

1 **Making maternity and neonatal care personalised in the**
2 **COVID-19 pandemic: results from the Babies Born Better**
3 **Survey in the UK and the Netherlands**

4
5 Lauri M.M. van den Berg^{1*}, Naseerah Akooji², Gill Thomson³, Ank de Jonge⁴, Marie-Clare Balaam³,
6 Anastasia Topalidou³ and Soo Downe³ - on behalf of the ASPIRE COVID-19 research team (details
7 below)

8
9 **Affiliations**

10 ¹ Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Midwifery
11 Science, AVAG/Amsterdam Public Health, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

12 ² Lancashire Clinical Trials Units, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom

13 ³ School of Community Health & Midwifery, Faculty of Health and Care, University of Central
14 Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom

15 ⁴ Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Midwifery
16 Science, AVAG/Amsterdam Reproduction and Development, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

17
18 *** Corresponding author**

19 E-mail: l.m.m.vandenberg@amsterdamumc.nl

20
21 **Short title**

22 Women's experiences of maternity and neonatal care in the UK and the Netherlands before and during
23 COVID-19.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **ASPIRE-COVID19 Research Team**

26 **Co-investigators**

27 Soo Downe, University of Central Lancashire; George Ellison, University of Central Lancashire; Alan
28 Fenton, Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; Alexander Heazell, University of
29 Manchester; Ank de Jonge, Amsterdam University Medical Center; Carol Kingdon, University of
30 Central Lancashire; Sarah Neal, University of Southampton; Zoe Matthews, University of
31 Southampton; Alexandra Severns, NHS England and NHS Improvement North West; Gill Thomson,
32 University of Central Lancashire; Anastasia Topalidou, University of Central Lancashire; Alison
33 Wright, Royal Free Teaching Hospital in London.

34 **Research Staff**

35 Naseerah Akooji, University of Central Lancashire; Marie-Clare Balaam, University of Central
36 Lancashire; Jo Cull, University of Central Lancashire; Lauri van den Berg, Amsterdam University
37 Medical Center; Sarah Cordey, University of Central Lancashire; Nicola Crossland, University of
38 Central Lancashire; Claire Feeley, University of Central Lancashire; Beata Franso, Amsterdam
39 University Medical Center; Steph Heys, University of Central Lancashire; Zoe Matthews, University
40 of Southampton; Gill Moncrieff, University of Central Lancashire; Sarah Neal, University of
41 Southampton; Rebecca Nowland, University of Central Lancashire; Deborah Powney, University of
42 Central Lancashire; Arni Sarian, University of Central Lancashire; Lucy Stone, University of
43 Southampton; Heidi Tranter, University of Central Lancashire; Joanne Harris, University of Central
44 Lancashire.

45 **Steering committee**

46 Maria Booker, Birthrights; Jane Sandall, Kings College London; Jim Thornton (chair), The University
47 of Nottingham; Tisian Lynskey-Wilkie, University of Central Lancashire; Vanessa Wilson, East
48 Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust.

49 **Advisory Group**

50 Rebecca Abe and Tinuke Awe, FivexMore; Toyin Adeyinka, MVP BAME Group; Ruth Bender-Atik,
51 The Miscarriage Association; Lia Brigante, RCM; Rebecca Brione, Birthrights; Franka Cadée,
52 International Confederation of Midwives (ICM); Elizabeth Duff, Expert; postnatal care; Tim Draycott,
53 Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG); Duncan Fisher, Fathers included/Family
54 included/the Family Initiative; Annie Francis, Neighbourhood Midwives; Arie Franx, Erasmus MC;
55 Lucy Frith, University of Liverpool; Louise Griew, National Maternity Voices; Clea Harmer, SANDS;
56 Caroline Homer, Burnet Institute; Australia; Marian Knight, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit
57 (NPEU); Amanda Mansfield, London Ambulance Service Trust; Neil Marlow, University College
58 London; Trixie Mcaree, NHS England; David Monteith, Grace in Action; Keith Reed, Twins Trust;
59 Yana Richens, UCL & City University; Lucia Rocca-Ihenacho, Midwifery Unit Network; Mary Ross-
60 Davie, RCM Scotland; Seana Talbot, BirthWise NI; Myles Taylor, British Maternal and Fetal
61 Medicine Society; Maureen Treadwell, Birth Trauma Association.

62 **Structured abstract**

63 **Background:** The COVID-19 pandemic had a severe impact on women's birth experiences. To date,
64 there are no studies that use both quantitative and qualitative data to compare women's birth
65 experiences before and during the pandemic, across more than one country.

66 **Aim:** To examine women's birth experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic and to compare the
67 experiences of women who gave birth in the United Kingdom (UK) or the Netherlands (NL) either
68 before or during the pandemic.

69 **Method:** This study is based on analyses of quantitative and qualitative data from the online Babies
70 Born Better survey. Responses recorded by women giving birth in the UK and the NL between June
71 and December 2020 have been used, encompassing women who gave birth between 2017 and 2020.
72 Quantitative data were analysed descriptively, and chi-squared tests were performed to compare
73 women who gave birth pre- versus during pandemic and separately by country. Qualitative data was
74 analysed by inductive thematic analysis.

75 **Findings:** Respondents in both the UK and the NL who gave birth during the pandemic were as likely,
76 or, if they had a self-reported above average standard of life, more likely to rate their labour and birth
77 experience positively when compared to women who gave birth pre-pandemic. This was despite the
78 fact that those labouring in the pandemic reported less support and choice. Two potential explanatory
79 themes emerged from the qualitative data: respondents had lower expectations during the pandemic,
80 and they appreciated that care providers tried hard to personalise care.

81 **Conclusion:** Our study implies that many women labouring during the COVID-19 pandemic
82 experienced restrictions, but their experience was mitigated by staff actions. However, personalised
83 care should not be maintained by the good will of care providers, but should be a priority in maternity
84 care policy to benefit all service users equitably.

85 **Introduction**

86 Pregnancy is a unique and life-changing event that is associated with new experiences and strong
87 emotions for many women and birthing people (further ‘women’) [1, 2]. Events during pregnancy,
88 childbirth and the post-partum period can continue to affect women for many years to come [3]. The
89 onset of the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic has had a severe impact on maternity
90 care provision around the world. More generally, the unknown situation, fear of COVID-19 and a
91 range of public health measures, such as lockdowns and several restrictions influenced the
92 psychological wellbeing of whole populations [4-7]. Besides these stressors for the general population,
93 women in the perinatal period faced additional consequences, such as restrictions in visiting their new-
94 born baby, their place of birth choice, and options for pain medication, that has negatively influenced
95 the mental health of many [8-10].

