

## **Psychological impact of infectious disease outbreaks on pregnant women: Rapid evidence review**

Samantha K. Brooks, Dale Weston, Neil Greenberg

Corresponding author: Dr Samantha K. Brooks, Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London, Weston Education Centre, London, SE5 9RJ, UK. Email: [samantha.k.brooks@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:samantha.k.brooks@kcl.ac.uk)

### **Abstract**

Infectious disease outbreaks can be distressing for everyone, especially so for those deemed to be particularly vulnerable, such as pregnant women who have been named a high-risk group in the current COVID-19 pandemic. This rapid review aimed to summarise existing literature on the psychological impact of infectious disease outbreaks on women who were pregnant at the time of the outbreak. In April 2020 five databases were searched for relevant literature and main findings were extracted. Thirteen papers were included in the review. The following themes were identified: negative emotional states; living with uncertainty; concerns about infection; concerns about and uptake of prophylaxis or treatment; disrupted routines; non-pharmaceutical protective behaviours; social support; demands from others; financial and occupational concerns; disrupted expectations of birth, prenatal care and postnatal care, and; sources of information. Results showed that pregnant women have unique needs during infectious disease outbreaks and could benefit from: up-to-date, consistent information and guidance; appropriate support and advice from healthcare professionals, particularly with regards to the risks and benefits of prophylaxis and treatment; virtual support groups, and; designating locations or staff specifically for pregnant women.

### **Keywords**

Coronavirus, COVID-19, disease outbreaks, infectious diseases, mental health, pregnancy, SARS, swine flu

## **Introduction**

Infectious disease outbreaks pose a major health risk across the globe. The outbreak of coronavirus COVID-19 was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organization on March 11<sup>th</sup> 2020 and has – as of April 3<sup>rd</sup> 2020 - seen over a million confirmed cases and over 58,000 related deaths worldwide (Rawlinson, 2020). Such outbreaks are understandably distressing for many people; there is a wealth of research to suggest a substantial negative psychological impact of pandemics (Gardner & Moallem, 2015; Perrin et al., 2009).

There is historical evidence of pregnant women being classified as a high-risk group during pandemics; for example, pregnancy was associated with poor clinical outcomes and high mortality rates during the H1N1 ‘swine flu’ pandemic (Mosby et al., 2011) and the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) pandemic (Lam et al., 2004; World Health Organization, 2010). Indeed, during the COVID-19 outbreak questions have also been raised about the particular risks for pregnant women and their unborn babies (Schwartz & Graham, 2020). A review of the limited data available so far (Dashraath et al., 2020) suggests that COVID-19 outcomes for mothers are more promising than for previous outbreaks. They report relatively low foetal complications associated with infection and report that 46/48 neonates born to COVID-19 infected mothers have not tested positive. They note that the majority of these women acquired COVID-19 in the third trimester; there is currently no data on outcomes for infections acquired in early pregnancy. Despite this promising early data, more research is needed to ascertain the true risk of COVID-19 for pregnant women and their unborn babies. As a result of this uncertainty, on March 16<sup>th</sup> 2020 the UK government announced that

pregnant women were considered a ‘vulnerable group’ who should be shielded from the virus (Jarvis, 2020; Public Health England, 2020).

Although there is a considerable body of literature on the clinical course and outcomes of being diagnosed with an infectious disease during pregnancy, comparatively little attention has been paid to the potential psychological impact such outbreaks can have on pregnant women, regardless of their infection status. However, it is likely that pregnant women may experience particularly high levels of distress during an infectious disease outbreak for several reasons. Firstly, they may have serious concerns about their own health, given the physiological changes that occur during pregnancy which may make them more susceptible to, or more severely affected by, infectious diseases (Jamieson et al., 2006a). They may also have concerns about the health of their unborn babies. Additionally, public health recommendations during infectious disease outbreaks often involve the use of novel vaccines and medications for prophylaxis and treatment, meaning that pregnant women are faced with the dilemma of either not complying with recommendations - thus putting themselves at risk of infection - or using novel medical treatments with little evidence available on the impact they might have on an unborn baby. Pregnant women may also experience distress due to the disruption of routine prenatal care and delivery: for example, women who gave birth in Hong Kong during the SARS outbreak were discharged as soon as possible after delivery and all prenatal services considered non-essential were suspended (Jamieson et al., 2006b), and hospitals in Taiwan saw a significant reduction in length of stay after birth (Lee et al., 2005). Similarly, during the H1N1 pandemic, the World Health Organization (2010) provided guidelines to programme managers and clinicians suggesting that both antenatal clinic visits and time spent in hospital by mother and baby immediately post-birth be reduced to the minimum required.

The COVID-19 pandemic may also lead to pregnant women becoming concerned because of social distancing and self-isolation recommended by governments worldwide. Rasmussen et al. (2008) point out that, even if medical appointments are reduced to the minimum possible, pregnant women continue to require both outpatient prenatal care and inpatient delivery services during a pandemic; in the context of COVID-19 this necessitates pregnant women leaving the safety of self-isolation. Additionally, research suggests that lack of control, or powerlessness over decisions relating to childbirth, can be traumatic (Patterson et al., 2018) raising concerns about how women giving birth during the COVID-19 pandemic will cope with decisions over the birthing process being out of their control. Furthermore, the COVID-19-related restrictions on hospital visitation procedures may be distressing for pregnant women; in many countries (such as the UK) women are being requested to attend all prenatal appointments alone (Oppenheim, 2020), and in some countries (including Poland and China) are even being required to give birth alone (Kahn & Cristoferi, 2020; Stevenson, 2020). However, familial support during the birthing process (including labour, delivery, and post-partum) is considered essential for women's wellbeing (American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, 2017) and the lack of such support may be difficult to cope with.

Given the relative dearth of research on the subject, the current review represents the first attempt to systematically examine literature on the psychological impact of previous infectious disease outbreaks on pregnant women. Specifically, the two main aims of the review were to consider i) what are the psychological outcomes associated with being pregnant during an infectious disease outbreak and ii) what factors are associated with these psychological outcomes, in order to gain an idea of how to reduce any negative psychological outcomes for pregnant women.

## **Method**

This research was carried out as a rapid evidence review in response to the COVID-19 outbreak of 2019-2020. Rapid reviews follow the general guidelines for traditional systematic reviews but are simplified (e.g. not searching grey literature; not conducting quality appraisal of the included studies; not translating foreign-language papers) in order to produce evidence rapidly. Rapid reviews are recommended during circumstances where policy-makers urgently need evidence synthesis as quickly as possible in order to inform public health guidelines (World Health Organization, 2017).

### *Search strategy*

The following databases were searched: Medline, PsycInfo, Embase, Global Health and Web of Science. All were searched from inception to the date of the searches (1 April 2020).

Search terms were:

1. pregnant OR pregnanc\*
2. psychological OR mental health OR trauma OR stress OR distress OR anxiety OR wellbeing OR well-being OR panic OR depress\*
3. pandemic\* OR disease outbreak\* OR SARS OR severe acute respiratory syndrome OR swine flu OR H1N1 OR avian influenza OR bird flu OR H5N1 OR Ebola OR MERS OR Middle East respiratory syndrome OR Zika OR coronavirus OR COVID-19
4. 1 AND 2 AND 3

### *Selection criteria*

To be included in the review, studies had to: i) report primary data; ii) be published in peer-reviewed journals; iii) be written in English; and iv) report on any psychological effects of

emerging infectious disease outbreaks on women who were pregnant at the time of the outbreak. Infectious disease outbreaks included SARS, MERS and Ebola. Zika was also considered a relevant outbreak for review because, despite the spread of the infection being different (i.e. primarily through mosquito bites rather than spread from person to person) this outbreak had a particular impact on pregnant women as it was associated with birth defects (Chakhtoura et al., 2019). The review focused on emerging infectious diseases (that is, one that appears for the first time in a population or rapidly increases in incidence or geographic range; World Health Organization, 2014), therefore studies looking at seasonal influenza were excluded.

### *Screening*

The authors ran the search strategy and downloaded citations from all databases to EndNote version X9 (Thomson Reuters, New York, United States) where duplicates were automatically removed. Titles and then abstracts were screened for their relevance to the selection criteria by one author (SKB). Full-texts of all papers remaining after abstract screening were downloaded and assessed to decide whether they met all inclusion criteria. Reference lists of all included papers were hand-searched.

### *Data extraction and synthesis*

Spreadsheets were created in order to systematically extract the following data from papers: authors, year of publication, country of study, design, infectious disease outbreak studied, number of participants, socio-demographic information on participants, measures used, and key results. The results of the studies were synthesised by one author (SKB) using thematic analysis to code the data and organise into themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

## Results

A total of 1694 citations were found in the initial search and 560 duplicates removed. 999 papers were excluded based on title, 115 excluded based on abstract, and nine excluded after assessing full-texts. Two additional papers were found via hand-searching, leaving a total of thirteen papers included in the review. Studies were international, including three from China (Dodgson et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2006; Ng et al., 2013; one with participants from Brazil, Puerto Rico and the USA (Linde & Siqueira, 2018); one with participants from both Scotland and Australia (Lohm et al., 2014); three from the USA (Lyerly et al., 2012; Lynch et al., 2012; Steelfisher et al., 2011); one from Brazil (Meireles et al., 2017); one from Turkey (Ozer et al., 2010); one from Canada (Sakaguchi et al., 2011); one from Japan (Sasaki et al., 2013); and one from both Scotland and Poland (Sim et al., 2011). Three focused on the SARS outbreak, eight papers on H1N1 and two papers on the Zika virus.

