

Inconsistency of infant caretakers' visual exposome with safe infant sleep recommendations: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Authors

Sophie de Visme, MSc,^{1,2} Yaël Pinhas, MD,³ Jérémie F. Cohen, MD, PhD,^{1,3} Rachel Y. Moon, MD,⁴ Floortje Kanits, PhD,⁵ Sabine Plancoulaine, MD, PhD,^{1,6} Anne-Laure Sellier, PhD,⁷ Inge Harrewijn, MD,⁸ Christèle Gras-Le Guen, MD, PhD,^{1,2,9} Martin Chalumeau, MD, PhD^{1,3}

Affiliations

¹ Université Paris Cité, Inserm, Centre for Research in Epidemiology and Statistics, Paris, France

² Nantes Université, CHU de Nantes, INSERM, UIC14 Femme-Enfant-Adolescent, CIC1413, Nantes, France

³ Université Paris Cité, Department of General Pediatrics and Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Necker-Enfants Malades hospital, Paris, France

⁴ Department of Pediatrics, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, United States

⁵ Department of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, Netherlands

⁶ Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, INSERM, Centre de Recherche en Neurosciences de Lyon CRNL U1028 UMR5292, WAKING, Bron, France

⁷ HEC Paris, Department of Marketing, Jouy-en-Josas, France

⁸ University of Montpellier, Department of Neonatal Pediatrics and Intensive Care, Montpellier University Hospital, Montpellier, France

⁹ Nantes Université, CHU de Nantes, Department of General Pediatrics and Pediatric Emergencies, Nantes, France

Corresponding author

Sophie de Visme, Nantes Clinical Investigation Centre, Nantes University Hospital, 5 allée de l'île gloriette, 44093 Nantes CEDEX 01, France. E-mail address: sophie.de-visme@inserm.fr, telephone number: +33 (0)2 76 64 39 67

AUTHOR STATEMENTS

Funding sources

No funding was received for this study.

Conflict of interest

All authors declare that they received no support from any organization for the submitted work; they had no financial relationships with any organization that might have an interest in the submitted work, and they had no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Data statement

Sophie de Visme had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Author's contributions

Design of the study: Sophie de Visme and Martin Chalumeau

Data collection: Yaël Pinhas and Sophie de Visme

Data analyses: Sophie de Visme, Yaël Pinhas, Jérémie Cohen and Martin Chalumeau

Drafting of the manuscript: Sophie de Visme and Martin Chalumeau

Revising the protocol and critical review of the manuscript: Yaël Pinhas, Jérémie F. Cohen, Rachel Y. Moon, Floortje Kanits, Sabine Plancoulaine, Anne-Laure Sellier, Inge Harrewijn, Christèle Gras-Le Guen

Final approval of the version to be published: all authors

ABSTRACT (346/350 WORDS)

Importance: Rates of sudden unexpected death in infancy (SUDI) remain high in several high-income countries. Several studies reported rates of pictures of sleeping infants or infant sleeping environments that were highly inconsistent with safe infant sleep recommendations (SISRs) to prevent SUDI.

Objective: To provide robust and synthesized evidence to decision-makers involved in corrective actions, we systematically assessed the proportion of pictures that were inconsistent with SISRs in the visual exposome of infant caretakers.

Data Sources: In November 2023, we searched PubMed, Web of Science, and Google Scholar.

Study Selection: Eligible studies included were those reporting the quantitative evaluation of the inconsistency between one or several SISRs and pictures depicting sleeping infants or a sleeping environment intended for an infant in physical and digital public spaces.

Data Extraction and Synthesis: Data were extracted independently by 2 authors. The risk of bias of included studies was assessed with a customized version of Hoy's tool for prevalence studies. A random-effects logistic regression model was used to obtain summary estimates of proportions of pictures. Between-study heterogeneity was estimated with the I^2 statistic.

Main Outcomes(s) and Measure(s): The proportion of pictures inconsistent with one or several SISRs from the American Academy of Pediatrics.

Results: We screened 1,086 articles and included 7 studies conducted between 2008 and 2023 that analyzed pictures found in parenting magazines, online and print newspapers, baby diaper packaging, commercial stock photography websites, and Instagram. The overall risk of bias was deemed low. Among the 5,442 pictures depicting sleeping infants or infant sleep environments, the summary estimates of the proportion of inconsistencies with SISRs were

39% for a non-supine sleeping position, 5% for a soft sleeping surface, 8% for sharing the sleeping surface, 14% for an unsafe crib, 58% for soft objects or loose bedding, 17% for a covered head, and 85% for at least one SISR inconsistency. All summary estimates had significant between-study heterogeneity.