96 Over the past two years several studies have evaluated the birth experiences of women during
97 the COVID-19 pandemic. For instance, an Italian qualitative study concluded that pregnant women
98 during the pandemic experienced fear, sadness, and uncertainty when they visualised their upcoming
99 birth [11]. A UK qualitative study of women labouring and giving birth during the pandemic revealed
100 that participants were concerned about feeling alone during birth due to companionship restrictions;
101 the possibility of transmission of COVID-19 to their baby; and restrictions on the use of water for
102 labour and/or birth [12]. In contrast, another Italian study showed similar satisfaction with birth
103 experience for those labouring and giving birth before and during the pandemic [13]. The survey did
104 not explore the reasons for the responses given at both time points. There is therefore a gap in
105 understanding what might influence the experience of maternity care both before and during a system-
106 wide crisis like a pandemic.

107 To address this gap and provide an in-depth understanding of women’s birth experiences
108 during the COVID-19 pandemic, we used qualitative and quantitative data to compare the experiences
109 of women and childbearing people who gave birth in the UK or the NL either before or during the
110 pandemic. The UK and the NL are European countries with comparable maternity care systems, and,
111 by population size, experienced similar numbers of COVID-19 infections. Their approach to the

112 pandemic in maternity care was somewhat different, with the NL having a more community-based
113 approach and the UK offering more hospital-centric care, but having greater structures in place for
114 service user organisations input [14]. A comparison between the two countries may give insight into
115 how different approaches to the pandemic are related to women’s birth experiences.

116 This study was undertaken as part of the ESRC/UKRI funded ASPIRE-COVID-19 study,
117 which included an analysis of responses to the international Babies Born Better survey version 3 (B3-
118 survey). The survey includes both quantitative questions about labour and birth experiences, and
119 qualitative questions designed to understand what underlies both positive and negative responses. To
120 our knowledge this is the first mixed-method study about childbirth experiences pre- and during the
121 COVID-19 pandemic. Our research question was: *What were the labour, birth, post-partum and*
122 *neonatal care experiences of UK and NL women before and during the COVID-19 pandemic and what*
123 *explains any differences?*

124

125 **Methodology**

126 **Study design**

127 This study is based on analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data from the online B3-survey
128 version 3. The B3-survey was designed with help of the EU-funded COST IS1405 network to assess
129 and interpret differences in the quality of maternity care within and between countries. The survey is
130 designed to capture women’s views about what went well in their maternity care experience and what
131 could have worked better.

132

133 **Data collection**

134 The B3 survey has been run since February 2014, with an overall response to date of over 97,000
135 women in 25 languages from 86 countries [15-19]. The third version of the survey has been open from
136 June 2020 (with a planned closure date of June 2022). Women are eligible to complete the survey if

137 they had a baby in the previous three years. For this analysis, responses recorded by women giving
138 birth in the UK and the NL between June and December 2020 were used, encompassing women who
139 gave birth to their most recent baby between 2017 and December 2020. The survey was accessible on
140 the BBB survey website (<https://www.babiesbornbetter.org/surveyportal/>) and was widely
141 disseminated by researchers, maternity care organisations, service-user organisations, hospitals and
142 midwifery practices through social media from June till September 2020. Responses from women who
143 gave birth in the UK and the NL were collected, but the survey was translated and available in 25
144 languages, so women could complete the survey in their preferred language, even if this was not
145 English or Dutch.

146 The survey captures demographics (such as age, parity, self-determined standard of life),
147 clinical factors (such as type of birth and problems during pregnancy). The place name or postcode of
148 the birth location was also captured. Problems during pregnancy were self-reported by the participants
149 and were categorised as *no problems, minor and severe medical and non-medical problems*. Self-
150 reported standard of life was assessed with the following question: ‘*compared to most people in this*
151 *country, I think my standard of life is...*’ followed by a Likert scale comprising the terms *much worse,*
152 *below average, average, above average and much better*. Women are asked to rate their overall birth
153 experience with the following question: ‘*How do you feel about your labour and birth experience?*’
154 using a Likert scale of *mostly a very good experience, mostly a good experience, some of it was good*
155 *and some of it was bad, mostly a bad experience or mostly a very bad experience*.

156 After that, respondents were asked to record the three most positive aspects of the care they
157 received, and three aspects that could have improved their birth experience. They were then invited to
158 imagine that a close relative or friend who was pregnant had asked for an honest description of the
159 care they had received, and to record what their response would be. The survey ends with an open
160 question where the woman can add any additional information about their labour and birth that they
161 think might be relevant.

162

163

164 **Data analysis**

165 Participants were divided into 2 categories: ‘pre-COVID’ and ‘COVID’. A participant belonged to the
166 ‘pre-COVID’ category if they gave birth before 1 March 2020 and to the ‘COVID’ category if they
167 had a baby from 1 March 2020 onwards. Participants who did not record a date of birth of their baby
168 (n=5) were not included in the analysis.

169

170 **Quantitative analysis**

171 Descriptive analyses were performed on all quantitative data in the survey, firstly by whether the
172 participant gave birth in the UK or the NL, and then by categorising participants into ‘pre-COVID’
173 and ‘COVID’. Chi-squared tests were performed on categorical variables by COVID status, separately
174 by country and between countries.

175 The dependent variable ‘birth experiences’ was then dichotomised into two categories:
176 positive and not positive. Positive contained responses ‘mostly good’ and ‘quite good’ and not positive
177 contained responses ‘some good, some bad’, ‘quite bad’, ‘mostly bad’. Standard of life was also
178 dichotomised into ‘below average & average’ and ‘above average’. Birth experiences and standard of
179 life were separately compared in the pre-COVID and COVID time periods and also separately by
180 country, because it is known that a higher than average standard of life might have impacted childbirth
181 experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic [20]. Stata version 17.0 was used for all quantitative data
182 analysis. All statistical tests were carried at the 5% level of significance.

183

184 **Qualitative analysis**

185 We analysed responses to the two open-ended questions in the BBB survey: question 1) “In the place
186 where you gave birth, what were the three most positive experiences of your care?” and question 2)
187 “What do you think could have made your experience better?”. We analysed the answers using Braun
188 and Clarke’s [21] inductive thematic approach. We used this method because it offers flexibility and
189 theoretical freedom to explore experiences, meanings and the reality of participants [21].

