

1 **Stress and resilience during pregnancy: a comparative study**
2 **between pregnant and non-pregnant women in Ethiopia**

3 **Mubarek Abera*¹, Charlotte Hanlon², Hikma Fedlu³, Mary Fewtrell⁴, Markos**
4 **Tesfaye⁵, Jonathan Wells⁴**

5 1Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Jimma University, Jimma,
6 Ethiopia

7 2Department of Psychiatry, Kings College London, UK

8 3Department of Public health, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Jimma University,
9 Jimma, Ethiopia

10 4Department of Population, Policy and Practice Research and Teaching, childhood
11 Nutrition Research Centre, University College London, London, UK

12 5Department of Psychiatry, St. Paul's Hospital Millennium Medical College, Addis
13 Ababa, Ethiopia

14
15 *Corresponding author: Email: Mubarek.abera@ju.edu.et; abmubarek@gmail.com ;
16 ORCID: [0000-0003-2592-1327](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2592-1327)
17
18

19

20 Statements and Declarations:

21 All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript

22 **Competing Interests: authors decaled no competing interest**

23 **Funding: No funding received for this work**

24 **Acknowledgement: Authors would like to acknowledge the study participants**

25

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background:** Stress occurring during pregnancy is associated with perturbances in maternal
28 psychology and physiology, and results in adverse pregnancy and birth outcomes. However, little
29 attention has been given to understand maternal stress and its potential negative consequences in
30 many low- and middle-income countries. We aimed to investigate whether pregnancy is associated
31 with greater stress and lower psychological resilience among women living in Jimma, Southwest
32 Ethiopia.

33 **Method:** An institution-based comparative cross-sectional study design was implemented in
34 Jimma University Medical Center from 15 September to 30 November 2021. Women attending
35 antenatal care and family planning services were invited to participate in the study. Participants
36 were interviewed using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10), Brief Resilience Scale (BRS), distress
37 questionnaire-5, and the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS). Linear regression
38 analysis was used to test associations of pregnancy (exposure) with outcomes of stress and
39 resilience scores, while adjusting for potential confounders. Stress and resilience were mutually
40 adjusted for one another in the final model.

41 **Results:** A total of 166 pregnant and 154 non-pregnant women participated, with mean age of 27.0
42 SD 5.0 and 29.5 SD 5.3 years respectively. Pregnancy was associated with increased stress score
43 by 4.1 points ($\beta=4.1$; 95% CI: 3.0, 5.2), and with reduced resilience by 3.3 points ($\beta=3.3$; 95% CI:
44 -4.5, -2.2) in a fully adjusted model. In mutually-adjusted models, pregnancy was independently
45 associated with greater stress ($\beta=2.9$, 95% CI 1.8, 3.9) and lower resilience ($\beta=-1.3$, 95% CI: -2.5,
46 -0.2) compared to non-pregnant women.

47 **Conclusion:** In this low income setting, pregnancy is associated with greater vulnerability in the
48 mental health of women, characterized by greater perceived stress and diminished resilience.
49 Context-relevant interventions to improve resilience and reduce stress could help improve the
50 health and wellbeing of mothers, with potential benefits for their offspring.

51 **Keywords:** Stress, resilience, mental health, pregnancy, Ethiopia

53 **Introduction**

54 The stress response, an adaptive component of physiology, represents a survival strategy during
55 exposure to threats, adverse experiences or stressors in life (1). When activated, the stress response
56 prepares the body for ‘fight or flight’ to promote safety and protection (1). However, chronic
57 activation of the stress response affects the body negatively and impairs health, wellbeing and
58 performance (2). The extent to which exposure to threats drives the perception of stress varies,
59 however, depending on an individual’s ability to cope or adapt with stressors and successfully
60 bounce back to the normal homeostasis from the effect of adversities (3). The impact of stressors
61 on the stress response is mediated by coping and adaptive strategies, forms of resilience that buffer
62 the adverse effects on health and wellbeing (4). The development of psychological resilience is a
63 dynamic process across the life span formed as a product of the interaction between biological,
64 psychological and socio-environmental factors (5,6). People with different levels of resilience
65 therefore respond differently to a similar set of stressors, such that those with low resilience are
66 more prone to the adverse consequences of stress.

67 Women in low-income countries experience disproportionate levels of stressors related to
68 household responsibilities, as well as gender inequalities such as an elevated risk of malnutrition,
69 dietary inadequacy and violence (in particular intimate partner violence) (7). Moreover, emerging
70 evidence indicates that the state of pregnancy itself induce additional stress to pregnant women
71 (8). The transition in social role associated with becoming a mother (9) may be accompanied by
72 new physiological sources of stress, and potentially greater sensitivity to stress. This issue has
73 major implications for public health, as experiencing stress during pregnancy has consequences
74 not only for the mother, but also for the offspring who may be exposed to the physiological signals
75 of stress through the placenta (10–12).

76 Stress in pregnancy can affect maternal health/wellbeing and quality of life by triggering
77 maladaptive emotional and physiological states. Because of its negative impact on maternal and
78 fetal health and nutrition during pregnancy, maternal stress may lead to adverse pregnancy and
79 birth outcomes, such as shorter gestational age, prolonged labor, abortion, stillbirth, low birth
80 weight, congenital anomalies, maternal perinatal infections, preeclampsia and hemorrhage
81 (2,13,14). These associations tend to be of dose-response nature, whereby the greater the maternal
82 stress, the greater the likelihood or magnitude of adverse outcomes. Perinatal complications and

83 prolonged labor were also associated with antenatal common mental disorders in Ethiopian
84 settings (15,16).