Conclusions and Relevance: Infant caretakers' visual exposome is greatly inconsistent with SISRs and could lead to dangerous practices, which should prompt actions from manufacturers, advertisers, newspaper and website editors, social media moderators, and legislators.

INTRODUCTION

Sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) and accidental suffocation and strangulation in bed are the most common causes of death found after investigation of sudden unexpected infant death (SUDI).¹⁻⁴ In the 1990s, identified risk factors for SIDS were a non-supine sleeping position and other factors related to the sleeping environment, including a non-firm sleep surface, lack of room sharing with parents, sharing the sleep surface with another person, a non-safe crib, soft objects or loose bedding, and head covering.⁵⁻¹¹ Although the prevention campaigns of the 1990s, consisting of safe infant sleep recommendations (SISRs), succeeded in reducing the incidence of SIDS by 50% to 80% depending on the country, since the early 2000s, the incidence has decreased only slightly or has even plateaued.¹²⁻¹⁴ In recent studies conducted in Australia, France, The Netherlands, and the United States, rates of parental practices for infant sleep that were inconsistent with SISRs ranged from 19% to 34%.¹⁵⁻¹⁹

Among the various factors reported to influence parents' and, more generally, infant caretakers' behaviors,²⁰ images act via the influence mechanisms of authority, social proof, and unity.²¹⁻²³ Images are well established as a modality better remembered than words, a phenomenon known as the "picture-superiority effect".²⁴⁻²⁷ The potential power of images to affect human health behavior led to their use in campaigns to prevent smoking,²⁸⁻³¹ alcohol consumption,³² sun exposure,³³ and obesity.^{34,35} Their effectiveness in influencing human behavior has led to legislation by some public authorities, for example, by the mandatory printing of a pictogram discouraging alcohol consumption during pregnancy on all alcohol bottles³⁶ or by banning images of babies on infant formula packaging in Europe to avoid promoting artificial feeding to the detriment of breastfeeding.³⁷

Several studies have evaluated the level of inconsistency between SISRs and pictures of sleeping infants or sleeping environments intended for an infant in the physical or digital visual public spaces. These studies reported variable but sometimes high rates of

inconsistency with SISRs.³⁸⁻⁴⁰ Together, these studies provide an overview of what can be referred to as “the visual exposome” of infant caretakers, that is, the sum of pictures to which infant caretakers are exposed and that may influence their knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding the implementation of SISRs. Of concern, these publications have not yet resulted in any corrective action by private or public stakeholders. To provide robust and synthesized evidence to public and private decision-makers who are involved in such corrective action, we systematically assessed the proportion of pictures of sleeping infants or infant sleep environments that were inconsistent with SISRs in the visual exposome of infant caretakers.

METHODS

This systematic review aimed to identify and synthesize studies evaluating the level of inconsistency between SISRs and pictures depicting sleeping infants or infant sleep environments in physical and digital visual public spaces. We followed the Center for Reviews and Dissemination’s guidance and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-analysis studies statement (PRISMA) to perform and report this study, respectively (**eTable 1**).^{41,42}

Information sources, search strategy, selection criteria and data collection process

In November 2023, we searched PubMed and Web of Science electronic databases, combining the following keywords in English language only: infant, baby, sleep, sleeping, safe, safety, unsafe, environment, recommendation, guideline, and guidance (**eText**). Two authors (YP and SV) independently assessed results by screening titles and abstracts, then full texts, to include relevant studies. In case of disagreement, consensus was reached with the help of a third author (MC). For all included studies, we examined their reference lists,

searched the Science Citation Index and Google Scholar for studies citing them, and examined their first 50 related articles in PubMed.

Eligible studies were those reporting the quantitative evaluation of the inconsistency between one or several SISRs by the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) (i.e., supine sleeping position, a firm sleep surface, room sharing with parents, not sharing the sleep surface with another person, use of a safety crib, no soft objects or loose bedding, and no head covering)^{43,44} and pictures depicting sleeping infants or a sleeping environment intended for an infant in the physical and digital visual public spaces (e.g., magazines, newspapers, billboards, advertising leaflet, packaging of childcare products as well as television, movies, social networks, websites). We chose not to study the use of a pacifier because this SISR is not mentioned in several European recommendations and is debated.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷

Two authors (SV and YP) independently extracted data on the characteristics of studies (design, setting, dates, countries), information needed for the risk of bias assessment, and numbers needed for the meta-analysis.. When data were missing or unclear in a study, the corresponding authors of the study were contacted for additional information.

