

1 **Mental health of pregnant women during the SARS-CoV-2**
2 **pandemic in France: evolution of self-perceived psychological**
3 **state during the first lockdown, and anxiety frequency two**
4 **months after the lockdown ended.**

5 Alexandra Doncarli^{1¶*}, Lucia Araujo-Chaveron^{1¶}, Catherine Crenn-Hebert^{2,3}, Marie-Noëlle
6 Vacheron⁴, Christophe Léon¹, Imane Khireddine¹, Francis Chin¹, Alexandra Benachi^{5,6}, Sarah
7 Tebeka^{7,8} and Nolwenn Regnault¹

8 ¹ Santé Publique France, Saint-Maurice, France

9 ² Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Louis Mourier University Hospital, AP-HP, Colombes,
10 France

11 ³ Regional Health Agency of Ile de France (ARS-IDF), Saint-Denis, France

12 ⁴ Consultation d'Information, Conseils et Orientation pour les femmes enceintes ou avec désir
13 d'enfant atteintes de trouble psychique (CICO), GHU Paris Psychiatrie et Neurosciences, Hôpital
14 Saint-Anne, Paris, France

15 ⁵ Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Antoine Beclere Hospital, AP-HP, Clamart, France.

16 ⁶ Université Paris Saclay, Clamart, France

17 ⁷ Université de Paris, INSERM U1266, F-75014 Paris, France;

18 ⁸ Department of Psychiatry, AP-HP, Louis Mourier Hospital, F-92700 Colombes, France

19 *Corresponding author

20 E-mail : alexandra.doncarli@santepubliquefrance.fr (AD)

21

22 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

23

24 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

25 Abstract

26 Previous pandemics and related lockdowns have had a deleterious impact on
27 pregnant women's mental health. We studied the impact of the SARS-CoV-2/Covid-19 pandemic
28 and France's first lockdown on pregnant women's mental health.

29 A cross-sectional study was conducted in July 2020 using a web-questionnaire completed by 500
30 adult women who were pregnant during the first lockdown in France (March-May 2020). Questions
31 focused on their self-perceived psychological state and affects they felt before and during the
32 lockdown and anxiety symptomatology (HAD) two months after it ended. A robust variance
33 Poisson regression model was used to estimate adjusted prevalence ratios (aPR) for anxiety and
34 self-perceived psychological state evolution.

35 One in five respondents (21.1%) reported psychological deterioration during lockdown. Associated
36 determinants were: i) little or no social support (self-perceived) (aRP=1.77, 95%CI[1.18-2.66]), ii)
37 increased workload (1.65, [1.02-2.66]), and iii) poor/moderate knowledge about SARS-CoV-2
38 transmission (1.60, [1.09-2.35]). Seven percent of women reporting psychological deterioration had
39 access to professional psychological support during lockdown, while 19% did not despite wanting
40 it. Women reported heightened powerlessness (60.3%), frustration (64%) and fear (59.2%) during
41 lockdown.

42 One in seven respondents (14.2%, 95%CI[10.9-18.2]) had anxiety symptoms. Determinants
43 associated: i) at least one pregnancy-related pathology (aPR=1.82, 95%CI[1.15-2.88]), ii)
44 overweightness or obesity (1.61, [1.07-2.43]), iii) one child under the age of six years in the
45 household during the lockdown (3.26, [1.24-8.53]), iv) little or no social support (self-perceived)
46 during the lockdown (1.66, [1.07-2.58]), v) friend or relatives diagnosed with Covid-19 or with
47 symptoms of the disease (1.66; [1.06-2.60]), vi) no access to medication for psychological distress

48 (2.86, [1.74-4.71]), and vii) unsuccessfully seeking exchanges with healthcare professionals about
49 their pregnancy during the pandemic (1.66, [1.08-2.55]).

50 Our results can guide prevention and support policies for pregnant women during pandemics,
51 current or future, with or without lockdowns. Preventing perinatal mental health problems is
52 essential to ensure a supportive environment for the child's development.

53

54 **Introduction**

55 Data from previous coronavirus outbreaks in 2002 and 2013 showed that pregnancy was a
56 risk factor for severe forms of associated respiratory diseases. More specifically, SARS-CoV-1 and
57 MERS-CoV were associated with significant acute respiratory distress syndrome [1, 2]. This reality,
58 together with recommendations of learned societies [3], prompted several countries, including
59 France, to declare in March/April 2020 that pregnant women should be considered a population at
60 greater risk of severe forms of Covid-19, the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 [4-7]. In the absence
61 of vaccines and effective pharmaceutical treatments at that time, most governments decided to
62 reduce the spread of the virus by implementing strict lockdowns of their entire population for
63 several months. In France, the first such lockdown took place between 17 March and 11 May 2020.
64 Recent studies showed the negative psychological effects of lockdowns implemented during
65 previous epidemics, including anxiety disorders, depressive disorders, psychological distress and
66 sleep disorders [8, 9]. Some of these negative psychological effects seem to persist after the
67 lockdown period [9]. Furthermore, the lockdown measures implemented to prevent the virus'
68 diffusion might have led to social deprivation and a lack of sufficient social support (i.e., from
69 family, friends, etc.), two known risk factors for mental health fragility in women during the
70 perinatal period [10, 11]. Thus, there was a potential psychological impact of lockdown measures in
71 pregnant women.

72 In addition, pregnant women - whether they were infected or not - knew that they were at greater
73 risk of developing severe forms of Covid-19, and consequently may have felt worried about their
74 own health and especially that of their unborn or newborn child. Thus, although little studied at the
75 beginning of the pandemic (this is also true for the previous SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV, and H1N1
76 outbreaks [12, 13]), there was a potential psychological impact linked to the perception of the risk
77 of developing a severe form of Covid-19 in pregnant women. And this could be a cumulative
78 impact with lockdown measures on the mental health of pregnant women. Several recent studies

79 showed indeed the negative psychological impact of the ongoing SARS-CoV-2 pandemic - whose
80 scale and duration are unprecedented - on anxiety, depression, and hostility in pregnant women. A
81 Quebec study on pregnant women before (n=496) and during (n=1258) the pandemic reported a
82 higher level of depressive, anxiety symptoms, and negative affect, and less positive affectivity [14].
83 Furthermore, a Chinese study reported higher scores of depression, anxiety and hostility, as well as
84 sleep disturbances in pregnant women [15].

85 Psychological disorders related to the current pandemic might also negatively impact pregnant
86 women's general physical health and their child's physical and mental health, especially in terms of
87 the risk of premature birth and low child birth weight. Most of all, they negatively impact the
88 development of the mother-newborn bond [16-19].