85 In turn, children born to stressed mothers have increased risk of morbidity, growth restriction, and
86 cognitive disability, and may have an elevated risk of mental and behavioral problems during
87 childhood such as anxiety, depression and attention deficit disorder (2,14,17–21). This scenario
88 contributes to the persistent burden of growth stunting and development among children in LMICs
89 (22). Finally, adults who survived stress in prenatal and postnatal life may have higher risk of non-
90 communicable diseases (NCDs) and reduced human capital (23). In turn, this has implications for
91 society, through reduced economic productivity (21,24,25). In this way, stress during pregnancy
92 may contribute to an inter-generational cycle of disadvantage (26,27).

93 Research on prenatal stress is especially important in countries where poverty and adverse life
94 circumstances are abundant. A recent WHO report indicated that maternal mental health is the
95 missed component of maternal health in LMICs (28,29). To date, for example, there are no
96 published data on stress and resilience during pregnancy in Ethiopia, a low-income country with a
97 high burden of maternal mental health problems, child stunting and other adverse environments
98 undermining optimal child development (30,31). The present study therefore aimed to investigate
99 whether pregnancy is associated with higher levels of stress and lower resilience, by comparing
100 these outcomes between pregnant and non-pregnant women in the city of Jimma, Ethiopia.

101

102

103 **Method and participants**

104 **Setting**

105 The study was conducted in the urban setting of Jimma Zonal City, Oromia Region, Ethiopia.
106 The city has two governmental hospitals, two private hospitals, five health centers, and more
107 than 10 private clinics. In addition, there are urban health extension workers providing maternal
108 and child health care services in the city. The total population of the city based on the 2021
109 projection is estimated to about 240,000. The study was conducted during the period September
110 to November, 2021.

111 **Design:**

112 We employed an institution-based comparative cross-sectional study design.

113 **Population**

114 We recruited pregnant and non-pregnant women aged between 18 and 40 years, attending
115 antenatal care and family planning services respectively at Jimma University Medical Center.
116 We invited consecutive women attending antenatal care and family planning services to
117 participate until we achieved the target sample size.

118 **Assessment**

119 **Background characteristics:** Information on age, parity, marital status, social support, religion,
120 family size, income, educational and occupational status was collected using a structured self-
121 report questionnaire.

122 **Stress assessment:** Stress was assessed using the 10 item Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10)
123 questionnaire (32) which has been validated in the local context in Ethiopia (33). PSS items were
124 scored as 0 (Never), 1 (Almost Never), 2 (Sometimes), 3 (Fairly Often), and 4 (Very Often).
125 Item 4, 5, 7 and 8 are positively phrased questions that required reverse coding during analysis.
126 The sum score ranges between 0 (low level) to 40 (maximum level).

127 **Resilience assessment:** Psychological resilience for various psychosocial stressors and stress
128 itself was assessed using the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS-6) (34) which contained 6 items scored

129 as 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree) to the resilience
130 item statements (34). Item 2, 4 and 6 are negatively phrased and required reverse coding during
131 analysis. The sum score for resilience ranges from 6 (low resilience) to 30 (high resilience)
132 points.

133 **Exposure:** For pregnancy status, women were classified as pregnant or non-pregnant as
134 confirmed by an obstetrician.

135 **Covariates:** Additional variables on the following parameters were collected.

136 **Household food insecurity access scale (HFIAS):** HFIAS validated for Ethiopian context was
137 used (35).

138 **Social support:** Perceived social support was assessed using a single question enquiring if
139 women currently have adequate or inadequate perceived social support.

140 **Physical activity:** Level of current physical activity was assessed using a single question
141 enquiring if women's current level of physical activity is decreased, similar or increased as
142 compared to their previous experience.

143 **Substance use:** History of life time use, last 12 months use, and current (last 3 months)
144 substance (Khat, alcohol, Nicotine, Shisha, and Marijuana, cannabis and other) use were asked.

145 **Psychological distress:** women were screened for psychological distress using the distress
146 questionnaire which contain 5 items (DQ-5) (36).

147 **Method of data collection:**

148 An interviewer-administered structured questionnaire was used for data collection. Two
149 bachelor-level health professionals conducted the interview. To maintain quality of the data, the
150 principal investigator closely supervised data collection. Data were checked for completeness on
151 the day of collection.

152 **Data management and analysis**

153 All data were entered into Epidata version 3.1 and transported to STATA-17 for analysis. The
154 data were checked for appropriateness and completeness before entry and then visualized and

155 cleaned using statistical software. Percentage and frequencies were used to describe categorical
156 data while mean and standard deviation (SD) or median and inter quartile range (IQR) were used
157 to describe continuous data depending on data distribution. The total scores of stress and
158 resilience were computed by summing the response for individual items. For stress, a score of 0-
159 14 was considered as low, 15- 26 as moderate and 27-40 as high stress (37). Individual resilience
160 scores for the six items were summed to a total score ranging from 5-30, and then divided by 6 to
161 obtain categorical level whereby values from 1-2.99 were considered low, 3.00 to 4.30 as
162 normal, and 4.31-5.00 as high resilience (34). T-test and Chi-square test were conducted to
163 examine relation of stress and resilience with status of pregnancy. Bivariate and multivariate
164 linear regression analysis were used to investigate the associations of stress and resilience with
165 pregnancy, adjusting for confounders.

166 After checking assumptions for linear regression, five different regression models were
167 developed and the outcome variables (stress and resilience) were regressed on the main exposure
168 (pregnancy status) adjusted for different covariates. **Model 1:** unadjusted (outcome variables
169 regressed on pregnancy); **Model 2:** Model 1 further adjusted for age; **Model 3:** Model 2 further
170 adjusted for parity; **Model 4:** (Fully adjusted model): Model 3 further adjusted for marital status,
171 social support, religion, family size, income, educational and occupational status, household food
172 insecurity level, physical activity, substance use status, ever use of substance and psychological
173 distress; **Model 5:** (stress and resilience mutually adjusted to each other) - *model 5a:* model 4 is
174 further adjusted for resilience score and stress is the outcome variable; *model 5b:* model 4 is
175 further adjusted for stress score and resilience is the outcome variable. The same regression
176 models were repeated for each specific PSS-10 and BRS-6 items to identify items contributing
177 for the overall association between pregnancy and the total stress score or resilience score. Life
178 time substance use, last 12 month substance use and last 3 months history of substance use were
179 interchangeably entered in to the full regression model, but only life time history of substance
180 use influenced the estimate for the main exposure compared to the other levels of substance use.