An overview of study characteristics is presented in Table I, while a detailed summary of the thematic analysis is presented in Table II. It should be noted that there is some overlap between themes; specifically, ‘negative emotional states’ in general emerged as a theme, but many papers also referred to negative emotions due to specific factors, which have also been classified as themes (for example, ‘concern about risk of infection’ is a negative emotional state, but also a theme in itself).

Table I. Study characteristics of included articles

<b>Study</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Disease outbreak</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Measures</b>
Dodgson et al.,	China (Hong	SARS	8 women who	Interviews

2010	Kong)		delivered healthy babies during the outbreak; mean age 34.3 (range 28-38)	about experiences of being pregnant and delivering their baby during the SARS epidemic
Lee et al., 2006	China (Hong Kong)	SARS	235 women pregnant during the outbreak compared to historical cohort of 939 recruited a year before; mean age 29.9 (SARS cohort), 29.6 (pre-SARS cohort)	Beck Depression Inventory, Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, Medical Outcomes Study Social Support Survey. SARS cohort also completed a 41-item questionnaire on worries, perceived risk and behavioural

				responses to SARS
Linde & Siqueira, 2018	Brazil, Puerto Rico & USA	Zika	18 women: 5 had a recently born baby, 6 were pregnant, 5 were planning to get pregnant, 3 had no plans to get pregnant. Age range 22-41	Interviews about personal and family life, perceptions and knowledge of Zika, views on reproductive health and rights regarding the Zika syndrome
Lohm et al., 2014	Australia & Scotland	H1N1	14 pregnant women aged between 20-40	Interviews and focus groups about experiences with H1N1 and the public health response to H1N1
Lyerly et al., 2012	USA	H1N1	22 pregnant women who had participated in the H1N1	Interviews about experiences of decision-

			vaccine trials; mean age 31, range 19-39	making around participation in the H1N1 vaccine trial
Lynch et al., 2012	USA	H1N1	144 women: 43.4% were pregnant and 56.6% were within 6 months post-partum; 26.4% were aged 18-24, 61.8% aged 25- 34 and 11.8% aged 35-44	Focus groups covering perceptions and awareness of H1N1, influenza vaccinations and antiviral medicines, and trusted sources of information
Meireles et al., 2017	Brazil	Zika	14 pregnant women: 6 in first trimester, 5 in second trimester, 3 in third trimester; mean age 33.4, range 28-40	Focus groups with questions on feelings and experiences around being pregnant during the Zika outbreak
Ng et al. (2013)	China (Hong Kong)	SARS	980 pregnant women of at	Study-specific survey asking

			least 16 weeks gestation; 0.6% aged under 18, 80.7% aged 18-35, 18.7% over 35	about socio-demographics, SARS knowledge, socio-economic impact of SARS and Chinese version of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory
Ozer et al. (2010)	Turkey	H1N1	314 pregnant women; 27.4% in first trimester, 33.8% in second, 38.8% in third	48-question study-specific survey covering vaccination status, factors affecting decisions about vaccinating, H1N1 vaccine side effects and beliefs about H1N1 vaccination campaign

				conspiracy
Sakaguchi et al., 2011	Canada	H1N1	130 pregnant women who called counselling service Motherisk for counselling regarding the safety of H1N1 vaccine; median age 33, range 21-45; 31.5% in first trimester at time of call, 46.2% in second, 22.3% in third	Study-specific questionnaire including questions on vaccination status, decision-making, and factors that precipitated call to Motherisk
Sasaki et al., 2013	Japan	H1N1	109 pregnant women attending prenatal classes	Study-specific questionnaire measuring anxiety, satisfaction with information supplied,

				reasons for anxiety, prophylaxis interventions practiced
Sim et al., 2011	Scotland & Poland	H1N1	10 pregnant women	Interviews covering socio-economic background, migration history, family circumstances, general health during pregnancy, views of healthcare received during pregnancy, perceptions and experience of H1N1 influenza and the vaccine, sources of information

				about H1N1 and the vaccine, government responses to the pandemic, and decision-making about the H1N1 vaccine
Steelfisher et al., 2011	USA	H1N1	514 pregnant women	Study-specific survey with approximately 84 questions relating to attitudes and experiences associated with the H1N1 vaccine

Table II. Themes emerging from included studies

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
Negative emotional states	Dodgson et al. (2010)	Participants reported frustration, anxiety, and difficulty sleeping.
	Lee et al. (2006)	<p>State anxiety was higher in pregnant women (mean score 37.2) during the SARS pandemic than a comparative pre-SARS group (mean score 35.5, <math>p=0.02</math>) while no significant difference was found in trait anxiety scores.</p> <p>The SARS cohort were slightly more likely to score highly on depression, but not significantly.</p> <p>18.4% of women felt uneasy even at home due to SARS, 54.7% felt a lack of security, and 48.3% a loss of freedom.</p> <p>Participants reported worries and fears, primarily regarding the risk of infection (see ‘concerns about risk of infection’ theme).</p>
	Linde & Siqueira (2018)	Participants reported sadness, uneasiness, fear, helplessness, panic, tension, responsibility, shame, failure, guilt due to pressure of having a healthy child, perceived loss of control of their own lives.
	Lohm et al.	Participants reported emotional stress.

	(2014)	
	Meireles et al. (2017)	<p>Participants reported a negative impact on body image due to not being able to show their bump or wear dresses that emphasised their pregnancy, and having to cover up in clothing that made them feel constrained.</p> <p>Participants felt that others (e.g. their partners and parents) placed demands of them regarding prevention of Zika, leaving them feeling under pressure.</p> <p>Participants reported anxiety around the impact of the virus – see ‘concerns about risk of infection’ sub-theme.</p>
	Ng et al. (2013)	<p>Mean STAI-state anxiety score was 50.4 (range 23-80). 65.2% experienced moderate anxiety, 22.6% high anxiety, and 12.2% low level anxiety. Age, marital status, gestational age, parity, education level and gestational complications were not significantly associated with anxiety level but there was a significant relationship between state anxiety score and extent of socioeconomic impact (<math>p &lt; 0.01</math>) where higher anxiety was associated with higher socioeconomic impact.</p>
	Sasaki et al. (2013)	<p>96.3% felt concerned or strongly concerned about pandemic. Nearly all who felt anxious cited their pregnancy as the main reason for this.</p>

Living with uncertainty	Dodgson et al. (2010)	Participants reported doubt and confusion about what was a true threat to themselves and their babies, often due to conflicting and constantly changing messages in the media. All reported receiving no recommendations from doctors regarding what they should and should not be doing during pregnancy and post-partum; all but two found this frustrating and said it added to their anxiety about their baby's safety.
	Linde & Siqueira (2018)	Participants reported uncertainty and mistrust concerning unknown factors surrounding Zika, contributing to feelings of helplessness and distress.
	Lohm et al. (2014)	Participants reported that the unknown effects of both infection and vaccination against infection increased their emotional stress.
	Meireles et al. (2017)	Participants reported uncertainty about the impact of the virus.
Concerns about risk of infection	Lee et al. (2006)	<p>Pregnant women tended to over-estimate their risk of contracting SARS: 21.9% believed they were likely or very likely to contract it, while 21.5% believed their newborns were likely to.</p> <p>Almost half (49.6%) of their participants were worried or very worried about contracting SARS themselves, while 58.1% were worried or very worried about their newborn contracting it; 63.2% were worried about their spouse contracting it; and 57.3% were worried about relatives or friends contracting it.</p>

		<p>46.6% were worried or very worried about infection leading to miscarriage and 46.2% were worried or very worried about infection leading to pre-term delivery.</p> <p>Fears could lead to disrupted healthcare: 66.7% feared antenatal visits in hospital, 79.9% feared any consultations in hospital, 12.0% cancelled appointments in hospital and 38.9% considered doing so, and 20.9% postponed appointments in hospital while 29.1% considered doing so.</p>
	<p>Lohm et al. (2014)</p>	<p>Participants reported concerns about the health of both themselves and their babies.</p> <p>Not knowing anyone who had the virus provided an impression of safety, and many were not too worried if they did not know of any cases. By contrast, others were mobilised into action (such as stopping work, pulling children out of school and no longer leaving the house) if the pandemic broke out in their neighbourhood.</p>