89 Given this context, we designed and implemented Covimater, a population-based study whose
90 objectives were (i) to explore the evolution in self-perceived psychological state between before and
91 during the first French lockdown (March-May 2020) in a sample of pregnant women, (ii) to assess
92 anxiety frequency and factors associated with anxiety symptoms in these women two months after
93 the end of lockdown.

94 **Materials and methods**

95 **Study design, setting and sample size of Covimater**

96 At our request, a service provider (BVA group) interviewed its unpaid pre-pandemic internet
97 panel of 15,000 future parents or parents of children under 3 years to create a pseudonymised non-
98 probabilistic sample of 500 pregnant adult women who met the inclusion criteria (described below)
99 and volunteered to participate in our survey. Covimater is a cross-sectional study using quotas
100 sampling, whereby the study sample is assigned a structure similar to that of the target population
101 (i.e., all pregnant women) in order to tend towards representativeness. The population of parents of
102 children under 1 year old - as per the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies 2016

103 census - was used to set the quotas [20]. By its broad representation, the latter was judged a good
104 proxy for our target population of pregnant women in France. The quotas for mothers of children
105 under 1 year old were applied to calculate weightings using Newton's algorithm [21] and obtain
106 weighted individual data for the statistical analysis presented herein (see below). Specifically, these
107 quotas comprised age group, socio-professional category (SPC), region of residence, size of urban
108 area, and parity.

109 Eligible women (see below) were invited by BVA to answer an online questionnaire between 6 and
110 20 July 2020 i.e. two months after the end of the first lockdown in France (March-May 2020). The
111 two-month interval was chosen i) to avoid the memory bias associated with a longer interval, and ii)
112 because the major recommended prevention measures had not changed in the two months after
113 lockdown. No significant difference in available data for age group, region of residence, or parity
114 was observed between the women participating in Covimater and women in the whole French
115 population who gave birth in a hospital maternity ward (i.e., 99% of pregnant women in France
116 [22]).

117 **Participants**

118 Our sample comprised 500 women who were: i) pregnant during the first lockdown in
119 France (from 17 March to 11 May 2020), ii) aged 18 and over, and iii) residents in metropolitan
120 France. We excluded two groups of women pregnant during lockdown but with limited exposure to
121 it: those who delivered in the two first weeks of lockdown and those whose first week of gestation
122 began during the last two weeks of lockdown (deducted from the expected date of delivery reported
123 by the women).

124 **Issues of interest: mental health measures**

125 Three aspects were studied:

126 - Change in self-declared general psychological state was assessed with the following two
127 questions: “Just before the lockdown, on a psychological level, how did you feel?” (good/quite
128 good/quite poor/poor), and “During the lockdown, on a psychological level, how did you feel?”
129 (good/quite good/quite poor/poor). In our analysis, the first study outcome was psychological
130 deterioration defined as a switch from a ‘good’ or ‘quite good’ psychological state just before the
131 lockdown to ‘quite poor’ or ‘poor’ state during the lockdown.

132 - Positive and negative study affects felt more strongly than usual during the lockdown: relief,
133 serenity, security, loneliness, frustration, powerlessness, anger, fear and despair. The related
134 question was: “During lockdown, did you feel the following emotions more strongly than usual?
135 (Yes, a lot/Yes, somewhat/No, not really/No, not at all). In the analysis, for each affect, it was
136 estimated that women who answered "yes, a lot" or "yes, somewhat" felt that affect more strongly
137 than usual during the lockdown.

138 - Anxiety symptoms two months after the first lockdown ended. Women were screened using
139 answers to the seven questions on anxiety in the 14-item Hospital Anxiety and Depression scale
140 (HAD) [23]. A score from 0 to 3 is assigned to each HAD question. Women with an overall score
141 of >10 for all seven anxiety questions were considered to have anxiety symptoms [24].

142 **Comparisons**

143 Explanatory variables were divided into five main themes:

144 **Demographic and socio-economic:** age, socio-professional category (SPC) reduced into SPC+
145 (self-employed women, managers, intermediate professions), SPC- (employees, blue-collar
146 workers) and inactive women (students and other professionally inactives), educational level (equal
147 to or higher than secondary school diploma, lower than secondary school diploma), perceived
148 financial situation (comfortable, just getting by, difficult to make ends meet).

149 **Pandemic and lockdown-related:** child(ren) under six years of age (*i.e.*, younger than required
150 school age in France) in the household during the lockdown, SARS-CoV-2 strain-on healthcare

151 system in region of residence (coded as green, orange or red, reflecting increased epidemic
152 pressure) [25], professional workload (did not work, lighter than/same as usual, heavier than usual),
153 self-perceived social support (from family, friends, etc. ; Very good/Good, Little or None),
154 experience of serious disputes/climat of violence (Very-often/Often, Sometimes/Rarely, Never),
155 level of knowledge about the virus' modes of transmission (score based on seven questions, see
156 details in Table 1), presence of COVID-19-type symptoms, family member or friends with COVID-
157 19 diagnosis or symptoms suggestive of the disease.

158 **Self-perception of the pandemic during the lockdown:** A scale-based score was recorded
159 for participants' perceived vulnerability to SARS-CoV-2 infection (from 0 (not at all vulnerable) to
160 10 (vulnerable)). A dichotomous variable was then created with 6/10 as the thresholds
161 corresponding to the average vulnerability observed (6.2 +/- 0.1).

162 **Pregnancy and health:** parity, gestational age at the end of the first lockdown, childbirth (during
163 or after first lockdown), at least one pre-existing chronic disease or pregnancy-related pathology
164 (see details of pathologies in Table 1, notes f and g), overweight/obesity status before pregnancy
165 (based on body mass index $\geq 25 \text{ kg/m}^2$; see Table 1, note h).

166 **Pregnancy monitoring during first lockdown:** had a consultation/examination
167 cancelled/postponed on a health professional's initiative, unsuccessful attempts to have an exchange
168 with healthcare professionals during lockdown about their pregnancy and the pandemic (women
169 who reported not needing such an exchange and those who did talk to a professional were
170 considered to have had successful attempts), taking medication for mood disorders or sleeping
171 problems during the lockdown.

172 More details are described in others publications about Covimater ([26-28])

173 **Ethics and endpoint**

174 Covimater received approval from the Saint Maurice Hospital Ethics Committee on
175 01/07/2020 (approval number n°2020-1). Internet panel volunteers included in the Covimater study

176 were informed by mail of the study's purpose then given the choice to participate in the survey.
177 Only pseudonymised databases were transmitted to Santé publique France. The data are stored on
178 Santé publique France's servers, respecting the agency's data security and confidentiality standards.