181 P-values and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were reported as measures of statistical significance
182 and the magnitude of effect respectively. The data were presented using table and forest plot
183 graphs.

184

185 **Ethics**

186 This study was approved by the IRB of Jimma University. Participant safety, privacy, and
187 confidentiality were ensured. All women were given information about the study and provided
188 their written consent for voluntary participation. The right not to participate or to withdraw from
189 the study was respected. All women during the study period were given equal opportunity to
190 participate in the study. Women with high stress scores were linked to a counseling service.

191

192 **Results**

193 **Background characteristics**

194 A total of 327 women were invited and 320 (166 pregnant and 154 non-pregnant) women
195 participated in the study. In pregnant compared to non-pregnant women, mean ages were 24.7
196 SD 5.1 years and 29.4 SD 5.3 years, average fertility rate was 2.0 SD 1.2 and 2.6 SD 1.1, and
197 average family size was 3.6 SD 1.4 and 5.2 SD 1.3, respectively. Most of the participants were
198 Muslim by religion, and married. Among the pregnant women, 15 % illiterate and 41% had
199 attended some level of primary education, while the corresponding figures were only 1% and
200 66% in the non-pregnant women. In terms of social support, only 28% of pregnant and 49% of
201 non-pregnant women reported having adequate social support. Most of the participants reported
202 having a low level of physical activity, but the frequency reporting decreased physical activity
203 was higher (63%) among the pregnant women than 32% in the non-pregnant women. All of these
204 variables differed significantly between pregnant and non-pregnant women.

205 *Table 1 here:*

206

207 **Stress and resilience**

208 Internal consistency for PSS-10 and BRS-6 scales were 0.73 and 0.72, respectively. The mean PSS
209 score was 18.7 SD 4.3 and 14.4 SD 4.3 in pregnant and non-pregnant women respectively. The
210 mean BRS score was 16.6 SD 4.7 and 18.0 SD 1.6 in pregnant and non-pregnant women
211 respectively. The proportion of moderate to severe (stress score 14- 40 points) perceived stress
212 was 89% in pregnant women and 53% in non-pregnant women. The proportion of low resilience
213 was 46.7% for pregnant and 21.4% for non-pregnant women.

214 *Table 2 here:*

215 **Correlation between stress and resilience**

216 Stress and resilience showed a negative correlation to each other (Figure 1). Pregnant women
217 showed higher stress and lower resilience while non-pregnant women contrastingly showed
218 lower stress and higher resilience.

219

220

221 *Figure 1 here:*

222 **Comparison of stress and resilience between pregnant and non-pregnant women**

223 **Unadjusted analysis**

224 Both stress and resilience scores were normally distributed in the sample population. In
225 unadjusted analyses, except PSS item 1 and 6, all PSS item scores were significantly higher in
226 pregnant compared to non-pregnant women (**Figure 2a**). Numerical values are given in
227 Supplementary Table 2a. Linear regression analysis showed that in an unadjusted model
228 pregnancy was positively associated with higher PSS stress score ($\beta=4.3$; 95% CI: 3.4, 5.3).
229 Similarly, except BRS item 2, all BRS item scores were significantly lower in pregnant
230 compared to non-pregnant women (**Figure 2b**). Numerical values are given in Supplementary
231 Table 2b. Linear regression analysis showed that pregnancy was associated with lower resilience
232 score in an unadjusted model ($\beta=-3.6$; 95% CI: -4.5, -2.6).

233 *Figure 2 here:*

234 **Adjusted analyses**

235 In a fully adjusted regression model, all PSS items except item 1 and 6 were significantly greater
236 in pregnant compared to non-pregnant women (**Figure 2a**). Numerical values are given in
237 Supplementary Table 2a. For the overall PSS score, after adjusting for marriage, social support,
238 religion, family size, income, education, occupation, household food insecurity status, distress,
239 and current physical activity level, pregnancy was associated with greater stress ($\beta=4.0$; 95% CI:
240 2.9, 5.1).

241 **Adjusted analysis**

242 In adjusted analyses, except PSS item 1, all PSS item scores were significantly higher in
243 pregnant compared to non-pregnant women (**Figure 3a**). Numerical values are given in
244 Supplementary Table 2a. Linear regression analysis showed that in a fully adjusted model
245 pregnancy was associated with higher stress score ($\beta=4.1$; 95% CI: 3.0, 5.2). Similarly, except
246 BRS item 2, all BRS item scores were significantly lower in pregnant compared to non-pregnant
247 women (**Figure 3b**). Numerical values are given in Supplementary Table 2b. Linear regression

248 analysis showed that pregnancy was associated with lower resilience score in the adjusted model
249 ($\beta=-3.3$; 95% CI: -4.5, -2.1).

250 *Figure 3 here:*

251 Lastly, in models that adjusted stress for resilience, and vice versa, pregnancy was associated
252 independently with higher stress ($\beta=2.8$; 95% CI: 1.7, 3.9), and with lower resilience ($\beta=-1.6$;
253 95% CI: -2.8, -0.5) (**Figure 4**).

254 *Figure 4 here:*

255 Other factors associated with higher stress in the overall sample include household food
256 insecurity score ($\beta=0.21$; 95% CI: 0.03, 0.38) in model 4, increased level of physical activity
257 ($\beta=0.24$; 95% CI: 0.90, 3.58), decreased level of physical activity ($\beta=0.25$; 95% CI: 0.13, 0.37),
258 distress ($\beta=0.25$; 95% CI: 0.03, 0.38), while resilience was associated with lower stress ($\beta=-0.4$;
259 95% CI: -0.48, -0.28) in model 5. Similarly, household food insecurity ($\beta=-1.2$; 95% CI: -0.18, -
260 2.2) and stress were associated with lower resilience ($\beta=-0.4$; 95% CI: -0.53, -0.31), while
261 compared to no change in physical activity increased physical activity ($\beta=2.1$; 95% CI: 0.7, 3.5),
262 decreased physical activity ($\beta=1.2$; 95% CI: 0.18, 2.2), and ever use of substance ($\beta=1.4$; 95%
263 CI: 0.4, 2.4) were associated with higher resilience in model 5.