190 First, all the answers were coded with initial codes with the help of MAXQDA version
191 2020.4.1. These initial codes were used to recognise patterns and were sorted into groups. For each
192 coding group, we then looked at the answers given by women who had given birth before or during
193 the COVID-19 pandemic. The initial themes were developed by LB, and were reviewed and refined
194 through discussions with all authors until consensus was reached. The writing process was guided by
195 the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) [22]. Since many responses
196 were in Dutch, the quotes were translated by the Dutch-speaking authors collaboratively.

197

198 **Reflexivity statement**

199 Our research team comprised seven women with different backgrounds, including midwifery,
200 psychology, statistics and women's studies. At the beginning of the analysis phase, we all believed
201 that restricting women's rights during childbirth in an attempt to prevent COVID-19 could lead to
202 short and long-term effects on women's psychological wellbeing. While prevention of infection is
203 important, lack of attention to psychological wellbeing may generate greater harm than benefit in the
204 longer term [23, 24]. We purposively looked for disconfirming data to ensure that these beliefs did not
205 unduly influence our findings.

206

207 **Ethics statement**

208 In the Netherlands the study was submitted to the Medical Ethics Review Committee of the VU
209 University Medical Centre (reference number 2020.255). No ethical approval was needed, since the
210 Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act did not apply to this study, as there was considered
211 to be no infringement on the physical and/or psychological integrity of the participants.

212 In the United Kingdom the study was approved by the University of Central Lancashire
213 (UCLan) Committee for Ethics and Integrity (STEMH 449 Amendment_1Jun20).

214 All the participants gave informed consent before they started the survey. The survey is
215 completely anonymous, so they were aware that they could not withdraw their data once they had
216 submitted their responses.

217 Results

218 Demographics

219 A total of 2203 completed surveys from the UK and The NL were recorded between June and
220 December 2020. 1303 (60%) of responses were from the UK and 900 (40%) were from the NL.
221 Overall, 31% (n=678) of respondents gave birth during the COVID-19 pandemic (March-December
222 2020); 36% (468) of all UK respondents, and 23% (n=210) of all respondents from the NL [Table 1].

223 **Table 1 Babies Born Better Survey responses in relation to COVID-19 pandemic**

	UK	Netherlands	Total
Responses	1303	900	2203
Baby during COVID-19; n (%)**			
Yes	468 (36.0)	210 (23.4)	678 (30.9)
No	833 (64.0)	687 (76.6)	1520 (69.1)
Year of birth: n (%)**			
2017	89 (7.0)	86 (9.8)	175 (8.1)
2018	301 (23.6)	218 (24.7)	519 (24.1)
2019	349 (27.4)	311 (35.3)	660 (30.6)
2020	535 (42.0)	267 (30.3)	802 (37.2)

224 +March 2020 to Dec 2020

225 * 5 missing responses

226 ** 47 missing responses

227

228 Table two provides demographic details [Table 2]. Median age (IQR) was 31 years old in the UK and
229 32 years old in the NL with minimal difference in the COVID periods. Highest level of education also
230 showed minimal differences between COVID periods for both countries. However, the NL had a
231 higher percentage (21%) of participants completing tertiary education compared to the UK (11%). No
232 significant differences were found in self-reported standard of life in either UK or the NL pre- or
233 during the pandemic.

234

235

236

237 **Table 2 Demographics of participants who completed the survey**

	UK			Netherlands		
	Pre-COVID	COVID	All	Pre-COVID	COVID	All
Age (years old); median (LQ, UQ)	31 (28,34)	31 (28,34)	31 (28,34)	32 (29,34)	31 (28,34)	32 (29, 34)
Educational level; n (%)	Pre-COVID	COVID	All	Pre-COVID	COVID	All
No formal schooling	1 (0.1)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	0	1 (0.1)
Primary education	1 (0.1)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.5)	2 (0.2)
Secondary education	77 (9.3)	68 (14.3)	145 (11.2)	11 (1.6)	1 (0.5)	12 (1.3)
Tertiary/professional/technical	86 (10.4)	50 (10.5)	136 (10.5)	129 (19.1)	57 (25.6)	186 (20.7)
University or equivalent	659 (80.0)	357 (74.8)	1016 (78.1)	535 (79.0)	164 (73.5)	699 (77.7)
p-value			p=0.097			p=0.145
Standard of life; n (%)	Pre-COVID	COVID	All	Pre-COVID	COVID	All
Much worse	0	0	0	1 (0.2)	0	1 (0.1)
Below average	15 (1.8)	3 (0.6)	18 (1.4)	13 (1.9)	2 (0.9)	15 (1.7)
Average	352 (42.7)	201 (42.1)	553 (42.5)	261 (38.6)	99 (44.4)	360 (40.0)
Above average	385 (46.7)	226 (47.3)	611 (46.9)	363 (53.7)	108 (48.4)	471 (52.4)
Much better	72 (8.7)	48 (10.0)	120 (9.2)	38 (5.62)	14 (6.3)	52 (5.8)
p-value			p=0.293			p=0.433

238

239 In the UK, 46% (n=380) reported pregnancy problems pre-COVID and 40% (n=193) during COVID.

240 There was a weak statistically significant difference in the UK ($\chi^2(1) = 4.2, p = .041$) but no

241 difference was found in the NL [Table 3].

242 **Table 3 Problems in pregnancy of the included participants**

	UK			Netherlands		
	Pre-COVID	COVID	All	Pre-COVID	COVID	All
Problems in pregnancy; n (%)	380 (46.1)	193 (40.3)	573 (44.0)	273 (40.3)	88 (39.5)	361 (40.1)
p-value			p=0.041*			p=0.820
Type of problems; n (%)	Pre-COVID	COVID	All	Pre-COVID	COVID	All
Minor non-medical problems	82 (21.2)	36 (18.1)	118 (20.1)	69 (24.6)	20 (22.2)	89 (24.0)
Minor medical problems	243 (62.8)	138 (69.4)	381 (65.0)	167 (59.4)	57 (63.3)	224 (60.4)
Severe non-medical problems	15 (3.9)	3 (1.5)	18 (3.1)	5 (1.8)	2 (2.2)	7 (1.9)
Severe medical problems	47 (12.1)	22 (11.1)	69 (11.8)	40 (14.2)	11 (12.2)	51 (13.8)
p-value			p=0.258			p=0.897

243 * $p \leq 0.05$

244 In the NL women reported a higher percentage of having a vaginal birth without help in both time

245 periods compared to the UK. No statistically significant difference was found in either country

246 between COVID time points for type of birth [Table 4]. There were statistically significant differences

247 ($\chi^2(4) = 15.38, p = .004$) in birth setting in the UK with more women giving birth in hospital during

248 COVID-19 pandemic compared to pre-COVID. No such difference was found in the NL, but the NL
 249 had a higher rate of homebirth overall among the respondents: 44% (n=399) compared to the UK; 18%
 250 (n=230).