	Lynch et al. (2012)	<p>Participants did not show high levels of concern: 25.2% were not at all worried, and many doubted the outbreak was as severe as reported and blamed the media for generating mass hysteria. Although many did not initially perceive H1N1 to be severe or personally threatening, views shifted during group discussions and exposure to news media and raised levels of concern.</p> <p>Concerns about infection appeared to depend on perceptions of risk: some participants reported awareness that pregnant women were at a higher risk for H1N1 and cited pregnancy as the main reason for their concern about infection, while others believed they were less vulnerable and pregnant women had stronger immune systems due to prenatal vitamins, healthy diet and exercise. Most reported a limited understanding of the potential severity of H1N1 during pregnancy and many were confused about how H1N1 differed from seasonal influenza. The primary source of this confusion was lack of consistent messages, particularly from the media.</p> <p>Concern about infection was higher among women in cities where H1N1 was most active, and lower in cities where the outbreak had not yet peaked.</p>
	Meireles et al. (2017)	<p>Participants reported uncertainty, anxiety and fear around the impact of the virus on both themselves and their baby.</p>

	Ng et al. (2013)	71.4% perceived that pregnant women would have a higher risk of being infected. 89% believed their unborn babies would be affected if they contracted it.  98% were worried about getting infected.
	Steelfisher et al. (2011)	34% were concerned they might get sick from H1N1 and 49% were concerned their baby might get sick. 52% believed pregnant women were more likely to become seriously ill than the general population from H1N1.
Concerns about, and uptake of, prophylaxis or treatment	Lee et al. (2006)	68.8% were worried or very worried about foetal malformation if antiviral drugs were needed for infection.
	Lohm et al. (2014)	Participants reported difficulties in deciding whether to get vaccinated or not; some delayed vaccination due to anticipating changing knowledge of the side effects.
	Lyerly et al. (2012)	Participants universally articulated positive or neutral valuation of risks and benefits associated with the H1N1 vaccine (although it must be noted all participants had taken part in the vaccine trial and therefore are likely to have positive views of the vaccine, and are not necessarily representative of pregnant women as a whole). Many believed the risk of contracting H1N1 outweighed any theoretical risk from vaccine. Many jumped at the chance to participate in the trial due to early access to the vaccine. Notions of a growing pandemic and finite supply of vaccine made them eager to have it early, particularly women nearing the end of their pregnancies. Many felt reassured by the research question itself which was focused on dosing rather than vaccine-related harm and

		made the vaccine seem already safe.
	Lynch et al. (2012)	Women had concerns about both vaccinations and antiviral medicine, and were not well-informed about either: 41.1% had low acceptance of the H1N1 vaccine, mostly due to concerns about the vaccine being untested and uncertainty about side effects, particularly long-term side effects for the developing foetus. Most were unaware of how antivirals work, confusing them with both antibiotics and vaccines, and some were hesitant about potential side effects of antivirals on their unborn baby. In fact, many were cautious about taking any medications during pregnancy for the same reason. Concern about infant's wellbeing, however, was a strong motivator for adopting preventive recommendations including vaccination. 43.5% would take antivirals such as Tamiflu.

	<p>Ozer et al. (2010)</p>	<p>8.9% got the H1N1 vaccine. 68.5% comfortable with decisions about vaccine, 7.3% not comfortable, 24.2% hesitant. Probability of receiving vaccine 3.46 times higher among working women than housewives, 1.85 times higher among women who already had a child, and 1.29 times higher among women with a high school education or higher. Correct knowledge about minimal risks associated with vaccine were associated with increase in receiving vaccine. Age, education, place of residence, chronic disease situation, and trimester were not significantly associated with vaccination status. 70.1% believed the vaccine could cause miscarriage, 74.2% thought it could cause deformation in children and 72.3% were worried vaccine could cause infertility.</p>
	<p>Sakaguchi et al. (2011)</p>	<p>Among the 104 participants who received the H1N1 vaccine, concern about risk of H1N1 in foetus and/or themselves was most cited reason for decision (73.1%) followed by recommendations encouraging vaccination (34.6%) and previous history of complication or illness from influenza (3.8%). More than 20% cited having household contacts (infant or elderly relative) or being a caregiver as contributing to decision. Among those who did not get the vaccine (n=26), concern about safety of vaccine for themselves and/or foetus was most cited reason (42.3%) followed by not thinking it necessary (23.1%) and previous adverse events associated with vaccinations (7.7%).</p>

<p>Sim et al. (2011)</p>	<p>Almost all (9/10) had a critical stance towards H1N1 vaccine. Deciding whether to have the vaccine or not was difficult and anxiety-provoking for all and was seen as choosing the 'least worst' option in terms of competing risks. Participants identified a contradiction between the culture of caution which characterises pregnancy-related advice and being urged to accept a relatively untested vaccine. The risk of being seen as a 'bad mother' for whichever course of action they took heightened the anxiety surrounding decision-making.</p> <p>The unborn baby was the primary concern in weighing up risks and benefits of having the vaccine; the protective effect of the vaccine on the baby was a key motivator, both to protect the baby in utero and also post-birth.</p> <p>Participants were concerned about the vaccine being relatively untested, and what was perceived to be a lack of evidence about long-term efficacy and side effects for both women and unborn babies.</p>
<p>Steelfisher et al. (2011)</p>	<p>Those who were concerned about their babies getting sick were more likely to have the H1N1 vaccine (50% v 33%) as well as those who believed they themselves were at greater risk than the general population of becoming seriously ill (54% v 28%). Main reasons for not having vaccine: concerns about safety risk to unborn babies (62%) and to themselves (59%); not believing they were at risk of getting H1N1 (15%) or that they would get seriously ill from it (15%); ability to get medication if they did become sick (11%).</p> <p>67% felt the H1N1 vaccine was safe, compared to 81% who felt the seasonal influenza vaccine was safe for</p>

		<p>pregnant women. Women who believed it was safe were more likely to get the vaccine (86% v 27%).</p> <p>62% discussed the vaccine with their healthcare provider. Pregnant women who received a recommendation from their healthcare provider to get the vaccine were more likely to have it (65% v 18%).</p>
Disrupted routines	Dodgson et al. (2010)	Daily routines were disrupted, often leading to relationship difficulties with spouses. Examples included: sleeping separately from partners if their partner had a high-risk occupation, avoiding contact with other family members, not leaving the house. Not leaving the house left participants who lived in small apartments feeling confined. Participants also did less shopping for food and baby supplies.
	Lee et al. (2006)	Many participants stopped leaving the house.
	Linde & Siqueira (2018)	Participants reported eliminating leisure activities.
	Ng et al. (2013)	<p>Decreased social activities: 4.5% not at all, 32.1% somewhat, 38% moderately, 25.4% very much.</p> <p>Decreased intimate contact with partner: 30.5% not at all, 40.2% somewhat, 22.3% moderately, 7% very much.</p> <p>Decreased social contact with friends: 16.9% not at all, 37% somewhat, 33.9% moderately, 12.3% very much.</p>

Non-pharmaceutical protective behaviours	Dodgson et al. (2010)	All participants reported living in a state of intense vigilance related to hygiene measures. Behaviours included monitoring the news, gathering hygiene supplies, ensuring anyone who entered their homes abided by the current recommendations, cleaning hands vigilantly, washing bags, clothes and hair after going out, cancelling planned visits from family, or banning visitors from the home entirely.
	Lee et al. (2006)	Participants reported adopting behavioural strategies to mitigate their risk of contracting infection, including washing hands more than usual (91.5%), wearing masks most or all of the time (70.1%), wearing gloves most or all of the time (1.7%), rarely or never leaving the house (37.2%) and going out less than usual (54.7%).
	Lynch et al. (2012)	Likelihood of taking the following recommendations: 100% of participants would wash their hands and cover coughs; 74.6% would keep children at home; 68.1% would stay away from large gatherings; 43.9% would get alternative prenatal care such as appointments being held over the telephone or at a different location; 36.8% would wear a mask.
	Linde & Siqueira (2018)	Participants reported using repellents constantly and wearing long sleeves and closed shoes which often caused discomfort.
	Meireles et al. (2017)	Participants avoided places of risk.

	<p>Ng et al. (2013)</p>	<p>Wearing a mask: 61.2% very much, 25.4% moderately, 10.6% somewhat, 2.8% not at all.</p> <p>Increased personal hygiene: 54.5% very much, 31.1% moderately, 10.8% somewhat, 3.6% not at all.</p> <p>Increased environment disinfection: 46.2% very much, 36.4% moderately, 14.6% somewhat, 2.9% not at all.</p> <p>Increased awareness of infection prevention: 50.8% very much, 37.8% moderately, 9.7% somewhat, 1.6% not at all.</p>
	<p>Sasaki et al. (2013)</p>	<p>Major precautions taken included wearing a mask, stocking up on ‘prophylaxis materials’ (not clear from article what these were), and information gathering. Nearly all practiced hand washing; other measures included gargling and wearing a mask.</p>
<p>Social support</p>	<p>Lee et al. (2006)</p>	<p>Women who were pregnant during the SARS outbreak reported significantly higher affectionate support (p=0.03), positive social interaction (p=0.01) and informational support (p=0.03) than the pre-SARS cohort, although the groups did not differ on tangible support.</p> <p>Only 10.8% of the SARS cohort reported feeling lonely during the outbreak. Social support appeared to mediate symptoms of depression; the authors noted a significant negative correlation between depression scores and social support scores (p&lt;0.0001).</p>