264 The mutually adjusted model explained 46% of the variance in PSS score and 38% of the
265 variance in the BRS score. The associations between pregnancy with stress and resilience were
266 stable across the different regression models indicating the robustness of the finding.

267

268 **Discussion**

269 In this study we compared stress and resilience between pregnant and non-pregnant women.
270 Pregnant women had higher stress and lower resilience than non-pregnant women. The
271 proportion of moderate to severe level of stress was higher in pregnant than non-pregnant
272 women. Similarly, one-third of pregnant women compared to two-thirds of non-pregnant women
273 had normal levels of resilience, suggesting that their coping strategies were hampered during
274 pregnancy. Independent of potential confounders, pregnancy status increased stress by 4 points
275 and decreased resilience by 3 points, and the associations with stress and resilience were also
276 largely independent of each other.

277 Global data showed that the mean stress score in a sample of 1406 women recruited from
278 different countries was 13.7 ± 6.6 (32) which is lower than our finding in a sample of mixed
279 pregnant and non-pregnant women (16.7 ± 4.8) (ref). In the current study, the pregnant women
280 had a much higher mean stress score (18.7 ± 4.3) while the non-pregnant women had only slightly
281 higher mean stress score (14.4 ± 4.3) compared to the global data. Similar to our findings,
282 previous studies have documented higher proportions of moderate to severe levels of stress in
283 pregnant compared to non-pregnant women in Thailand (38), Saudi Arabia (39) and Iran (40).
284 Unlike previous studies, we used a comparative study design to measure the association of
285 pregnancy with stress and resilience so that we are able to investigate the independent
286 association of pregnancy with both outcomes. As such, the current study provides more robust
287 findings from a low income setting compared to previous work.

288 As indicated in previous study (8), various factors could have contributed to the higher burden of
289 stress in this study. Women in general and pregnant women in particular are at a greater
290 disadvantage in LMICs because of a high burden of responsibility with “unpaid care”, combined
291 with very low levels of financial and non-financial reward (10,41–43). While life and role
292 transitions to new parenthood and expectations regarding a new baby are sources of personal and
293 family satisfaction, they can also be stressful experiences given uncertainty and concerns over
294 adverse outcomes for the pregnant women and the offspring, which can lead to a range of
295 negative psychological, physical, and mental consequences, all contributing to an increased state
296 of stress (44,45). In addition, pregnant women require an increased level of psycho-social
297 support to cope with the pregnancy alongside regular daily responsibilities; but in this study

298 around 72% of pregnant compared to 51% non-pregnant women reported that their social
299 support was inadequate. Moreover in a setting like Ethiopia where maternal mortality is high
300 (46,47), all pregnancies are considered to be “between life and death” and this situation increases
301 maternal stress significantly during pregnancy (8). All of these disadvantages that pregnant
302 women encounter on top of their pregnancy are additional life stressors (48–51). Last, but also
303 important, are the physiological and biological changes taking place during pregnancy such as
304 changes in homeostasis, hormonal levels, body weight, and changes in energy metabolism, all of
305 which can induce stress (52).

306 Pregnancy is associated with stress and resilience in opposing directions in the current study.
307 While perceived stress score was higher, resilience score was lower in pregnant compared to
308 non-pregnant women. At the first encounter, stressors/adversities affect or challenge an
309 individual’s level of resilience or coping strategies and subsequently they progress to induce
310 stress (4). While resilience is the ability to absorb shock/stressors, stress is the product of
311 impaired interactions between stressors and coping mechanisms. During immediate exposure to
312 stressors/adversities, resilience helps the body rapidly initiate acute stress responses through
313 activation of the Hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, leading to the release of cortisol
314 preparing the body for ‘fight or flight’ responses (6). Our data in both groups (Figure 1) show
315 that there is an inverse association between these outcomes, whereby higher resilience is
316 associated with lower perceived stress. However, each group also showed substantial variability
317 in this association where by pregnant women for the same level of resilience as to non-pregnant
318 women showed higher stress scores. (Figure 1)

319 Normal resilience facilitates a rapid activation of the HPA axis to benefit the body from its
320 activation and release of cortisol followed by a quick culmination of this process (53). In contrast
321 poor resilience fails to control the continued sustained activation of the HPA axis, leading to a
322 chronic increase in cortisol and resulting in uncontrolled stress (53). Resilience therefore helps to
323 protect normal homeostasis in the body by enabling it to bounce back from the psychological,
324 physiological and biological effects of stressful situations (3). Through these mechanisms,
325 normal resilience is mostly inversely associated with pathological stress, anxiety or depression
326 (54). Thus it is crucial to understand what and what levels of stressors overcome an individual’s
327 resilience and what support/intervention types improve resilience so stressors can be overcome.

328 This is especially important for women during pregnancy to benefit both the mother and her
329 offspring, improving the health and productivity of the next generation by breaking the
330 intergenerational transmissions of stress.

