cigarette Smoking Prevalence And Consumption. *Preventive Medicine*, 105, S10-S14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.20

17.05.006

- Nichter, M., Padmawati, S., Danardono, M., Ng, N., Prabandari, Y. and Nichter, M. 2009. Reading Culture From Tobacco Advertisements In Indonesia. *Tobacco Control*, 18, pp. 98-107. <u>https://doi.org/10.1136/tc.2008.025</u> 809
- Niu, Z., Xie, C., Wen, X., Tian, F., Ding, P., He, Y., Lin, J., Yuan, S., Guo, X., Jia, D. and Chen, W. Q. 2015.
  Placenta Mediates The Association Between Maternal Second-Hand Smoke Exposure During Pregnancy And Small For Gestational Age. *Placenta*, 36, pp.876-880. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.placenta.2</u> 015.05.005
- Niu, Z., Xie, C., Wen, X., Tian, F., Yuan, S., Jia, D. and Chen, W. Q. 2016. Potential Pathways By Which Maternal Second-Hand Smoke Exposure During Pregnancy Causes Full-Term Low Birth Weight. *Scientific Reports*, 6, p.24987. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep24987
- ÖBerg, M., Woodward, A., Jaakkola, M. S., Peruga, A. and PrüSs-UstüN, A. 2011. Who Global Estimate Of The Burden Of Disease From Second-Hand Smoke. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Stanković, A., Nikolić, M. & Aranđelović, M. 2012. Exposure То Environmental Tobacco Smoke And Absence From Work In Women In Niš, Serbia, Central European Journal of Public Health, 20, pp.24-28. https://doi.org/10.21101/cejph.a370 1
- Suzuki, D., Wariki, W. M. V., Suto, M., Yamaji, N., Takemoto, Y., Rahman, M. and Ota, E. 2019a. Secondhand Smoke Exposure During Pregnancy And Mothers' Subsequent Breastfeeding Outcomes: A Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis. *Scientific Reports*, 9,

p.8535.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-44786-z

- Suzuki, D., Wariki, W. M. V., Suto, M., Yamaji, N., Takemoto, Y., Rahman, M. M. and Ota, E. 2019b. Association Of Secondhand Smoke And Depressive Symptoms In Nonsmoking Pregnant Women: A Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis. Journal Of Affective Disorders. 245. pp.918-927. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.1 1.048
- Taylor, G., Mcneill, A., Girling, A., Farley,
  A., Lindson-Hawley, N. and
  Aveyard, P. 2014. Change In
  Mental Health After Smoking
  Cessation: Systematic Review And
  Meta-Analysis. *Bmj : British Medical Journal*, 348, g1151.
  <a href="https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g1151">https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g1151</a>
- Vila Candel, R., Soriano-Vidal, F. J., Hevilla Cucarella, E., Castro-Sanchez, E. and Martin-Moreno, J. M. 2015. Tobacco Use In The Third Trimester Of Pregnancy And Its Relationship To Birth Weight. A Prospective Study In Spain. Women And Birth, 28, E134-139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.20 15.06.003
- Wahabi, H. A., Alzeidan, R. A., Fayed, A. A., Mandil, A., Al-Shaikh, G. and Esmaeil, S. A. 2013. Effects Of Secondhand Smoke On The Birth Weight Of Term Infants And The Demographic Profile Of Saudi Exposed Women. *BMC Public Health*, 13, p.341. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-13-341</u>
- Weng, S. C., Huang, J. P., Huang, Y. L., Lee, T. S. and Chen, Y. H. 2016. Effects Of Tobacco Exposure On Perinatal Suicidal Ideation, Depression, And Anxiety. *Bmc Public Health*, 16, p.623. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-</u> <u>016-3254-z</u>

- Wipfli, H., Avila-Tang, E., Navas-Acien, A., Kim, S., Onicescu, G., Yuan, J., Breysse, P. and Samet, J. M. 2008.
  Secondhand Smoke Exposure Among Women And Children: Evidence From 31 Countries. *American Journal Of Public Health*, 98, pp.672-679. <u>https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2007.</u> 126631
- World Health Organization. 2008. Who Report On The Global Tobacco Epidemic: The Mpower Package, World Health Organization.
- World Health Organization. 2012. Global Adult Tobacco Survey: Indonesia Report 2011. Geneva: WHO.
- World Health Organization. 2015. Who Report On The Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2015: Raising Taxes On Tobacco. Geneva: WHO.
- World Health Organization. 2016. *Who Media Center Tobacco Fact Sheet*. Geneva: WHO.
- Yamane, T. 1967. *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis*, New York, Harper And Row.
- Zhou, S., Rosenthal, D. G., Sherman, S., Zelikoff, J., Gordon, T. and Weitzman, M. 2014. Physical, Behavioral, And Cognitive Effects Of Prenatal Tobacco And Postnatal Secondhand Smoke Exposure. Current Problems In Pediatric & Adolescent Health Care, 44. pp.219-241.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cppeds.20 14.03.007