251 **Table 4 Type of birth and birth setting of the included participants**

Type of birth; n (%)	UK			Netherlands		
	Pre-COVID	COVID	All	Pre-COVID	COVID	All
Normally with no assistance	441 (53.5)	259 (54.2)	700 (53.8)	464 (68.6)	156 (70.0)	620 (69.0)
With the help of ventouse (suction) or forceps	130 (15.8)	76 (15.9)	206 (15.8)	55 (8.1)	19 (8.5)	74 (8.2)
By a caesarean section, planned in pregnancy	70 (8.5)	45 (9.4)	115 (8.8)	33 (4.9)	11 (4.9)	44 (4.9)
By a caesarean section, due to emergency in labour	106 (12.9)	57 (11.9)	163 (12.5)	46 (6.8)	11 (4.9)	57 (6.3)
Other	77 (9.3)	41 (8.6)	118 (9.1)	78 (11.5)	26 (11.7)	104 (11.6)
p-value			p=0.948			p=0.909
Birth setting; n (%)	UK			Netherlands		
In a hospital	548 (66.5)	337 (70.4)	885 (67.9)	351 (51.9)	114 (51.1)	465 (51.7)
In a birth centre that is part of a hospital	180 (21.8)	77 (16.1)	257 (19.2)	129 (19.1)	34 (15.3)	163 (1.1)
In a birth centre that is not part of a hospital	13 (1.6)	11 (2.3)	24 (1.8)	1 (0.2)	0	1 (0.1)
At your home	148 (18.0)	82 (17.1)	230 (17.7)	294 (43.4)	105 (47.1)	399 (44.3)
Other	4 (0.5)	11 (2.3)	15 (1.2)	33 (4.9)	12 (5.4)	45 (5.0)
p-value			p = 0.004			p=0.723

252
 253 Most of the described demographics are in line with the population numbers, but the home birth rate in
 254 our sample is higher than in the overall population, for both the UK and the NL [25, 26].

255
 256 **Quantitative data**

257 The NL had a higher percentage of women reporting a very good birth experience 65% (n=581)
 258 compared to the UK 48% (n=624), which is a statistically significant difference between the two
 259 countries (p-value < 0.01). No significant differences were found in either country for labour and birth
 260 experiences pre and during the COVID-19 pandemic for the respondents as a whole [Table 5]. At both
 261 timepoints, and for those reporting all standards of life, reports of a positive experience were
 262 statistically significantly higher in the NL than in the UK.

263
 264
 265

266 **Table 5 Overall birth experience of the participants**

Labour & Birth experience; n (%)	UK			Netherlands		
	Pre-COVID	COVID	All	Pre-COVID	COVID	All
It was mostly a very good experience	380 (46.2)	244 (51.2)	624 (48.0)	425 (62.9)	156 (70.0)	581 (64.6)
It was mostly quite a good experience	149 (18.1)	82 (17.2)	231 (17.7)	138 (20.4)	43 (19.3)	181 (20.1)
Some of it was good, some of it was bad	164 (19.9)	100 (21.0)	264 (20.3)	69 (10.2)	16 (7.2)	85 (9.5)
It was mostly quite a bad experience	74 (9.0)	31 (6.5)	195 (8.1)	26 (3.9)	5 (2.2)	31 (3.4)
It was mostly a very bad experience	56 (6.8)	20 (4.2)	76 (5.9)	18 (2.7)	3 (1.4)	21 (2.3)
p-value within country	p=0.103			p=0.237		
p-value between countries overall	P < 0.01					

267

268 In the UK, similar rates of women reporting average and below standard of life had positive
 269 labour and birth experiences pre-COVID 64% (n=233) compared to during the COVID-19 pandemic
 270 (65%, n=132). Women reporting a higher standard of life were non-significantly more likely to report
 271 better experiences if they gave birth during the pandemic than those who gave birth before COVID
 272 (71% vs 65%).

273 In the NL, similar patterns were seen, with the more positive birth experience for women who
 274 gave birth during the pandemic reaching statistical significance for women self-reported higher
 275 standard of life (94% vs 84%) [Table 6].

276 **Table 6 Standard of Life and childbirth experiences of the included participants**

Standard of Life		UK			Netherlands		
		Positive	Not Positive	Total by row	Positive	Not Positive	Total by row
Below average & Average	Pre-COVID	63.7 (233)	36.3 (133)	366	82.6 (227)	17.4 (48)	231
	COVID	65.0 (132)	35.0 (71)	203	83.2 (84)	16.8 (17)	101
	Chi-squared P-value	0.745			0.887		
Above average	Pre-COVID	64.8 (296)	35.2 (161)	457	83.8 (336)	16.2 (65)	401
	COVID	70.8 (194)	29.2 (80)	274	94.3 (115)	5.7 (7)	122
	Chi-squared P-value	0.093			0.003		
Overall	Pre-COVID	64.3 (529)	35.7 (294)	823	83.3 (563)	16.7 (112)	676
	COVID	68.3 (326)	31.7 (151)	477	89.2 (199)	10.8 (24)	226
	Chi-squared P-value	0.136			0.032		

277

278

279 **Qualitative data**

280 Given that the findings that the experiences of women were similar or better during Covid than pre-
281 Covid are in direct contrast to many other studies in this area, we examined the responses to two open
282 questions to try to identify reasons for our unexpected results. Our thematic analysis identified two
283 themes underpinning negative experiences: 1) Lack of support; 2) Limits placed on freedom of choice.
284 Two further themes might explain why some reported experiences were more positive than
285 anticipated: 3) Lower expectations of care during the pandemic; and 4) Efforts of staff to give
286 personalised care, despite the rules. All four themes were more present in the accounts of women who
287 gave birth during the pandemic.