179 **Statistical analysis**

180 A robust variance Poisson regression model was used to estimate unadjusted and adjusted
181 prevalence ratios (aPR) [29] for two of the three study outcomes: declared psychological
182 deterioration and anxiety symptoms. Factors associated with each of these two outcomes which
183 either had a p -value <0.20 in bivariate analysis or were judged to be clinically relevant based on the
184 literature (gestational age at completion of study questionnaire, gestational age at end of lockdown
185 period, parity), were introduced into the multivariate models. When several variables were possibly
186 collinear, the model with the best likelihood score (lowest Bayesian information criterion) was
187 selected. Fractional polynomials showed a linear relationship between continuous variables
188 included in the models and the studied prevalence of each of the two outcomes. A manual
189 descending stepwise procedure was then applied to identify factors independently associated (p -
190 value <0.05) with each outcome. Hosmer-Lemeshow tests were performed to verify the goodness of
191 fit of each final model. Estimates of aPR, their 95% confidence intervals (95%CI) and associated p -
192 values are presented. As indicated by Zou, PRs can be interpreted in the same way as relative risk
193 (RR)[30].

194 Only a descriptive analysis was presented for women who felt affects more strongly than usual
195 during the lockdown (percentage and related 95%CI). The average affects (\pm standard deviation
196 (sd)) experienced during the lockdown was also calculated for the six negative affects (frustration,
197 anger, powerlessness, despair, loneliness and fear).

198 All statistical analyses were performed using Stata software ®version 14.2 (Stata Corp., College
199 Station, TX).

200 Results

201 Characteristics of women included in Covimater (Table 1)

202 Mean age was 31.4 years (sd=5.1). Four-fifths (78.1%) had a level of education equivalent
 203 to or higher than secondary school diploma, 36.1% were classified SPC-, 25.5% were inactive,
 204 31.7% declared they just got by financially while 19.1% reported that they could not make ends
 205 meet. Regarding their area of residence, 44.6% lived in a red-coloured zone (i.e., highest pressure
 206 on the healthcare system). Less than half had a child under six years of age in their home at the time
 207 of the lockdown. Just over a third had family members or friends who were diagnosed with Covid-
 208 19 or had symptoms suggestive of the disease. Finally, 17.9% perceived little or no social support
 209 during the lockdown, and nearly 28.1% had experienced serious dispute or a climate of violence.

210

211 Table 1. Description of pregnant women during the first COVID-19-related lockdown

212 (March-May 2020) who participated in the Covimater survey (n=500), France (July 2020).

	N (%) or mean (sd)*		[95%CI**]
Demographic and socio-economic characteristics			
Age (in years)	31.4	(5.1)	[30.8 - 31.9]
Socio-professional category (SPC) ^a			
SPC +	192	(38.4)	[33.9 - 43.2]
SPC -	180	(36.1)	[31.8 - 40.6]
Inactive	128	(25.5)	[20.5 - 31.2]
Educational level			
Equal to or higher than secondary school diploma	391	(78.1)	[73.6 - 82.1]
Lower than secondary school diploma	109	(21.9)	[17.9 - 26.4]
Perceived financial situation			
Comfortable	246	(49.2)	[44.2 - 54.2]
Just getting by	159	(31.7)	[27.2 - 36.6]
Difficult to make ends meet	95	(19.1)	[15.2 - 23.7]
Pandemic and lockdown related variables			
Child(ren) under six years of age in the household during the lockdown	234	(46.8)	[41.8 - 51.8]

SARS-CoV-2 strain on healthcare system (colour-coded) for the region of residence ^b				
	Green zone	127	(25.4)	[21.1 - 30.2]
	Orange zone	150	(30.0)	[25.7 - 34.7]
	Red zone	223	(44.6)	[39.7 - 49.6]
Professional workload				
	Did not work	351	(70.1)	[65.7 - 74.2]
	Lighter or same as usual	85	(17.1)	[14.0 - 20.7]
	Heavier than usual	64	(12.8)	[10.1 - 16.0]
Self-perceived social support				
	Very good / Good	411	(82.1)	[78.2 - 85.5]
	Little or none	89	(17.9)	[14.5 - 21.8]
Serious disputes/climat of violence				
	Very-often/ Often	11	(2.3)	[1.10 - 4.60]
	Sometimes / Rarely	129	(25.8)	[21.7 - 30.4]
	Never	360	(71.9)	[67.2 - 76.2]
Level of knowledge about SARS-CoV-2 transmission ^c				
	Good knowledge	170	(34.0)	[29.3 - 38.9]
	Poor/Moderate knowledge	330	(66.0)	[61.1 - 70.7]
Experiencing COVID-19 type symptoms				
		92	(18.4)	[14.9 - 22.6]
Family member or friend with COVID-19 diagnosis or symptoms suggestive of the disease				
		171	(34.2)	[29.7 - 39.0]
Self-perception of the pandemic during first lockdown				
Perceived vulnerability to severe forms of COVID-19 disease (max. 10; n=459) >6/10 ^d		250	(54.6)	[49.4 - 59.6]
Pregnancy and health				
Primiparous		203	(40.6)	[35.8 - 45.6]
Gestational age (weeks) ^e				
	<10	34	(6.8)	[4.70 - 9.80]
	10 - 20	177	(35.4)	[30.8 - 40.3]
	20 - 30	180	(36.1)	[31.4 - 41.0]
	30 - 40	77	(15.4)	[12.1 - 19.4]
	> 40	32	(6.3)	[4.30 - 9.20]
Childbirth				
	During lockdown	34	(6.8)	[4.70 - 9.80]
	After lockdown	466	(93.2)	[90.2 - 95.2]
Pre-existing chronic disease(s) ^f				
		152	(30.3)	[25.8 - 35.1]
Pregnancy-related pathology(ies) ^g				
		119	(23.7)	[19.9 - 28.0]

Overweight/obesity status before pregnancy ^h	212	(42.4)	[37.5 - 47.4]
Pregnancy monitoring during first lockdown			
Cancelled/postponed pregnancy consultations or examinations at the initiative of a health professional	182	(36.3)	[31.6 - 41.3]
Having an unmet need to communicate with health professionals about course of pregnancy/childbirth during pandemic			
No	295	(59.0)	[53.9 - 63.8]
Yes	205	(41.0)	[36.1 - 46.1]
Took medication for mood disorders/sleeping disorders			
No, because I did not need it	456	(91.2)	[87.9 – 93.7]
Yes	20	(3.9)	[2.3 – 6.5]
No, but I would have liked to	24	(4.9)	[3.1 – 7.5]