331 The fact that women in general have higher stress score in the current study could indicate the
332 competing responsibility between unpaid household/family responsibility and their aspirations
333 for personal development compounded by an unfavorable educational environment for females,
334 unrelenting household responsibility and lack of social support making it all difficult to balance
335 their personal development and family life (55,56) indicating the need for females friendly
336 environment to improve women empowerment in low income settings. Moreover, higher level of
337 household food insecurity, distress and increased physical activity have contributed to the higher
338 stress and lower resilience score in the current study. Household food insecurity is a form of
339 environmental adversities associated with poor mental health outcome (57) and is a common
340 phenomenon in a LMICs. While it is difficult to explain the association between ever use of
341 substance and higher resilience score, this might be attributed to financial access or freedom
342 those women have compared to others. Consistent to previous studies (58,59) increased level of
343 physical activity is associated with higher resilience but not with lower stress. This could happen
344 because the increase in physically active might be due to the increased household domestic
345 activities making them stressed, or otherwise stressed women might have tried physical activity
346 to reduce their level of stress.

347 **Strengths and Limitations**

348 Our use of a comparative cross-sectional study design, with both groups recruited from a similar
349 setting, enabled us to objectively compare the burden of stress in pregnant and non-pregnant
350 women. In addition, we covered both stress and resilience with additional psychosocial stressors
351 to account for their effect. The limitations in this study include the relatively small sample size,
352 possible selection bias, and selection of unmatched controls. We did not collect and analyze
353 objective stress biomarkers in the current study, hence our results relate only to perceived stress.
354 Moreover, we did not follow the women prospectively to evaluate the longitudinal progression of
355 stress and resilience as well as the impact of the stress on the health and wellbeing of the mother
356 and offspring and on pregnancy and birth outcomes.

357 **Conclusion and recommendation**

358 Perceived stress is higher and resilience is lower in pregnant women compared to non-pregnant
359 women in Ethiopia. There is a need for more research into the different stress response
360 mechanisms and stress biomarkers during pregnancy. Moreover mechanistic studies and context
361 relevant interventions to improve psychological coping and resilience, and to reduce stress are
362 required so as to improve the health and wellbeing of the mother and her offspring.

363

364

365 **References**

- 366 1. McEwen BS. Physiology and Neurobiology of Stress and Adaptation: Central Role of the Brain.
367 *Physiol Rev.* 2007 Jul;87(3):873–904.
- 368 2. Yaribeygi H, Panahi Y, Sahraei H, Johnston TP, Sahebkar A. The impact of stress on body function: a
369 review. *EXCLI J* 16Doc1057 ISSN 1611-2156 [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Sep 21]; Available from:
370 https://www.excli.de/vol16/Sahebkar_Panahi_21072017_proof.pdf
- 371 3. Liu H, Zhang C, Ji Y, Yang L. Biological and Psychological Perspectives of Resilience: Is It Possible to
372 Improve Stress Resistance? *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2018 Aug 21;12:326.
- 373 4. Oken BS, Chamine I, Wakeland W. A systems approach to stress, stressors and resilience in humans.
374 *Behav Brain Res.* 2015 Apr;282:144–54.
- 375 5. de Terte I, Stephens C, Huddleston L. The Development of a Three Part Model of Psychological
376 Resilience: Three Part Model of Psychological Resilience. *Stress Health.* 2014 Dec;30(5):416–24.
- 377 6. Feder A, Nestler EJ, Charney DS. Psychobiology and molecular genetics of resilience. *Nat Rev*
378 *Neurosci.* 2009 Jun;10(6):446–57.
- 379 7. Balhara YS, Verma R, Gupta C. Gender differences in stress response: Role of developmental and
380 biological determinants. *Ind Psychiatry J.* 2012;20(1):4.
- 381 8. Hanlon C, Whitley R, Wondimagegn D, Alem A, Prince M. Between life and death: exploring the
382 sociocultural context of antenatal mental distress in rural Ethiopia. *Arch Womens Ment Health.*
383 2010 Oct;13(5):385–93.
- 384 9. Ahmed AE, Albalawi A, Alshehri A, AlBlaihed R, Alsalamah MA. Stress and its predictors in pregnant
385 women: a study in Saudi Arabia. *Psychol Res Behav Manag.* 2017 Apr;Volume 10:97–102.
- 386 10. Rondó PHC, Ferreira RF, Nogueira F, Ribeiro MCN, Lobert H, Artes R. Maternal psychological stress
387 and distress as predictors of low birth weight, prematurity and intrauterine growth retardation. *Eur*
388 *J Clin Nutr.* 2003 Feb 1;57(2):266–72.
- 389 11. Oakley RH, Cidlowski JA. The biology of the glucocorticoid receptor: New signaling mechanisms in
390 health and disease. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2013 Nov;132(5):1033–44.
- 391 12. Bronson SL, Bale TL. The Placenta as a Mediator of Stress Effects on Neurodevelopmental
392 Reprogramming. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2016 Jan;41(1):207–18.
- 393 13. Traylor CS, Johnson JD, Kimmel MC, Manuck TA. Effects of psychological stress on adverse
394 pregnancy outcomes and nonpharmacologic approaches for reduction: an expert review. *Am J*
395 *Obstet Gynecol MFM.* 2020 Nov;2(4):100229.
- 396 14. Zietlow AL, Nonnenmacher N, Reck C, Ditzen B, Müller M. Emotional Stress During Pregnancy –
397 Associations With Maternal Anxiety Disorders, Infant Cortisol Reactivity, and Mother–Child
398 Interaction at Pre-school Age. *Front Psychol.* 2019 Sep 25;10:2179.