288

289 **Lack of support**

290 Responses to the question ‘What do you think could have made your experience better?’ indicate that
291 women who gave birth during the COVID-19 pandemic revealed a lack of support before, during and
292 after childbirth. For some women this was associated with fewer staff being available, or by shorter or
293 more distant contacts with staff due to COVID-19 social distancing measures:

294

295 *‘When I unexpectedly laboured I did not receive enough care waiting for my COVID test and*
296 *labouring waiting for C section.’ (‘What do you think could have made your experience*
297 *better?’ , UK woman, second child, gave birth August 2020)*

298

299 *‘More presence of the midwife and nurse during childbirth’ (‘What do you think could have*
300 *made your experience better?’ , NL woman, first child, gave birth July 2020)*

301

302 Furthermore, COVID-19 measures made it more difficult for women to receive their chosen labour
303 and post-partum support from a partner, family member and/or doula, due to restrictions in both
304 countries.

305

306 *'Because of the corona measures my partner was not allowed to be there during overnight*
307 *stay before the birth' ('What do you think could have made your experience better?', NL*
308 *woman, first child, gave birth April 2020)*

309
310 *'Partner being able to stay longer on the ward - limited visiting due to covid' ('What do you*
311 *think could have made your experience better?', UK woman, second child, gave birth*
312 *September 2020)*

313
314 *'Other family being able to visit the post-natal ward' ('What do you think could have made*
315 *your experience better?', UK woman, second child, gave birth September 2020)*

316

317 **Limits placed on freedom of choice**

318 The majority of the participants considered freedom to make choices about their labour and birth to be
319 very important. While many women reported that their freedom to make choices was respected during
320 childbirth, even during the COVID-19 pandemic, some of those giving birth during restrictions noted
321 limitations to this freedom. This was particularly noted in terms of choices about place of labour and
322 birth in the UK, due to some home birth services being closed.

323

324 *'Home birth service' ('What do you think could have made your experience better?', UK*
325 *woman, first child, gave birth June 2020)*

326

327 None of the respondents from the NL noted restrictions in home birth services, and for some, freedom
328 to give birth at home during the pandemic was a positive factor in their experience:

329

330 *'That I could give birth at home' ('In the place where you gave birth, what were the three*
331 *most positive experiences of your care?', NL woman, third child, gave birth May 2020)*

332

333 Furthermore, some respondents experienced limitations in other parts of their birth experience,
334 including the possibility to choose a water birth:

335

336 *'Due to Covid I was not allowed a water birth.'* (*'What do you think could have made your*
337 *experience better?'*, UK woman, first child, gave birth April 2020)

338

339 **Lower expectations of care during the pandemic**

340 As the previous results have shown, many of the women who gave birth during the COVID-19
341 pandemic in both the UK and the NL were alone when they wanted companionship (family and/or
342 professional), and had less freedom of choice. This being the case, it is surprising that the quantitative
343 data suggest that they were equally, or even more likely to report that their birth was a positive
344 experience compared to women who gave birth before the pandemic. One of the reasons behind this
345 might be that, during the pandemic, women had lower expectations for their labour and birth
346 experience, due to national and local restrictions. For example, the following examples were cited as
347 distinct positives of care by two women giving birth during the pandemic, even though this would be
348 seen as basic care standard in pre-pandemic times:

349

350 *'My own [primary care] midwife could attend the birth'* (*'In the place where you gave birth,*
351 *what were the three most positive experiences of your care?'*, NL woman, first child, gave
352 *birth August 2020)*

353

354 *'Flexibility so I could be supported by my husband in a stressful situation'* (*'In the place*
355 *where you gave birth, what were the three most positive experiences of your care?'*, UK
356 *woman, first child, gave birth August 2020)*

357

358

359

360 **Efforts of staff to give individualised care, despite the rules**

361 Many women in both groups, pre-COVID and COVID, valued the importance of known, competent,
362 caring and empathic care providers. The women who gave birth during the COVID-19 pandemic
363 tended to be complimentary about their care providers, particularly in relation to their efforts at a
364 difficult time.

365

366 *'The doctors and nurses were very helpful and flexible (despite Corona measures)' ('In the*
367 *place where you gave birth, what were the three most positive experiences of your*
368 *care?', NL woman, first child, gave birth March 2020)*

369

370 Several women were grateful for maternity care providers making exceptions to the COVID measures.

371

372 *'This was particular to the time of our birth, when there were still many Covid-19 related*
373 *restrictions in place, but the healthcare providers allowed my partner to be there from the*
374 *beginning of my induction drip rather than waiting until 4cm dilated which I know was the*
375 *case in other Trusts/hospitals' ('In the place where you gave birth, what were the three most*
376 *positive experiences of your care?', UK woman, first child, gave birth May 2020)*

377

378 One participant acknowledged that her childbirth experience during the pandemic was challenging ,
379 but complimented her midwives that they made the experience slightly better.

380

381 *'My midwives were very supportive and helpful. They [my midwives] made giving birth during*
382 *a pandemic slightly better' ('In the place where you gave birth, what were the three most*
383 *positive experiences of your care?', UK woman, first child, gave birth April 2020)*

384

385 **Discussion**

386 In this multi-method study we compared the childbirth experiences of UK and NL women responding
387 to the international B3 survey who gave birth before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. In general,
388 women giving birth in the NL were much more likely to rate their care as positive than women giving
389 birth in the UK, at both time points, and across all self-report standard of life categories. In each
390 country, women who gave birth during the COVID-19 pandemic were, on average, at least as positive
391 about their childbirth experiences as women who gave birth before the COVID-19 pandemic.
392 Moreover, the NL women who self-reported an above average standard of life were even more
393 positive about their birth experiences if they gave birth during the COVID-19 pandemic, and while
394 this trend was also seen in the UK data, it did not reach statistical significance. This is despite the fact
395 that many women labouring during the pandemic reported having less support, choice and control than
396 those in the pre-pandemic period. Based on the qualitative analyses, two mitigating factors appeared to
397 contribute to this unexpected finding: women seemed to have lower expectations during the pandemic,
398 and they appeared to appreciate that care providers tried hard to personalise care, sometimes despite
399 the rules they were supposed to be following.