Financial and occupational concerns	Dodgson et al. (2010)	<p>Some participants took early maternity leave from work with no pay if they worked in high-risk occupations such as healthcare.</p> <p>Other decreases in income were noted due to added expenses of having to use taxis as buses and subways were considered unsafe, and having to spend money on masks and cleaning supplies.</p>
	Linde & Siqueira (2018)	<p>Several participants placed careers at risk by giving up growth opportunities such as attending meetings and travelling for work; many tried to work from home or change occupation, often leading them to feel isolated from their colleagues.</p>
	Meireles et al. (2017)	<p>Participants reported additional expenses due to needing to buy repellents and appropriate clothing.</p>
	Ng et al. (2013)	<p>24.5% somewhat negative socioeconomic impact of SARS on daily life, 27.5% moderately, 30.2% very much so, 17.8% not at all. One third stated their family's financial situation had changed.</p> <p>There was a significant relationship between state anxiety score and extent of socioeconomic impact (<math>p &lt; 0.01</math>)</p> <p>Some participants made special leave arrangements from work: 43.6% not at all, 24.5% somewhat, 15.5% moderately, 16.4% very much.</p>
Disrupted expectations of	Dodgson et al. (2010)	<p>None of the women had the birth experience they had hoped for, due to changes in hospital practices. 50% reported that they could not have family members visit them in hospital; 25% reported that the father was to be</p>

<p>birth and prenatal / postnatal care</p>	<p>the only visitor; 37.5% had restricted time with their own babies as they were kept separately in the hospital nursery. They had to wear masks and gowns and could not kiss their babies, while fathers could only see them through glass, leading to concerns about lack of time for bonding and attachment. There were scheduled feeding times and if they missed one they had to wait for the next. Three participants who had planned deliveries in public hospitals opted instead to pay for private hospitals; participants reported monitoring the visiting policies of their chosen hospitals as well as whether there were SARS cases in those hospitals. One chose a caesarean delivery in a private hospital as her husband would not have been allowed to accompany a natural delivery. One participant reported having to wear a mask during labour which made her sick and caused difficulty breathing. Others reported a lack of pain relief during labour (for example not being allowed to breathe nitrous oxide, to prevent the spreading of disease).</p> <p>Participants reported feeling a lack of connection with healthcare providers in antenatal classes (due to having to sit at the back of the room and nurses all having masks on) as well as minimal contact with medical staff and less than optimal care during delivery.</p> <p>Participants also reported a lack of discharge teaching, so they were sent home not knowing how to properly change nappies or bathe their babies.</p>
--	---

Sources of information	Lyerly et al. (2012)	Participants felt they got more detailed information about the H1N1 vaccine from researchers in the vaccine trial than their doctors.
	Lynch et al. (2012)	Highly trusted sources of information were healthcare providers such as obstetricians, midwives and paediatricians and government health agencies; many distrusted the media which they perceived to be benefiting financially from the outbreak, and in some cases this distrust extended to government officials. Participants preferred the internet or social networks for communication because of immediate access and low cost. Participants with older children also recommended schools as a helpful medium for disseminating information. Most agreed that information should be disseminated in multiple ways through many channels.

Sakaguchi et al. (2011)	More than 60% reported information from direct health care providers or Motherisk were helpful. More than 65% found information from media was confusing and unhelpful.
Sasaki et al. (2013)	Users of municipality information reported using many more information sources than nonusers. Major information sources used were television, internet, and newspapers. Nearly all used television; fewer than 30% obtained information from a hospital or clinic, despite being seen regularly for appointments. Many felt that too little information was available.
Sim et al. (2011)	Participants did not feel official information about H1N1 vaccine addressed concerns in sufficient detail, and sought information from a variety of sources. 4 women perceived official information about H1N1 vaccine to be a form of propaganda. All sought out alternative information primarily through social networks and the internet. Lack of information about side effects on unborn baby was the most significant gap in official information.

1 *Negative emotional states*

2 Two studies measured state anxiety: Lee et al. (2006) found that state anxiety was  
3 significantly higher in pregnant women during the SARS pandemic than a comparative pre-  
4 SARS group ( $p=0.02$ ), and Ng et al. (2013) found that 22.6% of their participants reported  
5 high anxiety while 65.2% experienced moderate anxiety. Lee et al. (2006) also found that  
6 their SARS cohort were slightly, but not significantly, more likely to score highly on  
7 depression. Other negative emotional states included sadness, uneasiness, fear, panic, tension,  
8 loss of control of life, shame, failure, and guilt due to the pressure of having a healthy child  
9 (Linde & Siqueira, 2018); unease even when at home, feeling a lack of security and a loss of  
10 freedom (Lee et al., 2006); stress (Lohm et al., 2014); frustration, anxiety and sleep problems  
11 (Dodgson et al., 2010); concern and anxiety about the pandemic situation (Sasaki et al., 2013);  
12 pressure from others regarding prevention of infection (Meireles et al., 2017); and negative  
13 body image due to having to cover up in protective clothing that made them feel constrained  
14 (Meireles et al., 2017).

15

16 *Living with uncertainty*

17 Participants in four studies reported living with uncertainty, mostly due to doubt and  
18 confusion about the risk to their health and that of their baby (Dodgson et al., 2010; Linde &  
19 Siqueira, 2018; Lohm et al., 2014; Meireles et al., 2017). Uncertainty was worsened by  
20 conflicting and rapidly changing media messages and not receiving recommendations from  
21 doctors regarding what mothers should and should not be doing during pregnancy and post-  
22 partum (Dodgson et al., 2010).

23

24 *Concerns about risk of infection*

25 Six studies reported that participants expressed concerns about the health of both themselves  
26 and their babies (Lee et al., 2006; Lohm et al., 2014; Lynch et al., 2012; Meireles et al., 2017;  
27 Ng et al., 2013; Steelfisher et al., 2011), including beliefs that infection could lead to  
28 miscarriage or pre-term delivery (Lee et al., 2006) and fears that infection could affect  
29 healthcare due to causing participants to cancel antenatal appointments to avoid visiting the  
30 hospital (Lee et al., 2006). Levels of concern differed between studies: a study from Hong  
31 Kong (Lee et al., 2006) found that approximately half of their participants were worried or  
32 very worried about contracting SARS themselves, while in a study from China, Ng et al.  
33 (2013) found that 98% of participants were worried about getting infected; Lynch et al. (2012)  
34 found that their participants in the USA did not show high levels of concern and over a  
35 quarter were not at all worried, doubting the outbreak was as severe as reported and blaming  
36 the media for generating hysteria.

37

38 Our data suggests that concerns about infection may depend on perceptions of risk: Lee et al.  
39 (2006) and Ng et al. (2013) found that pregnant women may have a tendency to over-  
40 estimate their risk of contracting infectious diseases: Lee et al. (2006) found that 21.9% of  
41 participants believed they were likely or very likely to contract SARS, while 21.5% believed  
42 their newborns were likely to. In Ng et al.'s (2013) study, 71.4% perceived that pregnant  
43 women had a higher risk of being infected and 89% believed their unborn babies would be  
44 affected if they contracted it. Conversely, while a minority of Lynch et al.'s (2012)  
45 participants reported awareness that pregnant women were at a higher risk for H1N1 and  
46 cited pregnancy as the main reason for their concern about infection, many believed they  
47 were less vulnerable as they believed pregnant women had stronger immune systems due to  
48 prenatal vitamins, healthy diet and exercise. Most participants in this study reported a limited  
49 understanding of the severity of H1N1 and were confused about how it differed from

50 seasonal influenza. It should be noted that though many participants in this study did not  
51 initially perceive H1N1 to be severe or personally threatening, their views shifted during  
52 focus group discussions and exposure to news media, and increased their concerns.

53

54 Perception of risk was affected by proximity to the disease outbreak: lower perceived risk  
55 was observed in participants who did not know anyone with the virus (Lohm et al., 2014) or  
56 who lived in cities where the outbreak had not yet peaked (Lynch et al., 2012). Conversely,  
57 higher perceived risk was observed in participants who lived in neighbourhoods where the  
58 infection was higher (Lohm et al., 2014; Lynch et al., 2012).

59

#### 60 *Concerns about, and uptake of, prophylaxis or treatment*

61 Seven studies reported that some pregnant women expressed concerns about antiviral drugs  
62 (Lee et al., 2006; Lynch et al., 2012) or vaccinations (Lohm et al., 2014; Lynch et al., 2012;  
63 Ozer et al., 2010; Sakaguchi et al., 2011; Sim et al., 2011; Steelfisher et al., 2011). Concerns  
64 about antivirals were mostly due to being unaware of how they work and being hesitant about  
65 potential side effects on unborn babies (Lynch et al., 2012) while concerns about vaccines  
66 were mostly due to concerns about the vaccine being untested and uncertainty about side  
67 effects, particularly long-term side effects for the developing foetus (Lynch et al., 2012; Ozer  
68 et al., 2010; Sakaguchi et al., 2011; Sim et al., 2011; Steelfisher et al., 2011). Reasons for  
69 lack of uptake of vaccines included anticipating changing knowledge of the side effects  
70 (Lohm et al., 2014), not thinking it necessary (Sakaguchi et al., 2011), and previous adverse  
71 vaccination effects (Sakaguchi et al., 2011). Worryingly, over 70% of Ozer et al.'s (2010)  
72 participants believed the H1N1 vaccine could cause miscarriage, deformation in children or  
73 infertility. Many of Lynch et al.'s (2012) participants reported being cautious about taking  
74 any medications at all during pregnancy in case of side effects; similarly, Sim et al.'s (2011)

75 participants noted the contradiction between the culture of caution characterising most  
76 pregnancy-related health advice and being urged to have a relatively untested vaccine.  
77 Furthermore, some women were concerned about being seen as a bad mother no matter  
78 which decision they made about having the vaccine.