- 399 15. Hanlon C, Medhin G, Alem A, Tesfaye F, Lakew Z, Worku B, et al. Impact of antenatal common
400 mental disorders upon perinatal outcomes in Ethiopia: the P-MaMiE population-based cohort study.
401 Trop Med Int Health. 2009 Feb;14(2):156–66.
- 402 16. Bitew T, Hanlon C, Kebede E, Honikman S, Fekadu A. Antenatal depressive symptoms and perinatal
403 complications: a prospective study in rural Ethiopia. BMC Psychiatry. 2017 Dec;17(1):301.
- 404 17. Brunton PJ. Effects of maternal exposure to social stress during pregnancy: consequences for
405 mother and offspring. REPRODUCTION. 2013 Nov;146(5):R175–89.
- 406 18. Coussons-Read ME. Effects of prenatal stress on pregnancy and human development: mechanisms
407 and pathways. Obstet Med. 2013 Jun;6(2):52–7.
- 408 19. Dunkel Schetter C, Tanner L. Anxiety, depression and stress in pregnancy: implications for mothers,
409 children, research, and practice. Curr Opin Psychiatry. 2012 Mar;25(2):141–8.
- 410 20. Sawle GV, Ramsay MM. The neurology of pregnancy. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 1998 Jun
411 1;64(6):717–25.
- 412 21. Schneiderman N, Ironson G, Siegel SD. Stress and Health: Psychological, Behavioral, and Biological
413 Determinants. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. 2005 Apr 1;1(1):607–28.
- 414 22. World Health Organization. Maternal mental health and child health and development in low and
415 middle income countries : report of the meeting, Geneva, Switzerland, 30 January - 1 February,
416 2008. 2008 [cited 2022 Sep 21]; Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43975>
- 417 23. Oakley RH, Cidlowski JA. The biology of the glucocorticoid receptor: New signaling mechanisms in
418 health and disease. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2013 Nov;132(5):1033–44.
- 419 24. Smith KE, Pollak SD. Early life stress and development: potential mechanisms for adverse outcomes.
420 J Neurodev Disord. 2020 Dec;12(1):34.
- 421 25. Thoma MV, Bernays F, Eising CM, Pfluger V, Rohner SL. Health, stress, and well-being in Swiss adult
422 survivors of child welfare practices and child labor: Investigating the mediating role of socio-
423 economic factors. Child Abuse Negl. 2021 Jan;111:104769.
- 424 26. Agorastos A, Pervanidou P, Chrousos GP, Baker DG. Developmental Trajectories of Early Life Stress
425 and Trauma: A Narrative Review on Neurobiological Aspects Beyond Stress System Dysregulation.
426 Front Psychiatry. 2019 Mar 11;10:118.
- 427 27. Burton NO, Willis A, Fisher K, Braukmann F, Price J, Stevens L, et al. Intergenerational adaptations to
428 stress are evolutionarily conserved, stress-specific, and have deleterious trade-offs. eLife. 2021 Oct
429 8;10:e73425.
- 430 28. Atif N, Lovell K, Rahman A. Maternal mental health: The missing “m” in the global maternal and
431 child health agenda. Semin Perinatol. 2015 Aug;39(5):345–52.

- 432 29. Baron EC, Hanlon C, Mall S, Honikman S, Breuer E, Kathree T, et al. Maternal mental health in
433 primary care in five low- and middle-income countries: a situational analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res.*
434 2016 Dec;16(1):53.
- 435 30. Victora CG, Christian P, Vidaletti LP, Gatica-Domínguez G, Menon P, Black RE. Revisiting maternal
436 and child undernutrition in low-income and middle-income countries: variable progress towards an
437 unfinished agenda. *The Lancet.* 2021 Apr;397(10282):1388–99.
- 438 31. Black MM, Walker SP, Fernald LCH, Andersen CT, DiGirolamo AM, Lu C, et al. Early childhood
439 development coming of age: science through the life course. *The Lancet.* 2017 Jan;389(10064):77–
440 90.
- 441 32. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A Global Measure of Perceived Stress. *J Health Soc Behav.* 1983
442 Dec;24(4):385.
- 443 33. Manzar MD, Salahuddin M, Peter S, Alghadir A, Anwer S, Bahammam AS, et al. Psychometric
444 properties of the perceived stress scale in Ethiopian university students. *BMC Public Health.* 2019
445 Dec;19(1):41.
- 446 34. Smith BW, Dalen J, Wiggins K, Tooley E, Christopher P, Bernard J. The brief resilience scale:
447 Assessing the ability to bounce back. *Int J Behav Med.* 2008 Sep;15(3):194–200.
- 448 35. Gebreyesus SH, Lunde T, Mariam DH, Woldehanna T, Lindtjørn B. Is the adapted Household Food
449 Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) developed internationally to measure food insecurity valid in urban
450 and rural households of Ethiopia? *BMC Nutr.* 2015 Dec;1(1):2.
- 451 36. Batterham PJ, Sunderland M, Carragher N, Calear AL, Mackinnon AJ, Slade T. The Distress
452 Questionnaire-5: Population screener for psychological distress was more accurate than the K6/K10.
453 *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2016 Mar;71:35–42.
- 454 37. Cohen S, Williamson, G. Perceived Stress in a Probability Sample of the United States. Spacapan, S,
455 and Oskamp, S. (Eds.) *The Social Psychology of Health.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1988.
- 456 38. Thongsomboon W, Kaewkiattikun K, Kerdcharoen N. Perceived Stress and Associated Factors
457 Among Pregnant Women Attending Antenatal Care in Urban Thailand. *Psychol Res Behav Manag.*
458 2020 Dec;Volume 13:1115–22.
- 459 39. Ahmed AE, Albalawi A, Alshehri A, AlBlaihed R, Alsalamah MA. Stress and its predictors in pregnant
460 women: a study in Saudi Arabia. *Psychol Res Behav Manag.* 2017 Apr;Volume 10:97–102.
- 461 40. Keramat A, Malary M, Moosazadeh M, Bagherian N, Rajabi-Shakib MR. Factors influencing stress,
462 anxiety, and depression among Iranian pregnant women: the role of sexual distress and genital self-
463 image. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2021 Dec;21(1):87.
- 464 41. Miller PC, Sollie DL. Normal Stresses during the Transition to Parenthood. 2021;8.
- 465 42. Engidaw NA, Mekonnen AG, Amogne FK. Perceived stress and its associated factors among pregnant
466 women in Bale zone Hospitals, Southeast Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Res Notes.* 2019
467 Dec;12(1):356.