400

401 **Interpretation and comparison with other literature**

402 This study contributes to the ongoing evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic has had an
403 impact on women's labour, birth, post-partum and neonatal care experiences, and the mental health of
404 women, partners, and their babies [27-29]. Women in our study reported that they could not get the
405 support they wanted, either from their maternity care providers or from their chosen birth partner(s),
406 because of COVID-19 measures. Other researchers have linked the lack of family and healthcare
407 professional support to feelings of loneliness, especially where it continues into the post-partum period
408 [27, 30]. The importance of choice in matters such as place of labour and birth, water birth, and birth
409 partners for women is well documented [31-34]. Many of our respondents wanted options to choose
410 for homebirth and community services, before and during the pandemic. A study in the United States

411 revealed that women's increased interest for community care during the pandemic may have been due
412 to hospital being perceived as a less safe option [35]. Differences between the UK and NL in access to
413 home birth services is likely due to homebirth services being maintained in the NL during the
414 pandemic. In contrast in the UK, several home birth and midwife led unit services were closed and
415 maternity care was centralised into hospitals to concentrate staffing in the acute units [14].

416 Despite the restrictions to companionship and freedom to choose, our quantitative data
417 indicate that survey respondents who laboured and gave birth during the pandemic phase were, on
418 average, at least as positive about their labour and birth experiences as those giving birth before this
419 point. This is in direct contrast to most surveys to date [36, 37]. The responses to the open questions in
420 the survey shed some light on this phenomenon. Many women reported they were particularly grateful
421 for staff who went the extra mile to ensure personalised care, sometimes by making exceptions, even
422 though they were often not praised for it [38]. While this was appreciated and beneficial for many
423 respondents, there is growing evidence of moral distress and compassion fatigue among staff who are
424 trying to maintain services by continuously having to go 'above and beyond' their shift times, or by
425 the stress of breaking rules that they feel are damaging to women, birthing people and families [39,
426 40]. This is not sustainable and could be highly detrimental to staff wellbeing and therefore to safe and
427 personalised care in the longer term [41]. Moreover, there is an equity problem if women in higher
428 socio-economic groups are more likely to benefit from this. Our study highlights the inequities during
429 crisis time. The NL participants with a self-reported higher than average life standard had higher birth
430 satisfaction during the COVID-19 pandemic than women with a self-reported average or lower than
431 average life standard. These findings are confirmed by the study by Mollard and Kupzyk [20]. A
432 hypothesis for this difference might be that women and their families with an above average standard
433 of life had, in general, less stressors during the pandemic, such as job insecurity, loss of income and
434 caregiving burden [42]. It could also be that, in a crisis situation where resources and emotional
435 capacity are limited, staff respond even more to those who are most able to articulate their need for
436 individualised care compared to non-crisis situations [43]. Personalisation should continue to be an
437 important part of general policy in maternity care, and therefore of care provision at all levels of the

438 service, including guidelines and staffing resources, to enable staff to benefit all service users
439 equitably.

440

441 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

442 The strengths of our study include the large number of responses to the B3 survey both before and
443 after the pandemic, the ability to compare birth experiences between two European countries with
444 similar social structures, and the use of both quantitative and qualitative data. The combination of
445 methods gave us the opportunity to explain some of the unexpected findings in the quantitative data.
446 As far as we are aware there are no other published studies to date that can make this comparison for
447 women using childbirth services before and after the pandemic. Furthermore, our team consisted of
448 people from a range of different disciplines, which contributed to investigator triangulation and
449 therefore the trustworthiness of the results.

450 However, our study has some limitations. Since the data were downloaded from the survey
451 platform in December 2020, more women who gave birth during COVID-19 responded soon after
452 their birth than women who gave birth pre-pandemic. This might have led to different levels of recall
453 bias between the two groups. Although memory for the actual events of labour and birth is generally
454 stable over time, there is some evidence that affective memories may become less positive,
455 particularly if the labour or birth were difficult [44]. Furthermore, we used a convenience sampling
456 method since we disseminated the survey online. Our results are therefore relevant to women who
457 have similar characteristics to those in our sample. As our data suggest, women who self-identify as
458 having a lower than average standard of life are more likely to report negative labour and birth
459 experiences. Most studies report a disproportionately high adverse impact of the pandemic on women
460 who were from a minority background, or those with low health literacy [24]. These women may also
461 have been missing from our sample. Even though the B3 survey is available in 25 languages, this
462 would not benefit women who do not read their written language, or who do not have access to the
463 survey on smart phones or computers. Women having home births were overrepresented in both
464 countries. However, this does not explain the higher percentage of positive responses in the NL, since

465 women having home births tend to be more positive in their responses, so the over-representation of
466 home births in the UK suggests that, with a representative sample from both countries, these
467 differences would have been even greater.

468 **Conclusion**

469 In this study, respondents in both the UK and the NL who gave birth during the pandemic were, on
470 average, as likely, or more likely to rate their labour and birth experience positively when compared to
471 women who gave birth pre-pandemic. This was despite the fact respondents who gave birth during the
472 pandemic reported lack of support and choice. This apparent paradox may be partly because women
473 had fewer expectations of the care they were going to receive, which made them value normal care
474 practices more. There is also evidence that they valued the work of maternity care providers who
475 persisted with giving individualised care during the COVID-19 pandemic, despite the constraints of
476 resources and rules, and that this influenced positive care ratings. Our study implies that women were
477 adversely affected by COVID-19 restrictions during their labour and birth, but that there were
478 mitigating factors for some women, especially those with an above average self-reported standard of
479 life. Equitable personalisation of care is important during a crisis as well as in normal times, and
480 should be part of general policy in maternity care and routine implementation in actual practice to
481 benefit all service users, rather than being maintained for some, and, even then only through the
482 willingness of staff to go ‘above and beyond’.

483 **Acknowledgements**

484 We are grateful to all the participants for their willingness to share their experiences with us. We
485 acknowledge the work of those who contributed to developing the Babies Born Better Survey. Details
486 of the project, the Steering Group, and the Country Coordinators can be found at
487 <http://www.babiesbornbetter.org/about/>. Furthermore, we would like to thank maternity care
488 organisations in the NL and the UK for sharing the Babies Born Better Survey, and the ASPIRE
489 COVID-19 research team for their input during the study.

490

491 **Author contributions**

492 **Conceptualisation:** Lauri M.M. van den Berg, Naseerah Akooji, Gill Thomson, Ank de Jonge, Marie-
493 Clare Balaam, Anastasia Topalidou and Soo Downe.

494 **Data curation:** Lauri M.M. van den Berg and Naseerah Akooji.

495 **Formal analysis:** Lauri M.M. van den Berg, Naseerah Akooji, Gill Thomson, Ank de Jonge, Marie-
496 Clare Balaam, Anastasia Topalidou and Soo Downe.

