Health professionals' beliefs and attitudes towards preconception care: A systematic review

Authors

Cherie Caut[1], Danielle Schoenaker[2,3,4], Erica McIntyre[5,6], Amie Steel[1]

1. Australian Research Centre in Complementary and Integrative Medicine, School of Public Health, Faculty of Health, University of Technology Sydney, Building 10, Level 8, 235-253 Jones Street, Ultimo NSW 2007 Australia.
2. School of Human Development and Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
3. MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
4. NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK.
5. Institute for Sustainable Futures, University of Technology Sydney, Building 10, Level 10, 235-253 Jones Street, Ultimo NSW 2007 Australia. Visiting Fellow
6. Research Institute for Innovative Solutions for Well-being and Health, University of Technology Sydney, Ultimo NSW, Australia.

Corresponding author: Cherie Caut

Corresponding author email: cherie.d.caut@student.uts.edu.au

Abstract

Background

Health professionals have previously identified various barriers and factors that would help facilitate preconception care services in healthcare settings. Clinically relevant preconception information and clinical practice guidelines have since been developed to aid health professionals in preconception care delivery. This systematic review aimed to 1) synthesise recent literature (past 8 years) describing health professionals' beliefs and attitudes towards preconception care services or programmes and 2) determine if the experience of health professionals providing preconception care has changed compared to literature reviews conducted more than 8 years ago.

Methods

Five databases were searched between 27/01/2016 and 20/11/2024. Primary quantitative and qualitative research studies were included if they examined health professionals' beliefs and attitudes towards delivering preconception care services or programmes. Study quality was assessed using the CASP Checklist (qualitative studies) and AXIS tool (quantitative studies). Data synthesis used thematic categorisation adapted from the framework approach.

Results

Twenty-seven studies were included (n=11 qualitative, n=14 quantitative, n=2 mixed-methods studies). Methodological quality was generally good for qualitative studies but varied for quantitative studies. The results covered three categories: 1) *addressing preconception care health literacy* (i.e. lack of knowledge, awareness, training and resources), 2) *clinical practicalities of preconception car*e (i.e. need for coordination of care and clarity on role responsibility), and 3) *the role of the patient* (i.e. need for public health education to support patient-led conversations).

Conclusions

Little has changed regarding the barriers and facilitators to providing preconception care reported by health professionals. To improve the provision of preconception care, there is a need to co-develop professional and public preconception health education, clinical resources, and a coordinated preconception healthcare service model.

Keywords

preconception care, health professionals, beliefs and attitudes, systematic review

Introduction

People's modifiable preconception health (PCH) and health behaviours—such as body composition, lifestyle behaviours, nutrition, environmental exposures, and birth spacing—can affect maternal and child health[1-3]. The need to address such risk factors has led to clinical and public health measures that aim to screen for PCH risks and implement intervention strategies to optimise PCH and the health behaviours of prospective parents before conception, known as preconception care (PCC)[4]. The importance of PCC is highlighted by health policies and strategies produced by a number of countries around the world[5]. It has received dedicated attention from the World Health Organization[4] as a critically important component of healthcare that can impact multiple generations.

While PCC is valuable and important for prospective parents, healthcare providers experience a range of barriers to implementing PCC services or programmes[6, 7]. Previous systematic reviews that included studies conducted more than five years ago have reported health professionals' (HPs) experiences providing PCC and describe the types of barriers they experience, including but not limited to poor interprofessional communication, insufficient clinical time, funding, clinically relevant information, and public and HP awareness of the benefits of PCC[6, 7]. Conversely, HPs reported that adequate knowledge of PCC, prospective parents discussing their intention to become pregnant or requesting PCC, and clinical PCC resources would enable them to facilitate PCC[7]. To address some of these barriers and promote PCC services, clinician-focussed PCC information and guidelines have been developed[8, 9], and relevant information for implementing PCC programmes in organisations[10]. A recent systematic review, however, identified that existing

clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) on PCC supported by high-quality evidence are lacking[11]. Emerging research efforts aim to establish population PCH priorities and co-develop strategies to address them at a healthcare services level[12].