- 213 * Weighted and rounded values using Newton's algorithm [21] for discrete or qualitative variables. For continuous variables,
 214 mean (standard deviation) were presented.
- 215 ** 95% Confidence Interval
- 216 a Women on maternity leave and unemployed women were classified according to their current SPC category or their most
 217 recent category prior to ending work, respectively.
- 218 b Estimated by the Ministry of Health on 1 May 2020 on the basis of two variables : i) Virus circulation level (i.e.,
 219 percentage of emergency room admissions for suspected COVID-19) and ii) Strain on hospital intensive care unit capacity
 220 (i.e., occupancy rate of intensive care beds by patients with COVID-19), coded as green, orange or red, reflecting increased
 221 epidemic pressure on the healthcare system [25].
- 222 c Score based on seven questions (Good knowledge if all answers were correct; Poor/moderate knowledge else).
- 223 d Scores for participants' perceived vulnerability to SARS-CoV-2 infection during the first lockdown (from 0 (not at all
 224 vulnerable) to 10 (very vulnerable)). A dichotomous 'low/high' variables were then created for 'vulnerability', with 6/10 as
 225 the thresholds (see details in methods). No documented data for 41 pregnant women in terms of level of perceived
 226 vulnerability to severe forms of COVID -19.
- 227 e At the end of the first lockdown (11 May 2020).
- 228 f Diabetes, Overweight/obesity status before pregnancy, High blood pressure, Asthma, Cardiac condition, Autoimmune
 229 disease, Mental illness, Inherited bleeding disorders.
- 230 g Gestational diabetes, Pre-eclampsia, Preterm labour, Gestational hypertension.
- 231 h Body mass index \geq 25kg/m².

232 Psychological state between before and during the first lockdown

233 (Table 2 and Fig 1)

234 More than half (52.8%) of the study sample reported a poorer psychological state between
 235 before the lockdown and during it.

236 Furthermore, 21.1% had a marked deteriorated psychological state (i.e., they self-reported that their
 237 pre-lockdown state was good/quite good but their state during lockdown was quite poor/poor). This
 238 deterioration was higher among those who felt they received little or no social support (aPR=1.77,
 239 95%CI[1.18-2.66]), those with a heavier than usual workload (1.65 [1.02-2.66]), and those with
 240 poor/moderate knowledge of the symptoms and modes of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 (1.60, [1.09

241 -2.35]) (Table 2). Furthermore, of the women who reported a psychological deterioration during the
 242 lockdown, 7% consulted a psychiatrist or psychologist for psychological support during the
 243 lockdown, 19% wanted such support but did not get it, while 74% reported they did not need it
 244 (p<0.0001).

245 **Table 2. Factors associated with psychological deterioration felt during lockdown, Covimater**
 246 **survey (n=500), France (July 2020).**

	Obs. (n %)*		Psychological deterioration felt (n=105) ^a			
			Yes (n %)*		Adjusted PR [95% CI] **	p-value**
Demographic and socio-economic characteristics						
Age (in years)	31.4	(5.1)	31.6	(5.2)	1.00 [0.96-1.04]	0.74
Gestational age (in weeks) ^b	23.5	(9.0)	24.2	(9.7)	1.01 [0.99-1.03]	0.32
Socio-professional category ^c						
SPC+	192	(38.4)	37	(19.3)	1	
SPC-	180	(36.1)	39	(21.7)	1.11 [0.74-1.67]	0.60
Inactive	128	(25.5)	29	(22.6)	1.23 [0.66-2.28]	0.51
Parity						
Primiparous	203	(40.6)	42	(20.7)	1	
Multiparous	297	(59.4)	63	(21.2)	1.09 [0.70-1.71]	0.70
Pandemic and lockdown related variables						
Self-perceived social support						
Very good / Good	411	(82.1)	75	(18.2)	1	
Little or none	89	(17.9)	30	(33.7)	1.77 [1.18-2.66]	0.006
Workload during lockdown						
Did not work	351	(70.1)	72	(20.5)	1	
Lighter or same as usual	85	(17.1)	14	(16.5)	0.98 [0.58-1.65]	0.94
Heavier than usual	64	(12.8)	19	(29.7)	1.65 [1.02-2.66]	0.04
Knowledge about modes of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 ^d						
Good knowledge	170	(34.0)	57	(17.3)	1	
Poor/moderate knowledge	330	(66.0)	48	(28.2)	1.60 [1.09-2.35]	0.02

247 * Weighted and rounded values using Newton's algorithm for discrete or qualitative variables [21]. For continuous
 248 variables (age, pregnancy term), mean (standard deviation) were presented.

249 ** Adjusted Prevalence Ratio (aPR), Confidence Interval 95% (95%CI) and p-value obtained with robust variance
 250 Poisson regression model.

- 251 a Psychological deterioration defined as a switch from a 'good' or 'quite good' psychological state just before the
252 lockdown to 'quite poor' or 'poor' state during the lockdown. (see definition of the variable of interest in
253 Methods section).
254 b At the end of the first lockdown (11/05/2020).
255 c Women on maternity leave and unemployed women were classified according to their current SPC category or
256 their most recent category prior to ending work respectively.
257 d Score based on seven questions (Good knowledge if all answers were correct; Poor/moderate knowledge else).
258

259 A majority of respondents reported experiencing more intense feelings of powerlessness (60.3%),
260 frustration (64.0%), and fear (59.2%) than usual during the lockdown (Figure 1). They also reported
261 an average of 2.97 (sd=2.94-2.99) negative affects out of the six proposed (frustration, anger,
262 powerlessness, despair, loneliness and fear) during the lockdown.

263 **Fig. 1. Affects felt more strongly than usual during lockdown (March-May 2020) in pregnant**
264 **women who participated in the Covimater survey (n=500), France (July 2020).**

265 For each affect, women were asked: "During lockdown, did you feel this emotion more strongly than usual? (Yes, a lot/Yes,
266 somewhat/No, not really/No, not at all). Women who answered "yes, a lot" or "yes, somewhat" were considered to have felt this
267 affect more strongly than usual during the lockdown. This percentage and the 95% confidence interval (95%CI) were calculated and
268 presented here.

269 **Anxiety symptoms in study sample two months after the first French**
270 **lockdown ended (Table 3)**

271 Among women who took part in the survey, 14.2% (IC95%[10.9- 18.2]) had anxiety
272 symptoms. After adjusting for age, gestational age, SPC, parity and depression score, factors
273 associated with having anxiety symptoms were as follows: at least one pregnancy-related pathology
274 (aPR=1.82, 95%CI[1.15-2.88]), overweightness or obesity (1.61, [1.07-2.43]), at least one child
275 under the age of six years in the household during the lockdown (3.26, [1.24-8.53]), self-perceiving
276 little or no social support during the lockdown (1.66, [1.07-2.58]), and having loved ones diagnosed
277 with Covid-19 or with symptoms suggestive of the disease (1.66, [1.06-2.60]). In addition, anxiety
278 symptoms were more frequent in women who unsuccessfully tried to have an exchange with a
279 healthcare professional about impact of the pandemic on their pregnancy, than in those who had
280 such an exchange (1.66, [1.08-2.55]). Similarly, anxiety symptoms were more frequent in women

281 who unsuccessfully tried to obtain medication for mood disorders or sleeping disorders (2.86, [1.74-
 282 4.71]) than in those who responded that they did not take medication because they did not need it.
 283 However, the frequency of anxiety symptoms was not significantly different between women who
 284 had access to medication and those who did not (p=0.248).