Risk of bias assessment

The risk of bias of included studies was assessed with a customized version of Hoy's tool for prevalence studies.⁴⁸ Customization was required because Hoy's tool was originally developed for human participants rather than pictures in a non-finite space (see **eTable 2**). Seven of the 10 items of Hoy's tool were retained and adapted to our study question: 5 related to internal validity (data directly collected, acceptable case definition, reliable and valid evaluation, same mode of data collection, and appropriate numerator[s] and denominator[s] for the parameter of interest) and 2 to external validity (representativeness of the target "population" and random selection). Two authors (SV and MC) independently assessed each

risk-of-bias item. For each item and each study, a binary score was assigned: 0 for low risk and 1 for high risk. If an item had an unclear assessment, it was scored as high risk. As suggested,⁴⁹ the 7 unit scores were summed to obtain an overall score classified into 3 levels of risk of bias: low = 0-2; moderate = 3-5; and high = 6-7.

Statistical analysis

For the included studies, we described the settings and dates, the explored components of the SISRs and visual exposome, the risk of bias, and the results regarding the proportion of pictures inconsistent with SISRs. We performed a meta-analysis when 2 or more studies reported picture proportions for the same SISR, using a random-effects logistic regression model to obtain summary estimates of proportions and their 95% confidence intervals (CIs), as recommended.^{50,51} Forest plots were used to display the results. Between-study heterogeneity was estimated with the I^2 statistic⁵² and interpreted as per the Cochrane collaboration guidance.⁵² Statistical analyses involved using R 4.1.2 (R Core Team 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>) with the *meta* package (v5.5-0; Balduzzi, Rücker & Schwarzer, 2019).⁵³

RESULTS

Study characteristics

Among the 1,086 unique studies identified by our search strategy, 8 met our inclusion criteria, but one had to be excluded because the published results did not allow for a meta-analysis and the corresponding author did not respond to requests for additional information.⁵⁴ The 7 included studies (**Figure 1**)^{40,55–60} were conducted from 2008 to 2023 in the United

States,^{56,58–60} the United Kingdom,⁵⁷ The Netherlands,⁴⁰ and 11 European countries⁵⁵ (**Table 1**).

The 7 studies analyzed 9,618 pictures: 526 from print magazines “targeted to women of childbearing age”,⁵⁶ 559 from UK “popular” magazines or “UK sleeping baby images” found with a Google search,⁵⁷ 1,947 from the top 3 stock photo websites found with a Google search,⁵⁸ 41 from Google News archives of online and print newspapers that covered the 2016 new AAP sleep guidelines,⁵⁹ 5,400 from Instagram using hashtags relevant to infant sleeping practices and environments,⁶⁰ 514 from Instagram using hashtags relevant to infant sleeping practices and from accounts of Dutch companies or platforms related to infants,⁴⁰ and 631 from a Google search for baby diaper packages for sale online (**Table 1**).⁵⁵ Two studies included only pictures with a sleeping infant.^{40,57} Overall, 5,442 pictures depicted a sleeping environment intended for an infant, including 4,252 pictures with a sleeping infant (**Table 1**).

The 7 included studies reported data on the following SISRs (**Table 1**): supine sleeping position (n = 7 studies; 2,100 pictures), firm sleeping surface (n = 2 studies; 29 pictures), not sharing the sleep surface with another person (n = 7 studies; 688 pictures), safety crib (n = 2 studies; 494 pictures), no soft objects or loose bedding (n=5 studies; 2,901 pictures), no head covering (n = 3 studies; 554 pictures), and at least one inconsistency with SISRs (n = 3 studies; 1,769 pictures). No study evaluated the SISR related to room sharing with parents.

Risk of bias of included studies

With the modified Hoy’s tool, the overall risk of bias was deemed low for the 7 included studies (**eTable 3**).^{40,55–60} For the internal validity criteria, one study was judged at high risk of bias regarding the method of data collection used, which was not the same for all

pictures.⁵⁷ For the external validity criteria, all studies were judged at high risk of bias regarding the representativeness of the “target space”.