497 **Investigation:** Naseerah Akooji.

498 **Methodology:** Lauri M.M. van den Berg, Naseerah Akooji, Gill Thomson, Ank de Jonge, Marie-Clare
499 Balaam, Anastasia Topalidou and Soo Downe.

500 **Project administration:** Soo Downe.

501 **Resources:** Gill Thomson, Ank de Jonge, Anastasia Topalidou and Soo Downe.

502 **Supervision:** Gill Thomson, Ank de Jonge and Soo Downe.

503 **Visualisation:** Lauri M.M. van den Berg and Naseerah Akooji.

504 **Writing – original draft:** Lauri M.M. van den Berg and Naseerah Akooji.

505 **Writing – review & editing:** Lauri M.M. van den Berg, Naseerah Akooji, Gill Thomson, Ank de
506 Jonge, Marie-Clare Balaam, Anastasia Topalidou and Soo Downe.

507 *All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

508

509 **Data availability statement**

510 The Babies Born Better survey data will be available from the Data Services (ReShare data repository)
511 and DOIs will be provided on paper acceptance.

512 **Funding**

513 This research is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), as part of UK
514 Research and Innovation's rapid response to COVID-19 [grant number ES/V004581/1]. Full details of
515 the main study are available via ResearchRegistry (researchregistry5911) and via UKRI Gateway
516 (<https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=ES%2FV004581%2F1>).

517 This research article was based on the Babies Born Better project that was developed as part of
518 the EU-funded COST Action IS1405: BIRTH: 'Building Intrapartum Research Through Health - an
519 interdisciplinary whole system approach to understanding and contextualising physiological labour
520 and birth,' sustained by the COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology) Programme as
521 part of EU HORIZON 2020.

522

523 **Conflict of interest**

524 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

525 **References**

- 526 1. Mortazavi F, Ghardashi F. The lived experiences of pregnant women during COVID-19
527 pandemic: a descriptive phenomenological study. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth*.
528 2021;21(1):193.
- 529 2. Lou S, Frumer M, Schlütter MM, Petersen OB, Vogel I, Nielsen CP. Experiences and
530 expectations in the first trimester of pregnancy: a qualitative study. *Health expectations :*
531 *an international journal of public participation in health care and health policy*.
532 2017;20(6):1320-9.
- 533 3. Simkin P. Just another day in a woman's life? Women's long-term perceptions of their first
534 birth experience. Part I. *Birth (Berkeley, Calif)*. 1991;18(4):203-10.
- 535 4. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The
536 psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence.
537 *Lancet (London, England)*. 2020;395(10227):912-20.
- 538 5. Rossi R, Socci V, Talevi D, Mensi S, Niolu C, Pacitti F, et al. COVID-19 Pandemic and
539 Lockdown Measures Impact on Mental Health Among the General Population in Italy.
540 *Frontiers in psychiatry*. 2020;11:790.
- 541 6. Pfefferbaum B, North CS. Mental Health and the Covid-19 Pandemic. *The New England*
542 *journal of medicine*. 2020;383(6):510-2.
- 543 7. Bueno-Notivol J, Gracia-García P, Olaya B, Lasheras I, López-Antón R, Santabárbara J.
544 Prevalence of depression during the COVID-19 outbreak: A meta-analysis of community-
545 based studies. *International journal of clinical and health psychology : IJCHP*.
546 2021;21(1):100196.
- 547 8. Fan S, Guan J, Cao L, Wang M, Zhao H, Chen L, et al. Psychological effects caused by
548 COVID-19 pandemic on pregnant women: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Asian*
549 *journal of psychiatry*. 2021;56:102533.

- 550 9. Coxon K, Turienzo CF, Kweekel L, Goodarzi B, Brigante L, Simon A, et al. The impact
551 of the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic on maternity care in Europe. *Midwifery*.
552 2020;88:102779.
- 553 10. van Manen ELM, Hollander M, Feijen-de Jong E, de Jonge A, Verhoeven C, Gitsels J.
554 Experiences of Dutch maternity care professionals during the first wave of COVID-19 in a
555 community based maternity care system. *PloS one*. 2021;16(6):e0252735.
- 556 11. Ravaldi C, Wilson A, Ricca V, Homer C, Vannacci A. Pregnant women voice their
557 concerns and birth expectations during the COVID-19 pandemic in Italy. *Women and
558 birth : journal of the Australian College of Midwives*. 2021;34(4):335-43.
- 559 12. Karavadra B, Stockl A, Prosser-Snelling E, Simpson P, Morris E. Women's perceptions of
560 COVID-19 and their healthcare experiences: a qualitative thematic analysis of a national
561 survey of pregnant women in the United Kingdom. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth*.
562 2020;20(1):600.
- 563 13. Inversetti A, Fumagalli S, Nespoli A, Antolini L, Mussi S, Ferrari D, et al. Childbirth
564 experience and practice changing during COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study.
565 *Nursing open*. 2021;8(6):3627-34.
- 566 14. van den Berg LMM, Balaam M-C, Nowland R, Moncrieff G, Topalidou A, Thompson S,
567 et al. The United Kingdom and the Netherlands maternity care responses to COVID-19: a
568 comparative study. *Women and Birth*. 2022; Forthcoming.
- 569 15. Luegmair K, Zenzmaier C, Oblasser C, König-Bachmann M. Women's satisfaction with
570 care at the birthplace in Austria: Evaluation of the Babies Born Better survey national
571 dataset. *Midwifery*. 2018;59:130-40.
- 572 16. Raboteg-Šarić Z, Brajša-Žganec A, Mujkić A. Optimising childbirth in Croatia—mothers'
573 perceptions of the best experience and their suggestions for change. *The Central European
574 Journal of Paediatrics*. 2017;13:117-29.
- 575 17. Gouni O. Mothers' perceptions of their Birth Experience in Greece: Could We Do Any
576 Better Than That? Analysis of the Babies Born Better Survey for Greece. 2020.
577 2020;0(1):60.