285 **Table 3. Factors associated with anxiety symptoms frequency (defined as an HAD score>10)**
 286 **two months after the first SARS-CoV-2 pandemic lockdown ended in pregnant women who**
 287 **participated in the Covimater survey (n=500), France (July 2020).**

Anxiety symptoms (HAD score >10); n=71^a							
		Obs. (n %)*		Yes (n %)*		Adjusted PR [95% CI] **	p-value**
Demographic and socio-economic characteristics							
Age (in years)		31.4	(5.1)	30.7	(5.4)	0.96 [0.92-0.99]	0.03
Gestational age (in weeks) ^b		23.5	(9.0)	31.8	(7.1)	1.01 [0.98-1.04]	0.63
Socio-professional category ^c							
	SPC+	192	(38.4)	25	(13.0)	1	
	SPC-	180	(36.1)	23	(12.8)	0.86 [0.53-1.40]	0.56
	Inactive	128	(25.5)	23	(17.9)	0.85 [0.47-1.53]	0.59
Parity							
	Primiparous	203	(40.6)	29	(14.3)	1	
	Multiparous	297	(59.4)	42	(14.1)	0.54 [0.21-1.36]	0.19
Pregnancy and health							
Pregnancy-related pathology ^d							
	No	411	(82.1)	42	(11.0)	1	
	Yes	89	(17.9)	29	(24.3)	1.82 [1.15-2.88]	0.01
Overweight/Obesity ^e							
	No	351	(70.1)	32	(11.1)	1	
	Yes	85	(17.1)	39	(18.4)	1.61 [1.07-2.43]	0.02
Depression symptoms (HAD score >10)		64	(12.8)	9.1	(3.8)	1.19 [1.13-1.25]	<0.0001
Pandemic and lockdown related variables							
Child(ren) under the age of six years of age in the household							
	No	170	(34.0)	27	(10,1)	1	
	Yes	330	(66.0)	44	(18.8)	3.26 [1.24-8.53]	0.02

Self-perceived social support						
Very good / Good	411	(82.1)	45	(10.9)		1
Little or none	89	(17.9)	26	(29.2)	1.66 [1.07-2.58]	0.02
Family member or friend with COVID-19 diagnosis or symptoms suggestive of the disease						
No	329	(65.8)	38	(11.5)		1
Yes	171	(34.2)	33	(19.3)	1.66 [1.06-2.60]	0.03
Pregnancy monitoring during first lockdown						
Having an unmet need to communicate with health professionals about course of pregnancy/childbirth during pandemic						
No	295	(59.0)	29	(9.8)		1
Yes	205	(41.0)	42	(20.5)	1.66 [1.08-2.55]	0.02
Took medication for mood disorders/sleeping disorders						
No, because I did not need it	456	(91.2)	50	(10.9)		1
Yes	20	(3.9)	8	(40.0)	1.77 [0.87-3.61]	0.11
No, but I would have liked to	24	(4.9)	13	(54.2)	2.86 [1.74-4.71]	<0.0001

288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300

- * Weighted and rounded values using Newton's algorithm for discrete or qualitative variables [21]. For continuous variables (age, pregnancy term), mean (standard deviation) were presented.
- ** Adjusted Prevalence Ratio (aPR), Confidence Interval 95% (95%CI) and p-value obtained with robust variance Poisson regression model
- a Anxiety symptoms assessed two months after the first lockdown ended using to Hospital Anxiety and Depression scale (HAD). Score of >10 for all seven anxiety questions were considered to have anxiety symptoms (see definition of the variable of interest in Methods section).
- b At time of study (July 2020)
- c Women on maternity leave and unemployed women were classified according to their current SPC category or their most recent category prior to ending work respectively
- d Gestational diabetes, Pre-eclampsia, Preterm labour, Gestational hypertension, etc.
- e Body Mass Index \geq 25kg/m²

301 Discussion

302 This study assessed the some aspects of mental health of pregnant women living in France
303 during the ongoing SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Of the 500 women in the study sample, 52.8%
304 declared a poorer mental health during lockdown than before it. More specifically, 21.1% were
305 defined as having a deteriorated psychological state (i.e., they self-reported that their pre-lockdown
306 state was good/quite good but their state during lockdown was quite poor/poor). Factors associated
307 with this drastic deterioration in mental health during the lockdown were perceiving little or no
308 social support (i.e., family, friends, etc.) and a heavier-than-usual workload. In contrast, having a

309 good level of knowledge about the modes of transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 virus was a
310 protective factor. A majority of participants reported heightened feelings of powerlessness,
311 frustration or fear during lockdown. Regarding anxiety symptom frequency, measured two months
312 after the first lockdown ended (July 2020), 14.2% of the respondents had anxiety symptoms. The
313 following factors were associated with increased anxiety symptom frequency: a pregnancy-related
314 pathology, overweightness/obesity, a friend or family member who had been diagnosed with Covid-
315 19 or had symptoms suggestive of the disease, perceiving little or no social support during the
316 lockdown, having one or more children under the age of six in the household, unsuccessful attempts
317 to have an exchange with a healthcare professional about their pregnancy or about the
318 hospitalisation process for childbirth, and no access to medication to treat mood disorders or sleep
319 disorders.

320 The present study highlights that the first lockdown in France was associated with a deterioration of
321 self-perceived mental health in one of five pregnant women. Moreover, compared to women of
322 childbearing age (18 – 49 years) participating in a survey –CoviPrev- conducted in the French
323 general population at the same time [31], this deterioration appeared significantly more frequent
324 among pregnant women (21.1% vs 7.7%; $p < 0.0001$) (unpublished data). This result is consistent
325 with a recent literature review by Brooks *et al.* on the negative psychological impact of previous
326 quarantines [32]. Those authors also pointed out that providing sufficient and accurate information
327 to people self-isolating because of a pandemic gave them a better understanding of the reasons and
328 context, and consequently played a key role in preventing the harmful psychological effects of
329 lockdown. Likewise, a Chinese study on 1873 pregnant women showed that having access to
330 information provided by hospital services on antenatal care during the Covid-19 pandemic was a
331 protective factor against stress, anxiety and depression [33]. In the present study, we also showed
332 that women with a good level of knowledge about the modes of transmission of the virus were less
333 likely to have psychological deterioration.