Level of inconsistency of pictures with SISRs

Among the pictures depicting sleeping infants, a summary estimated proportion of 39% (95% CI 25-56) showed infants in a non-supine sleeping position (**Figure 2A**), 5% (95% CI 2-16) infants sleeping on a soft surface (**Figure 2B**), and 8% (95% CI 4-16) infants sharing the sleep surface with another person (**Figure 2C**). Among the pictures depicting sleeping environments intended for an infant, with or without a sleeping infant, a summary estimated proportion of 14% (95% CI 4-39) showed an unsafe crib (**Figure 3A**), 58% (95% CI 38-76) included the presence of soft objects or loose bedding (**Figure 3B**), and 17% (95% CI 15-20) showed the infant’s head covered (**Figure 3C**); 85% (95% CI 66-94) had at least one inconsistency with SISRs (**Figure 3D**). All summary estimates had a considerable between-study heterogeneity ($I^2 > 99%$, $p < 0.01$).

DISCUSSION

Main results

In this first systematic review and meta-analysis of the proportion of pictures depicting a sleeping environment intended for an infant, with or without a sleeping infant, in the physical and digital visual public spaces, the summary estimate of the proportion of pictures that were inconsistent with at least one SISR was 85%. These pictures depicted infants in environments that have been shown in epidemiological studies to greatly increase SIDS risk. In particular, 39% of pictures were inconsistent with the back-to-sleep recommendation, with the odds of SIDS being 4.9 times increased (95% CI 3.6–6.6)⁶¹ when a non-supine position is used and

the back-to-sleep campaigns being the major drivers for the decrease in SIDS incidence in the 1990s and early 2000s. The other inconsistencies we assessed had picture proportion estimates of 5% to 58% and portrayed environments that are well established to increase the risk of SIDS: the use of a non-firm sleeping surface, sharing a sleep surface with another person,⁶²⁻⁶⁴ using a non-safe crib, using soft objects or loose bedding, and head covering. Although room-sharing has long been recognized as a protective factor against SIDS, with a 20% to 50% risk reduction,^{65,66} we found no study that analyzed it, probably because this recommendation is difficult to assess from pictures mainly focusing on the infant and the infant's sleep surface.

Limitations

The first limitation is that the search strategy used only 3 electronic databases and English keywords, and some studies may have been missed, but we tried to minimize their numbers by searching Google Scholar, a multi-database search engine, for studies citing included studies. Second, for reasons described previously, we could not include one eligible study by Kreth *et al.*, who analyzed the level of inconsistency of printed advertisements from parenting magazines with the SISRs from the AAP.⁵⁴ In this study, performed in 2015, 35% of the 428 pictures analyzed depicted infant sleep environments inconsistent with SISRs, in line with the results of the present meta-analysis. Third, included studies more often analyzed the digital (n = 7) than physical (n = 3) visual exposome, probably because digital studies are easier to conduct. Furthermore, the included studies did not analyze several static media such as specialized newspapers or magazines, billboards, or posters on public transportation and videos in television, movie theaters, or the Internet (especially social networks). Fourth, although the 7 included studies were considered to have low overall risk of bias, the representativeness of the target visual spaces studied was evaluated at high risk of bias for all

7 studies. The adaptation of Hoy's tool is also a limitation but was necessary given the non-finite nature of the visual exposome. Fifth, for some SISRs (e.g. a firm sleeping surface) the number of inconsistencies was small, which resulted in a large confidence interval of the summary estimate. Finally, we found considerable between-study heterogeneity, which can be explained by the small number of studies included as compared with the large number of potential sources of variation including the countries studied, the study periods, and the variability of visual public spaces evaluated. It can also be explained by the partial unsuitability of use of the I^2 statistic to interpret in prevalence meta-analyses because it does not provide direct information about the distribution of effects.⁶⁷ The strength and direction of the bias related to these limitations are difficult to anticipate, and the estimates provided by the meta-analyses should be considered as general indicators rather than a precise evaluation of the entire visual exposome of infant caretakers.