While these guidelines aim to assist HPs providing PCC, an up-to-date understanding of HPs' views towards PCC delivery is needed to identify if the increasing availability of guidelines has reduced or changed previously reported barriers and if HPs also require other types of support to implement PCC meaningfully. Therefore, this systematic review aimed to 1) synthesise recent literature describing health professionals' beliefs and attitudes towards preconception care services or programmes and 2) compare these experiences to previous systematic review findings[6, 7].

Methods

This systematic review is reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses 2020[13] and was prospectively registered on the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO; CRD42021249386).

Eligibility criteria

Original primary research (quantitative and qualitative studies) published between 27/01/2016 and 20/11/2024 that sampled HPs (including, but not limited to, general practitioners, midwives, and obstetricians) and examined their beliefs and/or attitudes towards delivering PCC services or programmes were eligible for inclusion.

Information sources

Keyword and MeSH terms were employed in the databases MEDLINE (OVID), EMBASE (OVID), Maternity and Infant Care (OVID), CINAHL (EBSCO), and PsycINFO (EBSCO), with the following limits: title and abstract, studies in humans, published between 27/01/2016 to 27/01/2022. A second search was conducted for articles published between 28/01/2022 to 20/11/2024. No limits to language were applied. The search strategy is presented in Supplementary File 1.

Selection process

The search was conducted on 27 January 2022 and 20/11/2024. CC completed electronic database searches and downloaded citations and abstracts into EndNoteX9 citation management software. Duplication screening occurred before citations were exported into Covidence systematic review software[14]. Articles were screened by title and abstract initially by CC, and by DS and AS to establish reliability. Full-text articles were downloaded and screened initially by CC, followed by AS, to establish reliability before final inclusion for review. There were no disagreements between reviewers. References lists of the included studies were searched for additional eligible studies. Article exclusion reasons from the full-text screening stage were recorded.

Data collection process

CC initially extracted data from eligible studies into a customised form, followed by AS to establish reliability.

Data items

Data extracted included the study reference, title, aims, type of PCC service, location, population, study design, data collection method(s), sample size, and findings on HP beliefs and attitudes towards PCC.

Critical appraisal

The Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative Checklist[15] evaluated study reporting and methodological quality. Quantitative studies were assessed via the Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies (AXIS)[16]. CC critically appraised included studies, and AS assessed 10% of included studies for reliability. Disagreements were discussed until a consensus was reached. A third reviewer (EM or DS) was invited to adjudicate if unresolved.

Synthesis methods

A framework approach for applied and policy-relevant research was employed to analyse the data, identify common themes across the studies, and then categorise these findings to determine the key themes[17]. Findings on beliefs and attitudes towards PCC from the included studies were extracted by CC reading and re-reading each paper, and reviewed by AS, DS and EM. Common themes were then identified across the studies and further defined into categories. Each study was assigned as many categories as relevant to their reported findings.

Results

Study selection

Searches retrieved 604 articles. After removing duplicates, 376 titles and abstracts were screened (Figure 1). Thirty-seven full-text articles were checked for eligibility;

27 met the inclusion criteria and were included in this review. Reasons for exclusion at full-text screening are presented in Supplementary File 2.

[Insert Figure 1. Prisma flow diagram]

Study characteristics

All articles (n=27) were published in English between 2017 and 2023 (Table 1). Fourteen studies[18-31] employed a cross-sectional study design and survey method for data collection. Eleven qualitative studies were identified utilising focus groups (n=4)[32-35] or interviews (n=7)[36-42]. Two studies[43, 44] collected data using mixed methods; Devido et al. [43] employed a focus group and survey, and Mass et al. [44] a survey and interactive workshop. The included studies were conducted in Australia (n=6)[21-24, 29, 30]; the United States (US; n=5)[18, 25, 41-43]; the Netherlands (n=4)[31, 33, 37, 44]; United Kingdom (UK) (n=2)[35, 38]; India (n=2)[20, 34]; and one study each in New Zealand[19], Europe[36], Indonesia[32], Canada[26], Malawi[39], South Africa[27], Nigeria[40], and China[28]. A range of HPs were represented, including but not limited to pharmacists, nurses, midwives, general practitioners, obstetricians and gynaecologists. Sample size varied among the qualitative (n=11 to 92), quantitative (n=77 to 992) and mixed-methods (n=48 to 299) studies.