- 578 18. Skoko E, Ravaldi C, Vannacci A, Nespoli A, Akooji N, Balaam MC, et al. Findings from
579 the Italian Babies Born Better Survey. *Minerva ginecologica*. 2018;70(6):663-75.
- 580 19. Benet M, Escuriet R, Palomar-Ruiz L, Ruiz-Berdún D, Leon-Larios F. Women's agenda
581 for the improvement of childbirth care: Evaluation of the Babies Born Better survey data
582 set in Spain. *Birth (Berkeley, Calif)*. 2020;47(4):365-77.
- 583 20. Mollard E, Kupzyk K. Birth Satisfaction During the Early Months of the COVID-19
584 Pandemic in the United States. *MCN The American journal of maternal child nursing*.
585 2022;47(1):6-12.
- 586 21. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in*
587 *psychology*. 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 588 22. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
589 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International journal for*
590 *quality in health care : journal of the International Society for Quality in Health Care*.
591 2007;19(6):349-57.
- 592 23. Asefa A, Semaan A, Delvaux T, Huysmans E, Galle A, Sacks E, et al. The impact of
593 COVID-19 on the provision of respectful maternity care: Findings from a global survey of
594 health workers. *Women and birth : journal of the Australian College of Midwives*. 2021.
- 595 24. Niles PM, Asiodu IV, Crear-Perry J, Julian Z, Lyndon A, McLemore MR, et al. Reflecting
596 on Equity in Perinatal Care During a Pandemic. *Health equity*. 2020;4(1):330-3.
- 597 25. Perined. *Perinatale zorg in Nederland anno 2020: duiding door landelijke perinatale audit*
598 *en registratie*. Utrecht; 2021.
- 599 26. *Birth characteristics in England and Wales: 2020*. Newport: Office for National Statistics;
600 2022.
- 601 27. Shuman CJ, Morgan ME, Chiangong J, Paredy N, Veliz P, Peahl AF, et al. "Mourning
602 the Experience of What Should Have Been": Experiences of Peripartum Women During
603 the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Maternal and child health journal*. 2022:1-8.

- 604 28. Chivers BR, Garad RM, Boyle JA, Skouteris H, Teede HJ, Harrison CL. Perinatal Distress
605 During COVID-19: Thematic Analysis of an Online Parenting Forum. *Journal of medical*
606 *Internet research*. 2020;22(9):e22002.
- 607 29. Hessami K, Romanelli C, Chiurazzi M, Cozzolino M. COVID-19 pandemic and maternal
608 mental health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The journal of maternal-fetal &*
609 *neonatal medicine : the official journal of the European Association of Perinatal Medicine,*
610 *the Federation of Asia and Oceania Perinatal Societies, the International Society of*
611 *Perinatal Obstet*. 2020:1-8.
- 612 30. Jackson L, De Pascalis L, Harrold JA, Fallon V, Silverio SA. Postpartum women's
613 experiences of social and healthcare professional support during the COVID-19 pandemic:
614 A recurrent cross-sectional thematic analysis. *Women and birth : journal of the Australian*
615 *College of Midwives*. 2021.
- 616 31. Organization WH. WHO recommendations: intrapartum care for a positive childbirth
617 experience: transforming care of women and babies for improved health and well-being:
618 executive summary. World Health Organization; 2018.
- 619 32. Downe S, Finlayson K, Oladapo OT, Bonet M, Gülmezoglu AM. What matters to women
620 during childbirth: A systematic qualitative review. *PloS one*. 2018;13(4):e0194906.
- 621 33. Bohren MA, Berger BO, Munthe-Kaas H, Tunçalp Ö. Perceptions and experiences of
622 labour companionship: a qualitative evidence synthesis. *The Cochrane database of*
623 *systematic reviews*. 2019;3(3):Cd012449.
- 624 34. Dahlen HG. It is time to consider labour companionship as a human rights issue.
625 *Evidence-based nursing*. 2020;23(3):78.
- 626 35. Preis H, Mahaffey B, Lobel M. The role of pandemic-related pregnancy stress in
627 preference for community birth during the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic in the
628 United States. *Birth (Berkeley, Calif)*. 2021;48(2):242-50.
- 629 36. Janevic T, Maru S, Nowlin S, McCarthy K, Bergink V, Stone J, et al. Pandemic Birthing:
630 Childbirth Satisfaction, Perceived Health Care Bias, and Postpartum Health During the
631 COVID-19 Pandemic. *Maternal and child health journal*. 2021;25(6):860-9.

- 632 37. Mariño-Narvaez C, Puertas-Gonzalez JA, Romero-Gonzalez B, Peralta-Ramirez MI.
633 Giving birth during the COVID-19 pandemic: The impact on birth satisfaction and
634 postpartum depression. *International journal of gynaecology and obstetrics: the official*
635 *organ of the International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics*. 2021;153(1):83-8.
- 636 38. Appelman IF, Thompson SM, van den Berg LMM, van der Wal JTG, de Jonge A,
637 Hollander MH. It was tough, but necessary. Organizational changes in a community based
638 maternity care system during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative
639 analysis in the Netherlands. *PloS one*. 2022;17(3):e0264311.
- 640 39. Sarah Cordey GM, Joanne Cull, Arni Sarian, Deborah Powney, Carol Kingdon, Claire
641 Feeley, Soo Downe. “There’s only so much you can be pushed”: a commentary on the
642 magnification of the maternity staffing crisis by the 2020/21 COVID-19 pandemic.
643 Authorea. 2022.
- 644 40. Geraghty S, Speelman C, Bayes S. Fighting a losing battle: Midwives experiences of
645 workplace stress. *Women and birth : journal of the Australian College of Midwives*.
646 2019;32(3):e297-e306.
- 647 41. Sinclair S, Raffin-Bouchal S, Venturato L, Mijovic-Kondejewski J, Smith-MacDonald L.
648 Compassion fatigue: A meta-narrative review of the healthcare literature. *International*
649 *journal of nursing studies*. 2017;69:9-24.
- 650 42. Gassman-Pines A, Ananat EO, Fitz-Henley J, 2nd. COVID-19 and Parent-Child
651 Psychological Well-being. *Pediatrics*. 2020;146(4).
- 652 43. Heys S, Downe S, Thomson G. 'I know my place'; a meta-ethnographic synthesis of
653 disadvantaged and vulnerable women's negative experiences of maternity care in high-
654 income countries. *Midwifery*. 2021;103:103123.
- 655 44. Donate-Manzanares M, Rodríguez-Cano T, Rodríguez-Almagro J, Hernández-Martínez A,
656 Santos-Hernández G, Beato-Fernández L. Mixed-method study of women's assessment
657 and experience of childbirth care. *Journal of advanced nursing*. 2021;77(10):4195-210.

658