Implications

Worldwide, previous SIDS prevention campaigns mainly focused on informing infant caretakers about SISRs. In one of the studies included in the present systematic review, Kamra *et al.* showed that 23% of pictures associated with the media coverage of the 2016 SISRs from the AAP depicted sleeping infants in a non-supine sleeping position.⁵⁹ This is an issue because pictures that are not aligned with the 2016 SISRs can trigger an illusory truth effect, the finding that individuals tend to believe repeatedly presented false information as true.^{68,69} Thus, academic actors must now need to understand that producing evidence-based SISRs is not sufficient to deliver an adequate message to infant caretakers. Academic actors should embrace their societal responsibility to advocate for a safe visual exposome that conveys messages that promote SISRs and positively modify infant caretakers' behaviors. Recently, several major US retailers have stopped selling weighted infant sleep products that

are inconsistent with SISRs.⁷⁰ Along with the results of our systematic review, these concrete actions are an example of potential future steps that public health decision-makers, manufacturers, advertisers, newspaper and website editors, social media moderators, and legislators can take in terms of internal policies, quality standards, and legislation. As has been demonstrated by successful coordinated campaigns to decrease tobacco and alcohol consumption, these type of interventions will optimize the visual exposome of infant caretakers and help to spread behavior consistent with SISRs.

Conclusion

In this systematic review and meta-analysis, the infant caretaker visual exposome was greatly inconsistent with SISRs. Internal policies, quality standards and legislation can be used to create pictures of sleeping environments intended for an infant, with or without depicting a sleeping infant, in the physical and digital visual public spaces that are consistent with SISRs. The prevention of SUDI requires action from manufacturers, advertisers, newspaper and website editors, social media moderators, and legislators to minimize infant caretakers' high exposure to pictures that may lead to dangerous practices and infant deaths.

REFERENCES

1. Krous HF, Beckwith JB, Byard RW, et al. Sudden infant death syndrome and unclassified sudden infant deaths: a definitional and diagnostic approach. *Pediatrics* 2004; 114: 234–238.
2. Blair PS, Byard RW, Fleming PJ. Sudden unexpected death in infancy (SUDI): suggested classification and applications to facilitate research activity. *Forensic Sci Med Pathol* 2012; 8: 312–315.
3. Shapiro-Mendoza CK, Camperlengo L, Ludvigsen R, et al. Classification system for the sudden unexpected infant death case registry and its application. *Pediatrics* 2014; 134: e210-19.
4. Taylor BJ, Garstang J, Engelberts A, et al. International comparison of sudden unexpected death in infancy rates using a newly proposed set of cause-of-death codes. *Arch Dis Child* 2015; 100: 1018–1023.
5. de Jonge GA, Engelberts AC. Cot deaths and sleeping position. *Lancet* 1989; 2: 1149–1150.
6. Mitchell EA, Engelberts AC, Bettelheim KA, et al. Sleeping position and cot deaths. *Lancet* 1991; 338: 192.
7. Fleming PJ, Blair PS, Bacon C, et al. Environment of infants during sleep and risk of the sudden infant death syndrome: results of 1993-5 case-control study for confidential inquiry into stillbirths and deaths in infancy. *BMJ* 1996; 313: 191–5.
8. Leach CE, Blair PS, Fleming PJ, et al. Epidemiology of SIDS and explained sudden infant deaths. CESDI SUDI Research Group. *Pediatrics* 1999; 104: e43.
9. Blair PS, Mitchell EA, Heckstall-Smith EMA, et al. Head covering - a major modifiable risk factor for sudden infant death syndrome: a systematic review. *Arch Dis Child* 2008; 93: 778–783.
10. Fleming PJ, Blair PS, Pease A. Sudden unexpected death in infancy: aetiology, pathophysiology, epidemiology and prevention in 2015. *Arch Dis Child* 2015; 100: 984–988.
11. Moon RY, Hauck FR. Risk Factors and Theories. In: Duncan JR, Byard RW (eds) *SIDS Sudden Infant and Early Childhood Death: The Past, the Present and the Future*. Adelaide (AU): University of Adelaide Press, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK513386/> (2018, accessed 19 June 2020).
12. Hauck F, Tanabe K. International trends in sudden infant death syndrome and other sudden unexpected deaths in infancy: need for better diagnostic standardization. *Curr Pediatr Rev* 2010; 6: 95–101.
13. Task force on sudden infant death syndrome, Moon RY. SIDS and other sleep-related infant deaths: expansion of recommendations for a safe infant sleeping environment. *Pediatrics* 2011; 128: 1030–1039.