334 The frequency of anxiety symptoms measured two months after the lockdown in our study sample
335 was 14.2%. Knowing the variations in prevalence between countries and the screening tools used,
336 this frequency was of the same order of magnitude as that observed internationally in pregnant
337 women (22.4%) [34] before the current pandemic and among women of childbearing age in France
338 and more generally in Europe (20.2% according to the French *Baromètre Santé* survey 2017
339 (unpublished data); 14.9% according to the European Study of the Epidemiology of Mental
340 Disorders-ESEMeD - 2001-2003 [35]). An eleven-week study conducted in the United Kingdom
341 showed that the GAD-7 anxiety score in 11 pregnant women infected with SARS-CoV-2 rose to a
342 peak at the beginning of the first lockdown when the number of deaths in the UK during the study
343 period was at its highest, and subsequently progressively *decreased* over the rest of the study period
344 [36]. While one might suppose that a similar peak occurred in France, our results for anxiety -
345 obtained two months after the first French lockdown ended - may reflect adaptation and habituation
346 to Covid-19 health risks by pregnant women, something already observed in women of childbearing
347 age in the general population [37, 38]. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact Covimater was
348 conducted in July 2020, when the monitoring markers for the pandemic could be perceived as
349 reassuring by the women in France.

350 One interesting finding in our study, is that the proportion of those defined with anxiety symptoms
351 was significantly lower than in women of childbearing age participating in CoviPrev at the same
352 time (14.2% vs 24.8%; $p < 0.0001$). This echoes a finding in a case-control survey conducted in the
353 Turkish context [39]. However, although we weighted out data, a more in-depth analysis - taking
354 into account socio-demographic variables and general health status - is needed to better explain
355 these findings.

356 Anxiety symptom frequency in Covimater was significantly higher in participants with a
357 pregnancy-related pathology, those who were overweight or obese, and those with a loved one who
358 had been diagnosed with Covid-19 or had symptoms suggestive of the disease. Information on
359 Covid-19 morbidity and mortality and on populations at risk of severe forms of the disease - in

360 particular obese patients – were widely diffused through the media and social networks at the
361 beginning of the pandemic in France. This may have generated stress and increased anxiety in the
362 populations concerned. Furthermore, pregnancy-related pathologies, overweight and obesity have
363 all been associated with poorer perinatal mental health, and in particular, anxiety [40, 41]. In
364 another Turkish study of pregnant women during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, obesity was one of
365 the principal risk factors of higher anxiety and depression scores [42]. More generally, poor
366 physical health or chronic illness are associated with an increased risk of perinatal psychiatric
367 disorders [43].

368 Our analyses also show that having one or more children under six years of age during the first
369 French lockdown was associated with higher anxiety symptom frequency. Several studies have
370 pointed out that having young, less autonomous, non-school going children is an additional source
371 of daily stress during the current pandemic, especially for mothers must also continue their
372 professional activity during lockdown. For instance, in an internet survey of 10165 women in the
373 UK, those who lived with young children under five years old had significantly higher General
374 Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) mental distress scores [44]. Similarly, a Canadian longitudinal
375 study conducted before and during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic showed an increase in anxiety score
376 in women who experienced difficulties with childcare [45].

377 Some factors were associated with both psychological deterioration during the lockdown and
378 anxiety two months after, for instance perceiving little or no social support. This finding reflects the
379 international literature on the importance of quality social and familial support in maintaining good
380 physical and mental health, in particular for people experiencing especially difficult periods of
381 vulnerability such as pregnant women [46, 47]. Other studies conducted during the ongoing
382 pandemic have highlighted the importance of perceived social support in pregnant women’s well-
383 being, and its inverse association with anxiety [15, 48, 49]. One study highlighted that loneliness
384 mediates both the perceived social support-anxiety relationship and the social support-depression
385 relationship [48].

386 Other factors associated with higher frequency of anxiety symptoms during the first lockdown were
387 related to unsuccessful attempts to have an exchange with healthcare professionals about their
388 pregnancy and an unmet need for medication for mood or sleep. The lockdown has resulted in less
389 access to care, both in the general population and for women in the perinatal period ([26, 50]).
390 Thus, use of emergency psychiatric care drastically decreased in France [51]. In the United States
391 (Massachusetts), 35.9% of pregnant women reported a lower access to mental healthcare [52].
392 Women who had not already started psychiatric care may have had difficulty seeking information or
393 treatment from professionals. Before the pandemic, the unmet need for antenatal care, particularly
394 mental health care, was already a public health problem in France. Indeed, several studies
395 conducted before the current health crisis estimated that only a quarter of pregnant women with
396 mental health disorders receive specialised care [53, 54].
397 To the best of our knowledge, Covimater was the first national study in France that explores the
398 experiences, behaviours and mental health of pregnant women during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.
399 In order to compare results, the methodology and some of the questions were the same as those used
400 in another French survey - CoviPrev - which was conducted in the general population at the same
401 time. Compared to other international studies that often focused on third trimester pregnant women,
402 Covimater's design included women with different gestational ages during the first lockdown. In
403 Covimater, although some groups compared were unbalanced in size (with consequently reduced
404 power), this did not prevent the identification of significant associations with the variable of
405 interest. Covimater had some limitations. First, even though the study has a consistent internal
406 validity, the use of a panel and quota sampling imply that these findings lack external validity
407 (cannot be generalized to the whole French population of pregnant women). However, no
408 alternative method would have allowed this study to take place such a short time after the
409 lockdown, thus avoiding a significant recall bias. Second, sampling bias could explain the
410 overestimation of the percentage of pregnant women with chronic diseases or obesity. Third, as the
411 study questionnaire was self-administered including some retrospective assessments, there is a risk

412 of potential social desirability and recall biases. However, there is no reason that the latter should be
413 limited to the sub-group of pregnant women.

414 **Conclusion**

415 The results of this study emphasize the need of more adapted support for pregnant women during
416 the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, in particular: i) exchanges with health professionals about their
417 pregnancy and hospitalization for childbirth, ii) psychological support, iii) increased information
418 about the modes of transmission of the virus, iv) social support to avoid social isolation and v)
419 childcare services or a limitation of school closures. Strategies to prevent perinatal psychiatric
420 disorders are essential (i) to limit the negative impacts of impaired mental health on the course of
421 their pregnancy, (ii) to ensure the mother-newborn bond is established, and (iii) to guarantee
422 appropriate development of the infant/child.

423 **Acknowledgments**

424 This study was fully funded by public funds. Our thanks to Dorothée Lamarche (BVA group) for
425 her invaluable help in creating the study questionnaire and to Jude Sweeney (Milan, Italy) for the
426 English revision and copyediting of this manuscript.