79

80 However, participants also reported various motivators for receiving vaccines: the primary  
81 motivator appeared to be concerns about infants' wellbeing (Lynch et al., 2012; Sakaguchi et  
82 al., 2011; Sim et al., 2011) along with recommendations encouraging vaccination, previous  
83 history of complication or illness from influenza (3.8%), and having contact with vulnerable  
84 people such as infants or elderly relatives or being a caregiver (Sakaguchi et al., 2011).  
85 Factually correct knowledge about the minimal risks of vaccine were associated with  
86 increased likelihood of receiving the vaccine (Ozer et al., 2010). One study from the USA  
87 (Lyerly et al., 2012) reported entirely positive or neutral valuations of the H1N1 vaccine,  
88 with no negative perceptions voiced by participants, although it must be noted all participants  
89 had chosen to receive the vaccine as part of the vaccine trial and are not necessarily  
90 representative of pregnant women as a whole. Participants in this study believed the risk of  
91 contracting H1N1 outweighed any theoretical risk from the vaccine.

92

### 93 *Disrupted routines*

94 Pregnant women's daily routines, social lives and leisure activities were disrupted as they  
95 tried to eliminate the risk of contracting the diseases (Dodgson et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2006;  
96 Linde & Siqueira, 2018; Ng et al., 2013). Some did not leave their homes at all (Dodgson et  
97 al., 2010; Lee et al., 2006), which could lead to them feeling confined especially when living  
98 in a small apartment (Dodgson et al., 2010). Relationships with spouses could be affected, for

99 example due to decreased intimate contact (Ng et al., 2013) and sleeping separately due to  
100 fear of infection (Dodgson et al., 2010).

101

### 102 *Non-pharmaceutical protective behaviours*

103 Participants in several studies reported living in a state of vigilance related to hygiene  
104 measures and adopting new behaviours to mitigate their risk of contracting infection.  
105 Behaviours included monitoring the news and information-gathering (Dodgson et al., 2010;  
106 Sasaki et al., 2013); avoiding places of risk (Dodgson et al., 2010; Lynch et al., 2012;  
107 Meireles et al., 2012); gathering hygiene supplies (Dodgson et al., 2010); cleaning hands  
108 vigilantly (Dodgson et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2006; Lynch et al., 2012; Sasaki et al., 2013);  
109 washing bags, clothes and hair after leaving the house (Dodgson et al., 2010); wearing masks  
110 (Lee et al., 2006; Lynch et al., 2012; Ng et al., 2013; Sasaki et al., 2013); stocking up on  
111 prophylaxis materials (Sasaki et al., 2013); and cancelling planned visits from family or  
112 banning visitors to the home altogether (Dodgson et al., 2010). With regards to the Zika virus,  
113 participants reported using insect repellents constantly and wearing long sleeves and closed  
114 shoes which often caused discomfort (Linde & Siqueira, 2018).

115

### 116 *Social support*

117 Lee et al. (2006) found that women pregnant during the SARS outbreak reported significantly  
118 higher affectionate support ( $p=0.03$ ), positive social interaction ( $p=0.01$ ) and informational  
119 support ( $p=0.03$ ) than the pre-SARS cohort, although the groups did not differ on tangible  
120 support. In this study, only 10.8% of the SARS cohort reported feeling lonely during the  
121 outbreak; there is no comparable figure for the pre-SARS cohort as the question on loneliness  
122 was only asked to the SARS cohort. Social support appeared to mediate symptoms of

123 depression; the authors noted a significant negative correlation between depression scores  
124 and social support scores ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

125

#### 126 *Financial and occupational concerns*

127 In Ng et al.'s (2013) study, over a third of participants reported their family's financial  
128 situation had been negatively affected as a result of the outbreak. Participants reported  
129 increased expenses due to using taxis since buses and subways were considered unsafe  
130 (Dodgson et al., 2010) and having to buy supplies to mitigate their risk of infection, such as  
131 masks and cleaning supplies (Dodgson et al., 2010) or insect repellents and clothing  
132 (Meireles et al., 2017).

133

134 Some participants took early maternity leave from work and forfeited pay if they worked in  
135 high-risk occupations such as healthcare (Dodgson et al., 2010), or made special leave  
136 arrangements (Ng et al., 2013); others put their careers at risk by giving up career-promoting  
137 opportunities which involved attending meetings or travelling (Linde & Siqueira, 2018). In  
138 the latter study, many tried to work from home or change occupation, leading them to feel  
139 isolated from colleagues.

140

#### 141 *Disrupted expectations of birth and prenatal / postnatal care*

142 One study (Dodgson et al., 2010) reported on disrupted expectations of birth, prenatal care  
143 and postnatal care. In this study, none of the participants had the birth experience they had  
144 hoped for, due to changes in hospital practices such as not allowing family members to visit,  
145 not allowing fathers to be present for the birth, having to wear masks during labour, not being  
146 allowed pain relief during labour, minimal contact with healthcare staff, only allowing  
147 mothers to feed their babies at set times, or restricting new mothers' time with their babies

148 who were kept separately in the hospital nursery. Mothers had to wear masks and gowns and  
149 could not kiss their babies, while fathers could only see them through glass, leading to  
150 concerns about lack of time for bonding and attachment. In some cases, these changes in  
151 hospital policies led women to change their birth preferences, for example choosing  
152 caesarean delivery or delivery in a private hospital.

153

154 Prenatal care was also affected: participants reported feeling a lack of connection with  
155 healthcare providers in antenatal classes due to having to keep their distance from nurses, and  
156 nurses all having masks on. In terms of postnatal care, participants reported a lack of  
157 discharge teaching, so they were sent home not knowing how to properly change nappies or  
158 bathe their babies.

159

#### 160 *Sources of information*

161 Lynch et al. (2012) reported on the preferred sources from which participants got information  
162 on the outbreak: healthcare providers such as obstetricians, midwives and paediatricians were  
163 generally highly trusted, as well as government health agencies to a lesser extent. Many  
164 expressed distrust of the media, which they perceived to be benefiting financially from the  
165 outbreak; in some cases this distrust extended to government officials. Participants preferred  
166 the internet or social networks for communication because of immediate access and low cost.  
167 Participants who were already parents also suggested their children's schools were a helpful  
168 medium for disseminating information about vaccine and antiviral use, to help them make  
169 sound decisions. Most agreed that information should be disseminated in multiple ways  
170 through many channels. The majority of participants in Sakaguchi et al.'s (2011) study also  
171 reported finding information about the H1N1 vaccine from direct health care providers  
172 helpful, as well as the Motherisk counselling service (a hospital-based programme providing

173 evidence-based information regarding the safety or risks associated with treatments and  
174 infectious diseases during pregnancy); in the same study, more than 65% of participants  
175 found that media information was confusing and unhelpful.

176

177 Conversely, Sasaki et al. (2013) found that television, internet and newspapers were the most  
178 common sources of information about the H1N1 outbreak, while fewer than 30% of  
179 participants obtained their information from a hospital or clinic. Many participants felt that  
180 too little information was available. Sim et al.'s (2011) participants did not feel that official  
181 information about the H1N1 vaccine addressed their concerns, particularly about potential  
182 effects on unborn babies, and sought information from a variety of sources such as social  
183 networks and the internet. In this study, several participants perceived that the official  
184 information provided by the National Health Service was 'propaganda'.

185

186 It is also noteworthy that Lysterly et al. (2012) found that their participants, who had taken part  
187 in the H1N1 vaccine trial, felt they had received more information from the trial's researchers  
188 than they had from their doctors.