14. de Visme S, Chalumeau M, Levieux K, et al. National variations in recent trends of sudden unexpected infant death rate in Western Europe. *J Pediatr* 2020; 226: 179–85.
15. Colson ER, Geller NL, Heeren T, et al. Factors associated with choice of infant sleep position. *Pediatrics* 2017; 140: e20170596.
16. Konijnendijk AAJ, Engelberts AC, L’Hoir MP, et al. [Eleventh safe sleeping survey in the Netherlands: parents’ habits concerning infant sleep position and location]. *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk* 2018; 162: D2366.
17. Cole R, Young J, Kearney L, et al. Awareness of infant safe sleep messages and associated care practices: findings from an Australian cohort of families with young infants. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021; 5: e000972.
18. Parker JJ, Simon C, Bendelow A, et al. Fathers, Breastfeeding, and Infant Sleep Practices: Findings From a State-Representative Survey. *Pediatrics* 2023; 152: e2022061008.
19. Cinelli H, Lelong N, Le Ray C. *Enquête Nationale Périnatale*: Rapport 2021, <https://enp.inserm.fr/>.
20. Pease A, Garstang JJ, Ellis C, et al. Decision-making for the infant sleep environment among families with children considered to be at risk of sudden unexpected death in infancy: a systematic review and qualitative metasynthesis. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021; 5: e000983.
21. Cialdini RB. *Influence, new and expanded: The psychology of persuasion*. Harper Business, <https://www.harpercollins.com/products/influence-new-and-expanded-robert-b-cialdini> (2021, accessed 20 February 2023).
22. Houts PS, Doak CC, Doak LG, et al. The role of pictures in improving health communication: A review of research on attention, comprehension, recall, and adherence. *Patient Educ Couns* 2006; 61: 173–190.
23. Schubbe D, Scalia P, Yen RW, et al. Using pictures to convey health information: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects on patient and consumer health behaviors and outcomes. *Patient Educ Couns* 2020; 103: 1935–1960.
24. Grady CL, McIntosh AR, Rajah MN, et al. The effects of age on the neural correlates of episodic encoding. *Cerebral Cortex* 1999; 9: 805–814.
25. Paivio A, Csapo K. Picture superiority in free recall: Imagery or dual coding? *Cognitive Psychology* 1973; 5: 176–206.
26. Shepard RN. Recognition memory for words, sentences, and pictures. *J Verbal Learning Verbal Behav* 1967; 6: 156–163.
27. Whitehouse AJO, Maybery M, Durkin KA. The development of the picture-superiority effect. *Br J Dev Psychol* 2006; 24: 767–773.
28. Hammond D, Fong GT, McDonald PW, et al. Impact of the graphic Canadian warning labels on adult smoking behaviour. *Tobacco Control* 2003; 12: 391–395.

29. Fong GT, Hammond D, Hitchman SC. The impact of pictures on the effectiveness of tobacco warnings. *Bull World Health Organ* 2009; 87: 640–643.
30. Miller CL, Quester PG, Hill DJ, et al. Smokers' recall of Australian graphic cigarette packet warnings & awareness of associated health effects, 2005-2008. *BMC Public Health* 2011; 11: 1–11.
31. Cantrell J, Vallone DM, Thrasher JF, et al. Impact of tobacco-related health warning labels across socioeconomic, race and ethnic groups: Results from a randomized web-based experiment. *PLoS ONE* 2013; 8: e52206.
32. Giesbrecht N, Reisdorfer E, Rios I. Alcohol health warning labels: A rapid review with action recommendations. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022; 19: 11676.
33. McWhirter JE, Hoffman-Goetz L. Systematic review of population-based studies on the impact of images on UV attitudes and behaviours. *Health Promot Int* 2015; 30: 397–410.
34. Taillie LS, Hall MG, Popkin BM, et al. Experimental studies of front-of-package nutrient warning labels on sugar-sweetened beverages and ultra-processed foods: A scoping review. *Nutrients* 2020; 12: 569.
35. An R, Liu J, Liu R, et al. Impact of sugar-sweetened beverage warning labels on consumer behaviors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Prev Med* 2021; 60: 115–126.
36. Guillemont J, Léon C. [Alcohol and pregnancy: general public's knowledge in 2007 and changes in three years]. *Evolutions*, <https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/determinants-de-sante/alcool/alcool-et-grossesse-connaissances-du-grand-public-en-2007-et-evolutions-en-trois-ans2> (2008, accessed 14 November 2022).
37. Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2016/127 of 25 September 2015 supplementing Regulation (EU) No 609/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the specific compositional and information requirements for infant formula and follow-on formula and as regards requirements on information relating to infant and young child feeding (Text with EEA relevance). 2016.
38. Goodstein MH, Lagon E, Bell T, et al. Stock photographs do not comply with infant safe sleep guidelines. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2018; 57: 403–409.
39. Chin S, Carlin R, Mathews A, et al. Infant safe sleep practices as portrayed on Instagram: Observational study. *JMIR Pediatr Parent* 2021; 4: e27297.
40. Kanits F, L'Hoir MP, Boere-Boonekamp MM, et al. #sleepingbaby on Instagram: Nonadherence of images to safe sleeping advice and implications for prevention of Sudden Unexpected Death in Infancy. *PLoS One* 2023; 18: e0290580.
41. Tacconelli E. Systematic reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2010; 10: 226.
42. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021; 372: n71.