427

428 **References**

- 429 1. Jamieson DJ, Ellis JE, Jernigan DB, Treadwell TA. Emerging infectious disease outbreaks:
430 Old lessons and new challenges for obstetrician-gynecologists. *American Journal of Obstetrics and*
431 *Gynecology*. 2006;194(6):1546-55.
- 432 2. Schwartz DA, Graham AL. Potential Maternal and Infant Outcomes from (Wuhan)
433 Coronavirus 2019-nCoV Infecting Pregnant Women: Lessons from SARS, MERS, and Other
434 Human Coronavirus Infections. *Viruses*. 2020;12(2).
- 435 3. Peyronnet V, Sibiude J, Deruelle P, Huissoud C, Lescure X, Lucet JC, et al. Infection par le
436 SARS-CoV-2 chez les femmes enceintes : état des connaissances et proposition de prise en charge
437 par CNGOF. *Gynécologie Obstétrique Fertilité & Sénologie* 2020;48(5):436-43.
- 438 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Covid-19 and pregnancy. 2020.
- 439 5. Haut Conseil de la Santé Publique. Actualisation de l'avis relatif aux personnes à risque de
440 forme grave de Covid-19 et aux mesures barrières spécifiques à ces publics. 2020.
- 441 6. Public Health Agency of Canada. Coronavirus disease (covid-19)pregnancy, childbirth and
442 caring for newborns: advice for mothers during covid-19. 2020.
- 443 7. Public Health England (PHE). Guidance on social distancing for everyone in the UK 2020.
444 Available from: [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)
445 [distancing-and-for-vulnerable-people/guidance-on-social-distancing-for-everyone-in-the-uk-and-](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)
446 [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).
- 447 8. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The
448 psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet*.
449 2020;395(10227):912-20.

- 450 9. Jeong H, Yim HW, Song Y-J, Ki M, Min J-A, Cho J, et al. Mental health status of people
451 isolated due to Middle East Respiratory Syndrome. *Epidemiol Health*. 2016;38(0):e2016048-0.
- 452 10. Palumbo G, Mirabella F, Gigantesco A. Positive screening and risk factors for postpartum
453 depression. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2017;42:77-85.
- 454 11. Tebeka S, Hoertel N, Dubertret C, Le Strat Y. Parental Divorce or Death During Childhood
455 and Adolescence and Its Association With Mental Health. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. 2016;204(9):678-85.
- 456 12. Lam CM, Wong SF, Leung TN, Chow KM, Yu WC, Wong TY, et al. A case-controlled
457 study comparing clinical course and outcomes of pregnant and non-pregnant women with severe
458 acute respiratory syndrome. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*.
459 2004;111(8):771-4.
- 460 13. Mosby LG, Rasmussen SA, Jamieson DJ. 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1) in pregnancy:
461 a systematic review of the literature. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*.
462 2011;205(1):10-8.
- 463 14. Berthelot N, Lemieux R, Garon-Bissonnette J, Drouin-Maziade C, Martel É, Maziade M.
464 Uptrend in distress and psychiatric symptomatology in pregnant women during the coronavirus
465 disease 2019 pandemic. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2020;99(7):848-55.
- 466 15. Xie M, Wang X, Zhang J, Wang Y. Alteration in the psychologic status and family
467 environment of pregnant women before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Gynaecol*
468 *Obstet*. 2021.
- 469 16. Grigoriadis S, Graves L, Peer M, Mamisashvili L, Tomlinson G, Vigod SN, et al. Maternal
470 Anxiety During Pregnancy and the Association With Adverse Perinatal Outcomes: Systematic
471 Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2018;79(5).
- 472 17. Netsi E, Pearson RM, Murray L, Cooper P, Craske MG, Stein A. Association of Persistent
473 and Severe Postnatal Depression With Child Outcomes. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2018;75(3):247-53.


- 474 18. Śliwerski A, Kossakowska K, Jarecka K, Świtalska J, Bielawska-Batorowicz E. The Effect
475 of Maternal Depression on Infant Attachment: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of*
476 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(8).
- 477 19. Slomian J, Honvo G, Emonts P, Reginster JY, Bruyère O. Consequences of maternal
478 postpartum depression: A systematic review of maternal and infant outcomes. *Womens Health*
479 (Lond). 2019;15:1745506519844044.
- 480 20. Studies FNIOsAE. INSEE 2020 [updated 2020].
- 481 21. Deville J-C, Särndal C-E. Calibration Estimators in Survey Sampling. *Journal of the*
482 *American Statistical Association*. 1992;87(418):376-82.
- 483 22. Piffaretti C, Looten V, Rey S, Fresson J, Fagot-Campagna A, Tuppin P. Management of
484 pregnancy based on healthcare consumption of women who delivered in France in 2015:
485 Contribution of the national health data system (SNDS). *J Gynecol Obstet Hum Reprod*.
486 2018;47(7):299-307.
- 487 23. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*.
488 1983;67(6):361-70.
- 489 24. Roberge P, Doré I, Menear M, Chartrand É, Ciampi A, Duhoux A, et al. A psychometric
490 evaluation of the French Canadian version of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale in a large
491 primary care population. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. 2013;147(1):171-9.
- 492 25. Ministry of health. Coronavirus COVID-19 : Carte du déconfinement en France 2020.
493 Available from: [https://www.data.gouv.fr/fr/reuses/coronavirus-covid-19-carte-du-deconfinement-](https://www.data.gouv.fr/fr/reuses/coronavirus-covid-19-carte-du-deconfinement-en-france/)
494 [en-france/](https://www.data.gouv.fr/fr/reuses/coronavirus-covid-19-carte-du-deconfinement-en-france/).
- 495 26. Doncarli A, Araujo-Chaveron L, Crenn-Hebert C, Demiguel V, Boudet-Berquier J, Barry Y,
496 et al. Impact of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and first lockdown on pregnancy monitoring in France:
497 the COVIMATER cross-sectional study. (1471-2393 (Electronic)).