189

## 190 **Discussion**

191 The results of this review suggest a considerable potential for disease outbreaks to have a  
192 negative emotional impact on pregnant women, creating anxiety, distress and fear. Other  
193 themes emerging from the review, and also creating a negative impact, include uncertainty;  
194 concerns about infection and related health risks to both the self and unborn babies; concerns  
195 about prophylaxis or treatment; disrupted routines; financial and occupational concerns; and  
196 disrupted expectations of birth and prenatal and postnatal care. Intense vigilance with regards  
197 to non-pharmaceutical protective behaviours (such as wearing masks, hand-washing and

198 avoiding contact with others) was frequently reported. Social support may be a protective  
199 factor for poor mental health although during an outbreak this may be difficult to access.  
200 Sources of disease information included healthcare providers, government health agencies  
201 and the media; participants expressed mixed opinions about the trustworthiness of the various  
202 sources although healthcare professionals tended to be viewed as the most trustworthy.  
203  
204 This review suggests that being pregnant during a time of an outbreak increases the  
205 vulnerability of pregnant women to the associated stress of the situation. Indeed, the few  
206 papers in this review with measures of mental health suggested high levels of anxiety in  
207 pregnant women during infectious disease outbreaks. While no papers compared anxiety in  
208 pregnant and non-pregnant women during a disease outbreak, and it is likely that outbreaks  
209 can cause anxiety for all, one study (Lee et al., 2006) compared a pre-SARS group with a  
210 group who were pregnant during the SARS outbreak and found that state anxiety was  
211 significantly higher during the outbreak; another (Sasaki et al., 2013) found that nearly all  
212 pregnant women cited that being pregnant during an outbreak was their primary reason for  
213 feeling anxious. This is concerning as previous research suggests that experiencing prenatal  
214 stress can lead to adverse birth outcomes (Pais & Pai, 2018). Early identification of mental  
215 health issues in perinatal patients is therefore essential; midwives should be aware of  
216 pregnant women's propensity to experience intense anxiety during outbreaks and they should  
217 take account of the potential impact of such symptoms on their physical and mental health.  
218 Early identification of problems can allow obstetric providers to partner with mental health  
219 specialists in order to establish appropriate comprehensive treatment plans (Maher, 2019).  
220 Planning and provision of education of, and mental health services specifically for, pregnant  
221 women during infectious disease outbreaks is likely to be useful (Ng et al., 2013).

222

223 Feelings of uncertainty were cited by participants as a significant stressor in several studies.  
224 This is likely to be the case for many people – not just for pregnant women – as stress has  
225 been frequently linked to uncertainty across the population as a whole (Grupe & Nitschke,  
226 2013). Again, this is particularly concerning for pregnant women as previous research  
227 suggests that uncertainty can cause fear and distress in pregnancy (Melander, 2002) which, as  
228 outlined above, could in turn lead to adverse birth outcomes (Pais & Pai, 2018). Pandemics  
229 are characterised by uncertainty for everyone, but public health officials and healthcare  
230 providers can take steps to reduce this uncertainty as much as possible by ensuring that  
231 information provided to the public is timely, accurate, and consistent with information from  
232 other sources. This review provided some evidence that the media is perceived as  
233 untrustworthy, and so information directly from healthcare providers and official public  
234 health organisations appear preferable. The distrust of media reporting noted in other studies  
235 may be prevalent across the population as a whole, not just for pregnant women (Goodall et  
236 al., 2012). The current outbreak advice is not to watch much media and to seek information  
237 only from trusted sources (Williamson et al., 2020); pregnant women can take action  
238 themselves to avoid media especially if it causes them to become anxious.  
239  
240 Many participants in the reviewed studies expressed concerns about becoming infected, and  
241 the negative effects this could have on their own health and that of their babies; levels of  
242 concern differed across studies, and it is possible that these differences in concern about  
243 infection could be cultural. Concerns about infection appeared to be related to perceived  
244 rather than actual risk, with some participants over-estimating the risk of infection during  
245 pregnancy. This highlights the need for timely dissemination of accurate information, and for  
246 clinicians to monitor for over-estimation of infectious risk among pregnant women and clear  
247 up misconceptions. Where simple advice and reassurance does not work, there may be

248 benefit in brief psychotherapy using a cognitive-behavioural model in order to reduce anxiety  
249 and the associated risk of pregnancy complications (Asghari et al., 2016; Goodman et al.,  
250 2014).

251

252 Concerns about prophylaxis or treatment were prevalent. This is perhaps unsurprising as  
253 pregnant women have historically low vaccination rates for seasonal influenza (Yuen &  
254 Tarrant, 2014) and pandemic influenza (Fridman et al., 2011, Schmid et al., 2017). The  
255 decision about whether to receive vaccines or medications may well be distressing as  
256 pregnancy is already a time when women are faced with cultural expectations of motherhood  
257 involving eliminating all risk to the foetus and complying with medical advice and any  
258 examples of not abiding by advice lead to women being seen as undisciplined or ignorant  
259 (Bessett, 2010). It is essential that pregnant women are aware of trustworthy and up-to-date  
260 information about the risks and benefits of vaccines and medications; take-up of vaccination  
261 is more likely in women who have the correct knowledge about the minimal risks involved  
262 (Lyerly et al., 2012). Care needs to be taken to ensure this group have realistic risk  
263 perceptions and are likely to adopt the recommended behaviours. Concerns about risk to their  
264 baby were common, so education about the benefits and risks to unborn babies are important.  
265 The willingness of many of Lynch et al.'s (2012) participants to change their views during  
266 focus groups highlights a critical role for education.

267

268 Participants reported disrupted routines and changes to relationships with others, including  
269 spouses, due to social distancing. This is of concern as it is well-known that social support is  
270 essential in enhancing resilience during times of crisis (Brooks et al., 2020a) while poor  
271 social support is associated with negative psychological outcomes (Goldmann & Galea,  
272 2014), as is the isolation felt by people who are alone during quarantine in pandemics

273 (Brooks et al., 2020b). One study in this review explored the relationship between social  
274 support and anxiety in pregnant women and found that social support was protective (Lee et  
275 al., 2006). Interestingly, this study also found that women who were pregnant during the  
276 SARS outbreak reported significantly higher affectionate support, positive social interaction  
277 and informational support than the pre-SARS cohort, although the groups did not differ on  
278 tangible support. However, participants in other studies reported feeling isolated and lonely.  
279 This raises the question of how to ensure that social support is maintained during times of  
280 social distancing – which is of course essential for the population as a whole, not just for  
281 vulnerable groups. Mental health campaigns aimed at encouraging communication via phone  
282 or internet during physical isolation may be useful. There is evidence that support from others  
283 with similar experiences can be particularly helpful to alleviate stress in pregnancy (McLeish  
284 & Redshaw, 2017) and that social media is a substantial source of support for pregnant  
285 women and new mothers (Baker & Yang, 2018); therefore, online or text message support  
286 groups specifically for pregnant women to support each other and discuss their concerns,  
287 fears and experiences may be beneficial.

288

289 Financial and occupational concerns were common, which is unsurprising as these have been  
290 cited as major stressors for anyone off work during pandemics (Brooks et al., 2020b).  
291 Pregnant women – and indeed the general public as a whole – would therefore benefit from  
292 ensuring they are aware of what financial assistance is available during the pandemic and  
293 how and when it can be claimed (HM Treasury, 2020). In particular, the COVID-19 outbreak  
294 may be stressful for pregnant women who are ‘critical workers’ and therefore expected to  
295 continue working (Cabinet Office, 2020) despite also being told they are a vulnerable group  
296 who should be “particularly stringent in following social distancing measures” (Public Health  
297 England, 2020). Organisations should help as much as possible, for example changing the

298 work roles of pregnant women so they can work from home or away from the public where  
299 possible.

300

301 Participants in one study reported an overwhelming disruption in their expectations of birth,  
302 prenatal care and postnatal care, causing them to change their plans and preferences for birth.  
303 Additionally, maternity staff levels may be lower than usual during a pandemic due to  
304 reassignment of staff to other areas of the hospital or staff minimising contact with patients  
305 for their own protection. This raises the question of what is an acceptable level of care to  
306 provide to uninfected pregnant women during a pandemic and what could be considered  
307 neglectful (Dodgson et al., 2010). Guidance for healthcare professionals needs to be clear  
308 about which routine visits could be done over the phone or cancelled altogether, as well as  
309 how to provide appropriate care without exposing healthy women and newborns to illness. A  
310 solution may be designating a location and staff specifically for the care of healthy pregnant  
311 women (Rasmussen et al., 2008).

312

313 The reviewed literature showed that pregnant women often cope with concerns by taking  
314 drastic non-pharmaceutical precautions to avoid infection, which may affect all areas of their  
315 lives. Pregnant women may become hyper-vigilant with regard to monitoring the most  
316 current self-protection information available, hygiene practices and reducing contact with  
317 others. Of course, these practices are recommended in infectious disease outbreaks generally,  
318 and in themselves can be positive behaviours as they reduce the risk of infection. However, it  
319 is possible that such measures could also cause distress. More research is needed to explore  
320 the benefits and risks to mental health of prolonged hyper-vigilance, both for the population  
321 generally and during pregnancy and whether such behaviours predispose someone to post-  
322 outbreak mental ill-health.

323

324 Overall, this review highlights the fact that pregnant women are a highly vulnerable group in  
325 terms of psychological consequences during a pandemic; they need to care for both their own  
326 health and that of their unborn child, referred to as a ‘doubling of health responsibilities’ by  
327 Lohm et al. (2014). Planning for future pandemics should therefore make considerations  
328 specific to pregnant women to ensure their specific needs are addressed. Involving pregnant  
329 women in pandemic preparedness exercises would ensure that their voices are heard and  
330 specific concerns they may have are addressed, helping policy-makers to identify any gaps  
331 related to prenatal and postnatal care in current pandemic planning.