43. Moon RY, Task force on sudden infant death syndrome, Darnall RA, et al. SIDS and other sleep-related infant deaths: Evidence base for 2016 updated recommendations for a safe infant sleeping environment. *Pediatrics* 2016; 138: e20162940.
44. Moon RY, Carlin RF, Hand I, et al. Sleep-related infant deaths: updated 2022 recommendations for reducing infant deaths in the sleep environment. *Pediatrics* 2022; 150: e2022057990.
45. Warren JJ, Levy SM, Kirchner HL, et al. Pacifier use and the occurrence of otitis media in the first year of life. *Pediatr Dent* 2001; 23: 103–107.
46. Vogel A, Hutchison B, Mitchell E. The impact of pacifier use on breastfeeding: A prospective cohort study. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2001; 37: 58–63.
47. Tolppola O, Renko M, Sankilampi U, et al. Pacifier use and breastfeeding in term and preterm newborns—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Pediatr* 2022; 181: 3421–3428.
48. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, et al. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2012; 65: 934–939.
49. Brennan CJ, Roberts C, Cole JC. Prevalence of occupational moral injury and post-traumatic embitterment disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2024; 14: e071776.
50. Schwarzer G, Chemaitelly H, Abu Raddad LJ, et al. Seriously misleading results using inverse of Freeman-Tukey double arcsine transformation in meta-analysis of single proportions. *Res Synth Methods* 2019; 10: 476–483.
51. Lin L, Chu H. Meta-analysis of proportions using generalized linear mixed models. *Epidemiology* 2020; 31: 713–717.
52. Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.3 (updated February 2022), <https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/> (2022, accessed 20 October 2022).
53. Balduzzi S, Rucker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. *Evid Based Ment Health* 2019; 22: 153–160.
54. Kreth M, Shikany T, Lenker C, et al. Safe sleep guideline adherence in nationwide marketing of infant cribs and products. *Pediatrics* 2017; 139: e20161729.
55. de Visme S, Korevaar DA, Gras-Le Guen C, et al. Inconsistency between pictures on baby diaper packaging in Europe and safe infant sleep recommendations. *J Pediatr* 2024; 264: 113763.
56. Joyner BL, Gill-Bailey C, Moon RY. Infant sleep environments depicted in magazines targeted to women of childbearing age. *Pediatrics* 2009; 124: e416-422.
57. Epstein J, Jolly C, Mullan L. A review of images of sleeping infants in UK magazines and on the internet. *Community Pract* 2011; 84: 23–26.