- 468 43. Praharsio NF, Tear MJ, Cruwys T. Stressful life transitions and wellbeing: A comparison of the stress
469 buffering hypothesis and the social identity model of identity change. *Psychiatry Res.* 2017
470 Jan;247:265–75.
- 471 44. Epifanio MS, Genna V, De Luca C, Roccella M, La Grutta S. Paternal and Maternal Transition to
472 Parenthood: The Risk of Postpartum Depression and Parenting Stress. *Pediatr Rep.* 2015 May
473 25;7(2):5872.
- 474 45. Kline M, Cowan PA, Pape Cowan C. The Origins of Parenting Stress During the Transition to
475 Parenthood: A New Family Model. *Early Educ Dev.* 1991 Oct;2(4):287–305.
- 476 46. Overview of Maternal health _ Ministry of Health - Ethiopia. [https://www.moh.gov.etsiteinitiatives-4-](https://www.moh.gov.etsiteinitiatives-4-colMaternal_Health)
477 [colMaternal_Health](https://www.moh.gov.etsiteinitiatives-4-colMaternal_Health). Accessed on 8/20/2022.
- 478 47. Tesfay N, Tariku R, Zenebe A, Woldeyohannes F. Critical factors associated with postpartum
479 maternal death in Ethiopia. Keenanasseril A, editor. *PLOS ONE.* 2022 Jun 24;17(6):e0270495.
- 480 48. Kim MK, Lee SM, Bae SH, Kim HJ, Lim NG, Yoon SJ, et al. Socioeconomic status can affect pregnancy
481 outcomes and complications, even with a universal healthcare system. *Int J Equity Health.* 2018
482 Dec;17(1):2.
- 483 49. Shishehgar S, Dolatian M, Majd HA, Bakhtiary M. Socioeconomic status and stress rate during
484 pregnancy in Iran. *Glob J Health Sci.* 2014 Apr 22;6(4):254–60.
- 485 50. Weyers S, Dragano N, Möbus S, Beck EM, Stang A, Möhlenkamp S, et al. Low socio-economic
486 position is associated with poor social networks and social support: results from the Heinz Nixdorf
487 Recall Study. *Int J Equity Health.* 2008 Dec;7(1):13.
- 488 51. Bedaso A, Adams J, Peng W, Sibbritt D. Prevalence and determinants of low social support during
489 pregnancy among Australian women: a community-based cross-sectional study. *Reprod Health.*
490 2021 Dec;18(1):158.
- 491 52. de Weerth C, Buitelaar JK. Physiological stress reactivity in human pregnancy—a review. *Neurosci*
492 *Biobehav Rev.* 2005 Apr;29(2):295–312.
- 493 53. de Kloet ER, Joëls M, Holsboer F. Stress and the brain: from adaptation to disease. *Nat Rev Neurosci.*
494 2005 Jun;6(6):463–75.
- 495 54. Feder A, Fred-Torres S, Southwick SM, Charney DS. The Biology of Human Resilience: Opportunities
496 for Enhancing Resilience Across the Life Span. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2019 Sep;86(6):443–53.
- 497 55. Logan BI, Bloch M, Beoku-Betts JA, Tabachnik BR. Women and Education in Sub-Saharan Africa:
498 Power, Opportunities, and Constraints. *Contemp Sociol.* 2000 Jul;29(4):630.
- 499 56. Mussida C, Patimo R. Women’s Family Care Responsibilities, Employment and Health: A Tale of Two
500 Countries. *J Fam Econ Issues.* 2021 Sep;42(3):489–507.

501 57. Wolfson JA, Garcia T, Leung CW. Food Insecurity Is Associated with Depression, Anxiety, and Stress:
502 Evidence from the Early Days of the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States. *Health Equity*. 2021
503 Feb 1;5(1):64–71.

504 58. Arida RM, Teixeira-Machado L. The Contribution of Physical Exercise to Brain Resilience. *Front*
505 *Behav Neurosci*. 2021 Jan 20;14:626769.

506 59. Nichols ES, Pathak HS, Bgeginski R, Mottola MF, Giroux I, Van Lieshout RJ, et al. Machine learning-
507 based predictive modeling of resilience to stressors in pregnant women during COVID-19: A
508 prospective cohort study. Ab Wahab MN, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2022 Aug 11;17(8):e0272862.

509

510

511

512 **Tables:**

Table 1: Background characteristics of study participant, n=320				
Variable	Mean ± SD; n (%)	Pregnant women, n- 166	Non-pregnant women n=154	P-value from: t-test, or chi- square
Age	27.0±5.7	24.7±5.1	29.4±5.3	0.01 ^a
Married	295 (92)	159 (96)	136 (88)	0.01 ^b
Religion				
Muslim	195 (61)	110 (66)	85 (55)	0.04 ^b
Christian	125 (39)	56 (34)	69 (45)	
Average fertility/birth rate	2.3±1.2	2.0±1.2	2.6±1.1	0.01 ^a
Gestational age, Weeks		22.2 ± 8.1	-	
Educational status n=299		n=159	n=140	
Illiterate,	25 (8)	24 (15)	1 (1)	0.01 ^b
Primary (grade 1-8)	126 (42)	66 (42)	93 (66)	
Secondary (grade 9-12)	100 (33)	44 (28)	58 (41)	
Diploma and above (> grade 12)	48 (16)	25 (16)	23 (16)	
Average family size	4.4±1.6	3.6±1.4	5.2±1.3	0.01 ^a
Social support, n=320				
Perceived adequate	122 (38)	46 (28)	76 (49)	0.01 ^b
Perceived inadequate	198 (62)	120 (72)	78 (51)	
Current physical activity				
No change	123 (38)	48 (29)	75 (49)	0.02 ^b
Increased	44 (14)	14 (8)	30 (20)	
Deceased	153 (48)	104 (63)	49 (32)	