332

### 333 *Limitations*

334 Data screening, extraction and analysis were carried out by only one author, due to the rapid  
335 nature of the review; in typical systematic reviews, it is preferable for double-screening to  
336 take place and for multiple reviewers to analyse the data to enhance the validity of the review.  
337 However, the resultant data was discussed with all authors as the paper went through multiple  
338 revisions prior to submission. Searches were limited to English-language papers due to lack  
339 of time to get foreign-language papers translated, meaning evidence may have been missed.  
340 The generalisability of the studies reviewed is not clear, as much may depend on the cultural  
341 context.

342

343 No standardised quality appraisal of the included papers was carried out, as is common in  
344 rapid evidence reviews (Haby et al., 2016). However, there were some particularly notable  
345 limitations to the literature, such as low response rates and a lack of quantitative research. It  
346 must also be noted that only one study (Lee et al., 2006) compared mental health outcomes  
347 for women pregnant during an outbreak with a pre-outbreak control group of pregnant

348 women. For that reason, it is difficult to fully ascertain the mental health-related differences  
349 in being pregnant during a disease outbreak and being pregnant at any other time. There was  
350 also no research directly comparing pregnant women with the non-pregnant population  
351 during an outbreak, so again, we cannot say whether pregnant women are more likely to  
352 experience stress during an outbreak than the rest of the population.

353

#### 354 *Conclusion*

355 Pregnant women have specific needs during a pandemic and may be at risk of adverse  
356 psychological effects of the COVID-19 outbreak. This is important as there is a clear link  
357 between poor mental health in pregnant women and complications with the pregnancy. It is  
358 thus vital that they are well-informed about public health recommendations, which should  
359 include detailed description of benefits or lack of risk to unborn babies as well as a clear  
360 rationale for why prophylaxis or treatment is necessary. Virtual support groups (e.g. online)  
361 specifically for pregnant women to support each other may be useful although these should  
362 be informed by factual information and should not fuel anxiety. Healthcare professionals  
363 involved in the care of pregnant women should be aware of the most current guidance and  
364 ensure that they closely monitor mental health during pregnancy and where necessary  
365 provide early evidence-based care.

366

#### 367 **Declarations of interest**

368 None.

369

#### 370 **Disclaimer**

371 The research was funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection  
372 Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response at King's College

373 London in partnership with Public Health England (PHE), in collaboration with the  
374 University of East Anglia. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily  
375 those of the NHS, the NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care or Public Health  
376 England.

377

### 378 **Role of the funding source**

379 The funding source had no role in study design; the collection, analysis and interpretation of  
380 data; the writing of the article; or the decision to submit it for publication.

381

### 382 **References**

383 American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. (2017). Hospital disaster preparedness  
384 for obstetricians and facilities providing maternity care. *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 130(6),  
385 e291-e297.

386

387 Asghari, E., Faramarzi, M. & Mohammadi, A.K. (2016). The effect of cognitive  
388 behavioural therapy on anxiety, depression and stress in women with preeclampsia. *Journal*  
389 *of Clinical & Diagnostic Research*, 10(11), QC04-1C07.

390

391 Baker, B. & Yang, I. Social media as social support in pregnancy and the postpartum. *Sexual*  
392 *& Reproductive Healthcare*, 17, 31-34.

393

394 Bessett, D. (2010). Negotiating normalization: The perils of producing pregnancy symptoms  
395 in prenatal care. *Social Science & Medicine*, 71, 370-377.

396

- 397 Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research*  
398 *in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- 399
- 400 Brooks, S.K., Amlot, R., Rubin, G.J. & Greenberg, N. (2020a). Psychological resilience and  
401 post-traumatic growth in disaster-exposed organisations: Overview of the literature. *BMJ*  
402 *Military Health*, 166(1), 52-56.
- 403
- 404 Brooks, S.K., Webster, R.K., Smith, L.E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N. &  
405 Rubin, G.J. (2020b). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid  
406 review of the evidence. *The Lancet*, 395(10227), 912-920.
- 407
- 408 Cabinet Office. (2020). Guidance for schools, childcare providers, colleges and local  
409 authorities in England on maintaining educational provision. Available online:  
410 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-educational-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-educational-provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-maintaining-educational-provision)  
411 [provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-maintaining-educational-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-educational-provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-maintaining-educational-provision)  
412 [provision](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-educational-provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-maintaining-educational-provision) [accessed 12 April 2020]
- 413
- 414 Chakhtoura, N., Hazra, R. & Spong, C.Y. (2019). Zika virus: A public health perspective.  
415 *Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 30(2), 116-122.
- 416
- 417 Dashraath, P., Jing Lin Jeslyn, W., Mei Xian Karen, L., Li Min, L., Sarah, L., Biswas, A.,  
418 Arjandas Choolani, M., Mattar, C. & Lin, S.L. (2020). Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)  
419 pandemic and pregnancy. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, doi:  
420 10.1016/j.ajog.2020.03.021.
- 421

422 Dodgson, J.E., Tarrant, M., Chee, Y-O. & Watkins, A. (2010). New mothers' experiences of  
423 social disruption and isolation during the severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak in Hong  
424 Kong. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 12(2), 198-204.  
425

426 Fridman, D., Steinberg, E., Azhar, E., Weedon, J. & Wilson, T.E. (2011). Predictors of  
427 H1N1 vaccination in pregnancy. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 204(6, S1),  
428 S124-127.  
429

430 Gardner, P.J. & Moallef, P. (2015). Psychological impact on SARS survivors: Critical review  
431 of the English language literature. *Canadian Psychology*, 56(1), 123-135.  
432

433 Goldmann, E. & Galea, S. (2014). Mental health consequences of disasters. *Annual Review*  
434 *of Public Health*, 35, 169-183.  
435

436 Goodall, C., Sabo, J., Cline, R. & Egbert, N. (2012). Threat, efficacy, and uncertainty in the  
437 first 5 months of national print and electronic news coverage of the H1N1 virus. *Journal of*  
438 *Health Communication*, 17(3), 338-355.  
439

440 Goodman, J.H., Guarino, A., Chenausky, K., Klein, L., Prager, J., Petersen, R., Forget, A. &  
441 Freeman, M. (2014). CALM pregnancy: results of a pilot study of mindfulness-based  
442 cognitive therapy for perinatal anxiety. *Archives of Women's Mental Health*, 17(5), 373-387.  
443

444 Grupe, D.W. & Nitschke, J.B. (2013). Uncertainty and anticipation in anxiety: An integrated  
445 neurobiological and psychological perspective. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 14(7), 488-  
446 501.

447

448 Haby, M.M., Chapman, E., Clark, R., Barreto, J., Reveiz, L. & Lavis, J.N. (2016). What are  
449 the best methodologies for rapid reviews of the research evidence for evidence-informed  
450 decision making in health policy and practice: a rapid review. *Health Research Policy and*  
451 *Systems*, 14(1), 83.

452

453 HM Treasury. (2020). Support for those affected by COVID-19. Available online:  
454 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/support-for-those-affected-by-covid-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/support-for-those-affected-by-covid-19/support-for-those-affected-by-covid-19)  
455 [19/support-for-those-affected-by-covid-19](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/support-for-those-affected-by-covid-19/support-for-those-affected-by-covid-19) [accessed 12 April 2020]

456

457 Jamieson, D.J., Ellis, J.E., Jernigan, D.B. & Treadwell, T.A. (2006b). Emerging infectious  
458 disease outbreaks: Old lessons and new challenges for obstetrician-gynecologists. *American*  
459 *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 194, 1546-1555.

460

461 Jamieson, D.J., Theiler, R. & Rasmussen, S.A. (2006a). Emerging infections and pregnancy.  
462 *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 12(11), 1638-1643.

463

464 Jarvis, S. (2020). COVID-19: What you need to know about coronavirus and pregnancy.  
465 Available online: [https://patient.info/news-and-features/covid-19-what-you-need-to-know-](https://patient.info/news-and-features/covid-19-what-you-need-to-know-about-coronavirus-and-pregnancy)  
466 [about-coronavirus-and-pregnancy](https://patient.info/news-and-features/covid-19-what-you-need-to-know-about-coronavirus-and-pregnancy) [accessed 03 April 2020]

467

468 Kahn, M. & Cristoferi, C. (2020). Anxiety, anger and hope as women face childbirth during  
469 coronavirus pandemic. Available online: [https://uk.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-](https://uk.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-europe-childbirth/anxiety-anger-and-hope-as-women-face-childbirth-during-coronavirus-pandemic-idUKKBN21E1O2)  
470 [europe-childbirth/anxiety-anger-and-hope-as-women-face-childbirth-during-coronavirus-](https://uk.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-europe-childbirth/anxiety-anger-and-hope-as-women-face-childbirth-during-coronavirus-pandemic-idUKKBN21E1O2)  
471 [pandemic-idUKKBN21E1O2](https://uk.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-europe-childbirth/anxiety-anger-and-hope-as-women-face-childbirth-during-coronavirus-pandemic-idUKKBN21E1O2) [accessed 12 April 2020]

472

473 Lam, C.M., Wong, S.F., Leung, T.N., Chow, K.M., Yu, W.C., Wong, T.Y., Lai, S.T. & Ho,  
474 L.C. (2004). A case-controlled study comparing clinical course and outcomes of pregnant and  
475 non-pregnant women with severe acute respiratory syndrome. *BJOG: an International Journal*  
476 *of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 111, 771-774.