58. Goodstein MH, Lagon E, Bell T, et al. Stock photographs do not comply with infant safe sleep guidelines. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2018; 57: 403–409.
59. Kamra P, Pitt MB. Sleeping on the job: unsafe infant sleep environments depicted in the news coverage of the 2016 AAP safe sleep recommendations. *J Commun Healthc* 2018; 11: 223–227.
60. Chin S, Carlin R, Mathews A, et al. Infant safe sleep practices as portrayed on Instagram: Observational study. *JMIR Pediatr Parent* 2021; 4: e27297.
61. Gilbert R, Salanti G, Harden M, et al. Infant sleeping position and the sudden infant death syndrome: systematic review of observational studies and historical review of recommendations from 1940 to 2002. *Int J Epidemiol* 2005; 34: 874–887.
62. Fleming PJ, Blair PS, Bacon C, et al. Environment of infants during sleep and risk of the sudden infant death syndrome: results of 1993-5 case-control study for confidential inquiry into stillbirths and deaths in infancy. Confidential Enquiry into Stillbirths and Deaths Regional Coordinators and Researchers. *BMJ* 1996; 313: 191–195.
63. Hauck FR, Herman SM, Donovan M, et al. Sleep environment and the risk of sudden infant death syndrome in an urban population: the Chicago Infant Mortality Study. *Pediatrics* 2003; 111: 1207–1214.
64. Vennemann MM, Hense H-W, Bajanowski T, et al. Bed sharing and the risk of sudden infant death syndrome: can we resolve the debate? *J Pediatr* 2012; 160: 44-48.e2.
65. Scragg RK, Mitchell EA, Stewart AW, et al. Infant room-sharing and prone sleep position in sudden infant death syndrome. New Zealand Cot Death Study Group. *Lancet* 1996; 347: 7–12.
66. Carpenter RG, Irgens LM, Blair PS, et al. Sudden unexplained infant death in 20 regions in Europe: case control study. *Lancet* 2004; 363: 185–191.
67. Migliavaca CB, Stein C, Colpani V, et al. Meta-analysis of prevalence: I2 statistic and how to deal with heterogeneity. *Res Synth Methods* 2022; 13: 363–367.
68. Fazio LK, Brashier NM, Payne BK, et al. Knowledge does not protect against illusory truth. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 2015; 144: 993–1002.
69. Ozubko JD, Fugelsang J. Remembering makes evidence compelling: retrieval from memory can give rise to the illusion of truth. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn* 2011; 37: 270–276.
70. Schering S, Writer S. AAP leaders call decision to pull harmful weighted sleep products a ‘strong first step’, <https://publications.aap.org/aapnews/news/28768/AAP-leaders-call-decision-to-pull-harmful-weighted> (2024, accessed 29 May 2024).

FIGURES & TABLES

Figure 1 PRISMA flow diagram of the systematic review.

Figure 2 Forest plots of proportions of pictures depicting (A) a sleeping infant in a non-supine sleeping position, (B) a sleeping infant on a soft surface, and (C) a sleeping infant sharing the sleep surface with another person.

Figure 3 Forest plots of proportions of pictures depicting (A) a sleeping infant in an unsafe crib, (B) a sleeping environment with or without an infant, depicting soft objects or loose bedding, (C) a sleeping infant with the head covered, and (D) a sleeping infant with at least one inconsistency with SISRs.

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies.

Author (year) by date of publication	Country	Subject of study	Study period	Number of pictures evaluated	Number of pictures depicting a sleeping environment intended for an infant	Number of pictures with a sleeping infant	Safe infant sleep recommendations (SISRs) assessed						
							Supine sleeping position	Firm sleeping surface	Not sharing the sleep surface with another person	Safety crib	No soft objects or loose bedding	No head covering	At least one inconsistency with SISRs
Joyner <i>et al</i> (2009)	USA	Printed magazines	2008	526	391	122	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Epstein <i>et al</i> (2011)	UK	Printed magazines and Internet	2009-11	559	559	559	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Goodstein <i>et al</i> (2018)	USA	Stock photo websites	2017	1,947	1,867	1,590	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
Kamra <i>et al</i> (2018)	USA	Online and print newspapers	2016	41	39	22	✓		✓		✓		✓
Chin <i>et al</i> (2021)	USA	Instagram	2020	5,400	1,563	1,134	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Kanits <i>et al</i> (2023)	The Netherlands	Instagram	2022	514	514	514	✓		✓		✓		
de Visme <i>et al</i> (2023)	11 European countries	Internet	2022-23	631	209	311	✓				✓		✓
Total (number of pictures, studies)				9,618	5,442	4,252	7	2	6	2	5	3	3

ONLINE-ONLY SUPPLEMENTS

eTable 1 PRISMA 2020 Checklist

eTable 2 Risk of bias assessment items (adapted from Hoy *et al.*, J Clin Epidemiol 2012)

eTable 3 Risk of bias assessment results

eText Search box in PubMed

Figure 1 PRISMA flow diagram of the systematic review.




Figure 2 Forest plots of proportions of pictures depicting (A) a sleeping infant in a non-supine sleeping position, (B) a sleeping infant on a soft surface, and (C) a sleeping infant sharing the sleep surface with another person.






Figure 3 Forest plots of proportions of pictures depicting (A) a sleeping infant in an unsafe crib, (B) a sleeping environment with or without an infant, depicting soft objects or loose bedding, (C) a sleeping infant with the head covered, and (D) a sleeping infant with at least one inconsistency with SISRs.


A




B



C



D



*SISRs : safe infant sleep recommendations