- 498 27. Araujo-Chaveron L, Doncarli AA-O, Crenn-Hebert C, Demiguel V, Boudet-Berquier J,
499 Barry Y, et al. Pregnant women's unmet need to communicate with a health professional during the
500 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic lockdown in France: The Covimater cross-sectional study. (1932-6203
501 (Electronic)).
- 502 28. Araujo-Chaveron L, Doncarli A, Vivanti AJ, Salanave B, Lasbeur L, Gorza M, et al.
503 Perception of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic by pregnant women during the first lockdown in France:
504 worry, perceived vulnerability, adoption and maintenance of prevention measures according to the
505 Covimater study. (2211-3355 (Print)).
- 506 29. Barros AJD, Hirakata VN. Alternatives for logistic regression in cross-sectional studies: an
507 empirical comparison of models that directly estimate the prevalence ratio. *BMC Medical Research*
508 *Methodology*. 2003;3(1):21.
- 509 30. Zou G. A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. *Am*
510 *J Epidemiol*. 2004;159(7):702-6.
- 511 31. Raude J, Lecrique J-M, Lasbeur L, Leon C, Guignard R, du Roscoät E, et al. Determinants
512 of Preventive Behaviors in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic in France: Comparing the
513 Sociocultural, Psychosocial, and Social Cognitive Explanations. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2020;11.
- 514 32. Brooks SK, Weston D, Greenberg N. Psychological impact of infectious disease outbreaks
515 on pregnant women: rapid evidence review. *Public Health*. 2020;189:26-36.
- 516 33. Jiang H, Jin L, Qian X, Xiong X, La X, Chen W, et al. Maternal Mental Health Status and
517 Approaches for Accessing Antenatal Care Information During the COVID-19 Epidemic in China:
518 Cross-Sectional Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23(1):e18722.
- 519 34. Dennis CL, Falah-Hassani K, Shiri R. Prevalence of antenatal and postnatal anxiety:
520 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2017;210(5):315-23.

- 521 35. Lépine JP, Gasquet I, Kovess V, Arbabzadeh-Bouchez S, Nègre-Pagès L, Nachbaur G, et al.
522 Prévalence et comorbidité des troubles psychiatriques dans la population générale française :
523 résultats de l'étude épidémiologique ESEMeD/MHEDEA 2000/ (ESEMeD). *L'Encéphale*.
524 2005;31(2):182-94.
- 525 36. Kotabagi P, Fortune L, Essien S, Nauta M, Yoong W. Anxiety and depression levels among
526 pregnant women with COVID-19. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2020;99(7):953-4.
- 527 37. Chan-Chee C LC, Lasbeur L, Lecrique JM, Raude J, Arwidson P, du Roscoät E. La santé
528 mentale des Français face au Covid-19 : prévalences, évolutions et déterminants de l'anxiété au
529 cours des deux premières semaines de confinement (Enquête CoviPrev, 23-25 mars et 30 mars-1er
530 avril 2020). *Bull Epidémiol Hebd*. 2020;13:260-9.
- 531 38. Loewenstein G, Mather J. Dynamic processes in risk perception. *Journal of Risk and*
532 *Uncertainty*. 1990;3(2):155-75.
- 533 39. Yassa M, Yassa A, Yirmibeş C, Birol P, Ünlü UG, Tekin AB, et al. Anxiety levels and
534 obsessive compulsion symptoms of pregnant women during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Turkish*
535 *journal of obstetrics and gynecology*. 2020;17(3):155-60.
- 536 40. Dalfrà MG, Nicolucci A, Bisson T, Bonsembiante B, Lapolla A. Quality of life in pregnancy
537 and post-partum: a study in diabetic patients. *Qual Life Res*. 2012;21(2):291-8.
- 538 41. Molyneaux E, Poston L, Ashurst-Williams S, Howard LM. Obesity and mental disorders
539 during pregnancy and postpartum: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obstet Gynecol*.
540 2014;123(4):857-67.
- 541 42. Ayaz R, Hoccoğlu M, Günay T, Yardımcı OD, Turgut A, Karateke A. Anxiety and
542 depression symptoms in the same pregnant women before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J*
543 *Perinat Med*. 2020;48(9):965-70.

- 544 43. Brown HK, Wilton AS, Ray JG, Dennis C-L, Guttman A, Vigod SN. Chronic physical
545 conditions and risk for perinatal mental illness: A population-based retrospective cohort study.
546 PLOS Medicine. 2019;16(8):e1002864.
- 547 44. Pierce M, Hope H, Ford T, Hatch S, Hotopf M, John A, et al. Mental health before and
548 during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population.
549 The Lancet Psychiatry. 2020;7(10):883-92.
- 550 45. Racine N, Hetherington E, McArthur BA, McDonald S, Edwards S, Tough S, et al. Maternal
551 depressive and anxiety symptoms before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada: a
552 longitudinal analysis. The Lancet Psychiatry. 2021;8(5):405-15.
- 553 46. Alipour Z, Kazemi A, Kheirabadi G, Eslami AA. Relationship Between Marital Quality,
554 Social Support and Mental Health During Pregnancy. Community Ment Health J. 2019;55(6):1064-
555 70.
- 556 47. Khanlari S, Eastwood J, Barnett B, Naz S, Ogbo FA. Psychosocial and obstetric
557 determinants of women signalling distress during Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS)
558 screening in Sydney, Australia. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2019;19(1):407.
- 559 48. Harrison V, Moulds ML, Jones K. Perceived social support and prenatal wellbeing; The
560 mediating effects of loneliness and repetitive negative thinking on anxiety and depression during
561 the COVID-19 pandemic. Women and Birth. 2021.
- 562 49. Lebel C, MacKinnon A, Bagshawe M, Tomfohr-Madsen L, Giesbrecht G. Elevated
563 depression and anxiety symptoms among pregnant individuals during the COVID-19 pandemic.
564 Journal of Affective Disorders. 2020;277:5-13.
- 565 50. Bradley D, Blaine A, Shah N, Mehrotra A, Gupta R, Wolfberg A. Patient Experience of
566 Obstetric Care During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Preliminary Results From a Recurring National
567 Survey. Journal of Patient Experience. 2020;7(5):653-6.

- 568 51. Pignon B, Gourevitch R, Tebeka S, Dubertret C, Cardot H, Masson VD-L, et al. Dramatic
569 reduction of psychiatric emergency consultations during lockdown linked to COVID-19 in Paris
570 and suburbs. medRxiv. 2020:2020.05.19.20095901.
- 571 52. Masters GA, Asipenko E, Bergman AL, Person SD, Brenckle L, Moore Simas TA, et al.
572 Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health, access to care, and health disparities in the
573 perinatal period. J Psychiatr Res. 2021;137:126-30.
- 574 53. Bales M, Pambrun E, Melchior M, Glangeaud-Freudenthal NMC, Charles MA, Verdoux H,
575 et al. Prenatal Psychological Distress and Access to Mental Health Care in the ELFE Cohort.
576 European Psychiatry. 2020;30(2):322-8.
- 577 54. Le Strat Y, Dubertret C, Le Foll B. Prevalence and correlates of major depressive episode in
578 pregnant and postpartum women in the United States. Journal of Affective Disorders.
579 2011;135(1):128-38.
- 580



Proportion of pregnant women with affects felt more strongly than usual during lockdown

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.14.22277634>; this version posted July 15, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).