477

478 Lee, C-H., Huang, N., Chang, H-J., Hsu, Y-J., Wang, M-C. & Chou, Y-J. (2005). The  
479 immediate effects of the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) epidemic on childbirth in  
480 Taiwan. *BMC Public Health*, 5, 30.

481

482 Lee, D.T., Sahota, D., Leung, T.N., et al. (2006). Psychological responses of pregnant women  
483 to an infectious outbreak: A case-control study of the 2003 SARS outbreak in Hong Kong.  
484 *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 61(5), 707-713.

485

486 Linde, A.R. & Siqueira, C.E. (2018). Women's lives in times of Zika: mosquito-controlled  
487 lives? *Cadernos de saude publica*, 34(5), e00178917.

488

489 Lohm, D., Flowers, P., Stephenson, N., Waller, E. & Davis, M.D.M. (2014). Biography,  
490 pandemic time and risk: Pregnant women reflecting on their experiences of the 2009  
491 influenza pandemic. *Health*, 18(5), 493-508.

492

493 Lyerly, A.D., Namey, E.E., Gray, B., Swamy, G. & Faden, R.R. (2012). Women's views  
494 about participating in research while pregnant. *IRB: Ethics & Human Research*, 34(4), 1-8.

495

496 Lynch, M.M., Mitchell, E.W., Williams, J.L., Brumbaugh, K., Jones-Bell, M., Pinkney, D.E.,  
497 Layton, C.M., Mersereau, P.W., Kendrick, J.S., Eguino Medina, P. & Rojas Smith, L. (2012).  
498 Pregnant and recently pregnant women's perceptions about influenza A pandemic (H1N1)  
499 2009: Implications for public health and provider communication. *Maternal and Child Health*  
500 *Journal*, 16, 1657-1664.  
501  
502 Maher, M.J. (2019). Emergency preparedness in obstetrics: Meeting unexpected key  
503 challenges. *Journal of Perinatal & Neonatal Nursing*, 33(3), 238-245.  
504  
505 McLeish, J. & Redshaw, M. (2017). Mothers' accounts of the impact on emotional wellbeing  
506 of organised peer support in pregnancy and early parenthood: a qualitative study. *BMC*  
507 *Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 17, 28.  
508  
509 Meireles, J.F.F., Neves, C.M., da Rocha Morgado, F.F. & Ferreira, M.E.C. (2017). Zika vírus  
510 and pregnant women: A psychological approach. *Psychology & Health*, 32(7), 798-809.  
511  
512 Melander, H. (2002). Experiences of fears associated with pregnancy and childbirth: A study  
513 of 329 pregnant women. *Birth*, 29(2), 101-111.  
514  
515 Mosby, L.G., Rasmussen, S.A. & Jamieson, D.J. (2011). 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1)  
516 in pregnancy: a systematic review of the literature. *American Journal of Obstetrics and*  
517 *Gynecology*, 205(1), 10-18.  
518  
519 Ng, J., Sham, A., Leng Tang, P. & Fung, S. (2004). SARS: Pregnant women's fears and  
520 perceptions. *British Journal of Midwifery*, 12(11), 698-703.

521

522 Oppenheim, M. (2020). Pregnant women forced to give birth without support in hospital

523 amid coronavirus outbreak. The Independent. Available online:

524 [https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/coronavirus-pregnant-women-birth-](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/coronavirus-pregnant-women-birth-hospital-nhs-parents-advice-a9439391.html)

525 [hospital-nhs-parents-advice-a9439391.html](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/coronavirus-pregnant-women-birth-hospital-nhs-parents-advice-a9439391.html) [accessed 05 April 2020]

526

527 Ozer, A., Arikan, D.C., Kirecci, E. & Ekerbicer, H.C. (2010). Status of pandemic influenza

528 vaccination and factors affecting it in pregnant women in Kahramanmaras, an Eastern

529 Mediterranean city of Turkey. PLoS ONE, 5(12), e14177.

530

531 Pais, M. & Pai, M.V. (2018). Stress among pregnant women: A systematic review. Journal of

532 Clinical and Diagnostic Research, 12(5), LE01-LE04.

533

534 Patterson, J., Hollins Martin, C. & Karatzias, T. (2018). PTSD post-childbirth: A systematic

535 review of women's and midwives' subjective experiences of care provider interaction.

536 Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology, 37(1), 56-83.

537

538 Perrin, P.C., McCabe, L. & Everly Jr, G.S. (2009). Preparing for an influenza pandemic:

539 Mental health considerations. Prehospital and Disaster Medicine, 24(3), 223-230.

540

541 Public Health England. (2020). Guidance on social distancing for everyone in the UK.

542 Available online: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-on-social-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-on-social-distancing-and-for-vulnerable-people/guidance-on-social-distancing-for-everyone-in-the-uk-and-protecting-older-people-and-vulnerable-adults)

543 [distancing-and-for-vulnerable-people/guidance-on-social-distancing-for-everyone-in-the-uk-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-on-social-distancing-and-for-vulnerable-people/guidance-on-social-distancing-for-everyone-in-the-uk-and-protecting-older-people-and-vulnerable-adults)

544 [and-protecting-older-people-and-vulnerable-adults](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-on-social-distancing-and-for-vulnerable-people/guidance-on-social-distancing-for-everyone-in-the-uk-and-protecting-older-people-and-vulnerable-adults) [accessed 10 April 2020]

545

546 Rasmussen, S.A., Jamieson, D.J. & Bresee, J.S. (2008). Pandemic influenza and pregnant  
547 women. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 14(1), 95-100.

548

549 Rawlinson, K. (2020). Coronavirus latest: April 3, at a glance. *The Guardian*. Available  
550 online: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/04/coronavirus-latest-at-a-glance>  
551 [accessed 12 April 2020]

552

553 Sakaguchi, S., Weitzner, B., Carey, N., Bozzo, P., Mirdamadi, K., Samuel, N., Koren, G. &  
554 Einarson, A. (2011). Pregnant women's perception of risk with use of the H1N1 vaccine.  
555 *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Canada*, 33(5), 460-467.

556

557 Sasaki, T-K., Yoshida, A. & Kotake, K. (2013). Attitudes about the 2009 H1N1 influenza  
558 pandemic among pregnant Japanese women and the use of the Japanese municipality as a  
559 source of information. *Southeast Asian Journal of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*,  
560 44(3), 388-399.

561

562 Schmid, P., Rauber, D., Betsch, C., Lidolt, G. & Denker, M-L. (2017). Barriers of influenza  
563 vaccination intention and behavior – A systematic review of influenza vaccine hesitancy,  
564 2005-2016. *PLoS ONE*, 12(1), e0170550.

565

566 Schwartz, D.A. & Graham, A.L. (2020). Potential maternal and infant outcomes from  
567 (Wuhan) Coronavirus 2019-nCoV infecting pregnant women: Lessons from SARS, MERS,  
568 and other human coronavirus infections. *Viruses*, 12(2), 194.

569

570 Sim, J.A., Ulanika, A.A., Katikireddi, S.V. & Gorman, D. (2011). 'Out of two bad choices, I  
571 took the slightly better one': Vaccination dilemmas for Scottish and Polish migrant women  
572 during the H1N1 influenza pandemic. *Public Health*, 125(8), 505-511.

573

574 Steelfisher, G.K., Blendon, R.J., Bekheit, M.M., Mitchell, E.W., Williams, J., Lubell, K.,  
575 Peugh, J. & DiSogra, C.A. (2011). Novel pandemic A (H1N1) influenza vaccination among  
576 pregnant women: motivators and barriers. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*,  
577 204(6 Suppl 1), S116-123.

578

579 Stevenson, A. (2020). 'I felt like crying': Coronavirus shakes China's expecting mothers. *The*  
580 *New York Times*. Available online:  
581 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/25/business/coronavirus-china-pregnant.html> [accessed 12  
582 April 2020]

583

584 Williamson, V., Murphy, D. & Greenberg, N. (2020). COVID-19 and experiences of moral  
585 injury in front-line key workers. *Occupational Medicine*,  
586 <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqaa052>

587

588 World Health Organization. (2010). Pregnancy and pandemic influenza A (H1N1) 2009:  
589 Information for programme managers and clinicians. Available online:  
590 [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK200794/pdf/Bookshelf\\_NBK200794.pdf](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK200794/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK200794.pdf) [accessed  
591 02 April 2020]

592

593 World Health Organization. (2014). A brief guide to emerging infectious diseases and  
594 zoonoses. WHO Regional Office for South-East Asia. Available online:  
595 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/204722> [accessed 12 April 2020]  
596  
597 World Health Organization. (2017). Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: a  
598 practical guide. Available online: [https://www.who.int/alliance-  
599 hpsr/resources/publications/rapid-review-guide/en/](https://www.who.int/alliance-hpsr/resources/publications/rapid-review-guide/en/) [accessed 05 April 2020]  
600  
601 Yuen, C.Y.S. & Tarrant, M. Determinants of uptake of influenza vaccination among pregnant  
602 women – A systematic review. *Vaccine*, 32, 4602-4613.