513 *Note: a: P-value from t-test; b: p-value form Chi-square test*

514

Variable		Mean ± SD; n=319	Pregnant women, n- 165	Non-pregnant women n=154	P-value (t- test)
Stress Z-score		-0.0001±1.00	0.43±0.89	-0.43±0.90	-
Stress raw score (0-40 points)		16.7±4.8	18.7±4.3	14.4 ±4.3	0.01
Resilience raw score, (6-30 points)		19.4±4.7	17.7±3.4	21.3±5.2	0.01
Resilience likert scale score		3.2±0.9	3.0±0.6	3.5 ±0.9	0.01
Variables	Category	n (%)	Pregnant women, n- 165	Non-pregnant women n=154	P-value (χ²)
Stress level raw score classifications	Low	90(28.3)	18 (11.0)	72 (46.8)	0.01
	Moderate	221(69.5)	139(84.8)	82(53.2)	
	High	7(2.2)	7(4.3)	0	
	Moderate & high	228 (71.7)	146(89.0)	82(53.2)	
Resilience level	Low	110 (34.5)	77 (46.7)	33 (21.4)	0.01
	Normal	172 (53.9)	87 (52.7)	85 (55.2)	
	High	37 (11.6)	1 (0.01)	36 (23.4)	

515

516 **Table 3a: Association of pregnancy with stress score**

Regressed for stress		Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
Exposures		β	[95% CI]		β	[95% CI]		β	[95% CI]		β	[95% CI]	
Pregnancy status	Pregnant	4.30	3.35	5.25	4.23	3.18	5.29	4.24	3.18	5.29	4.10	3.00	5.22
Age	Age	-	-	-	-0.01	-0.11	0.08	-0.01	-0.12	0.10	-0.08	-0.19	0.04
Parity	Parity>2	-	-	-				-0.08	-1.24	1.09	-0.09	-1.24	1.06
Marital	Non-married	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.64	-1.27	2.55
Social support	Good support	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.20	-0.90	1.30
Religion	Non-Muslim	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.23	-0.77	1.24
Family size	Family size >5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.11	-1.12	1.34
Income	Low income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Medium income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.10	-1.40	1.58
	Higher income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.32	-0.93	1.57
Educational status	No education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Primary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.73	-0.10	3.55
	Secondary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.25	-0.69	3.19
	College and above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.32	-1.17	3.80
Occupation	No occupation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Employed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1.32	-3.20	0.55
	Merchant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.35	-1.84	1.14
Household food insecurity	Household food insecurity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.21	0.03	0.38
Physical activity	As usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Increased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.70	.25	3.15
	Decreased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.93	-1.13	2.00
Distress score	Distress score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.26	0.13	0.39
Substance use	Ever use	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.46	-1.49	0.57
	Resilience	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

517

518 **Table 3b: Association between pregnancy statuses with resilience score**

Regressed for resilience		Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
Exposures		β	[95% CI]		β	[95% CI]		β	[95% CI]		β	[95% CI]	
Pregnancy status	Pregnant	-3.58	-4.54	-2.62	-3.46	-4.52	-2.40	-3.46	-4.52	-2.39	-3.33	-4.50	-2.16
Age	Age	-	-	-	-0.03	-0.07	0.12	0.03	-0.10	0.14	0.04	-0.08	0.16
Parity	Parity \geq 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.003	-1.17	1.17	-0.14	-1.34	1.06
Marital	Non-married	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.08	-2.07	1.91
Social support	Good support	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.65	-1.80	0.50
Religion	Non-Muslim	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.66	-1.71	0.39
Family size	Family size >5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.45	-0.82	1.73
Income	Low income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Medium income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.74	-2.30	0.81
	Higher income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.85	-2.15	0.46
Educational status	No education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Primary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.07	-3.98	-0.17
	Secondary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1.76	-3.78	0.27
	College and above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-2.62	-5.21	-0.02
Occupation	No occupation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Employed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.51	-0.45	3.47
	Merchant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.24	-1.32	1.79
Food insecurity	Household food insecurity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.32	-0.50	-0.13
Distress score	Distress score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.02	-0.16	0.12
Physical activity	As usual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0		
	Increased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.43	-0.09	2.94
	Decreased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.83	-0.28	1.94
Substance use	Ever use	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.58	0.50	2.66
	Stress score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

519

520

521

522

523 **Appendix I: Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10)**

524 The questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts during **the last month**. In each case, you will

525 be asked to indicate **how often you felt** or thought a certain way.

S. No	Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10): In the last 1-month	Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Very Often
1.	How often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?	0	1	2	3	4
2.	How often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?	0	1	2	3	4
3.	How often have you felt nervous and “stressed”?	0	1	2	3	4
4.	How often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?	0	1	2	3	4
5.	How often have you felt that things were going your way?	0	1	2	3	4
6.	How often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?	0	1	2	3	4
7.	How often have you been able to control irritations in your life?	0	1	2	3	4
8.	How often have you felt that you were on top of things?	0	1	2	3	4
9.	How often have you been angered because of things that were outside of your control?	0	1	2	3	4
10.	How often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?	0	1	2	3	4

526

527

528 **Appendixes**

529 **Appendix II: Brief Resilience Scale (BRS-6)**

Brief Resilience Scale (BRS-6) Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements.					
Questions	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1. I tend to bounce back quickly after hard times.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have a hard time making it through stressful events.	1	2	3	4	5
3. It does not take me long to recover from a stressful event.	1	2	3	4	5
4. It is hard for me to snap back when something bad happens.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I usually come through difficult times with little trouble.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Tend to take a long time to get over set-backs in my life.	1	2	3	4	5

530

531

Figure 1




Figure 1: Linear prediction for stress on resilience by pregnancy status

Figure 2




Figure 2: Mean difference in (a) Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) items and (b) Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) items between pregnant and non-pregnant women in a simple model

Figure 3




Figure 3: Mean difference in (a) PSS-10 item scores and (b) BRS-6 item scores between pregnant and non-pregnant women, in the fully adjusted model.

Figure 4




Figure 4: Association of pregnancy with stress and resilience in the mutually adjusted models