[Insert Table 1. Characteristics of included studies]

Critical appraisal of included studies

Quality assessment details are presented in Table 2 and Table 3 for qualitative and quantitative studies, respectively.

188 Most of the qualitative studies fulfilled all the CASP checklist[15] criteria for
189 assessing methodological quality. One study[39] needed to be more transparent on
190 the appropriateness of the recruitment strategy, consideration of researcher bias and
191 rigour of data analysis. The methodological quality of the quantitative studies was
192 varied[16]. Sample size justification, non-response bias and funding sources or
193 conflicts of interest were the most poorly reported criteria, followed by the use of
194 instruments or measurements that had been trialled, piloted, or published
195 previously.
196
197 **[Item Table 2. CASP Quality Assessment]**
198 **[Item Table 3. AXIS Quality Assessment]**
199
200 Results of syntheses
201 Three common thematic categories across the findings from the reviewed studies
202 were identified and defined: *addressing preconception care health literacy, clinical*
203 *practicalities of preconception care*, and *the role of the patient*.
204
205 **Addressing preconception care health literacy**
206 Twenty-three studies reported findings related to addressing PCC health literacy[18-
207 26, 28-36, 38, 39, 41-43]. These studies addressed PCH knowledge, clinical training
208 needs and access to resources.
209
210 Preconception health knowledge gaps
211 Insufficient knowledge about PCH as a barrier to HPs' PCC practices was commonly
212 reported. For example, an Australian cross-sectional study of GPs (n=110) found
213 their lack of knowledge of PCC guidelines to be one of the most common barriers to

214 their delivery of PCC[24]; this view was shared by 40% of midwives in a second
215 Australian study[21] and 95% of nurses in another Australian study[30], a broader
216 group of HPs from a UK qualitative study.[38] The lack of knowledge as a barrier to
217 PCC provision also applied to GPs (n=304) in Australia providing care to men[23], of
218 whom almost all respondents (90%) indicated that they did not feel confident about
219 their knowledge of the factors affecting male fertility[23]. A cross-sectional study on
220 midwives (n=338) from Australia[29] found that most (85%) rated their overall
221 knowledge about pre and interconception health for women as excellent or above
222 average, although for men or partners, a higher proportion of participants (40%)
223 reported their overall knowledge as below average, poor or none. Participants with
224 more than 11 years of experience were more likely to report above average to
225 excellent knowledge (OR 3.11; 95% CI 1.09, 8.85), although, for men or partners, this
226 association was limited to midwives with more than 21 years of experience (OR 2.20;
227 95% CI 1.18, 4.11). Another cross-sectional study from Australia[30], on nurses
228 (n=152) found that only one in 20 respondents agreed that they had excellent
229 knowledge about PCC for women and men. When asked to rate their knowledge of
230 the importance of women's health in the preconception period, over half (54%)
231 reported average to below-average levels. Regarding the importance of men's health
232 in the preconception period, this increased to two-thirds of respondents (67%)
233 reporting average to below average knowledge. In contrast, a study[28] of HPs in
234 China found that 26.9% of those providing care to women with type 1 diabetes felt
235 they lacked the knowledge to deliver PCC to this population. At the same time, a US
236 study reported a significant positive association between teaching self-efficacy and
237 preconception counselling knowledge among parish nurses (n=48) providing
238 diabetes education to women with diabetes[43]. Only one cross-sectional study
239 sampling dentists and gynaecologists (n=300) from India investigated clinician

240 characteristics associated with PCH knowledge[20]. It was found in logistic
241 regression analyses that older age doctors (Adjusted odds ratio [AOR]=1.055 (95%
242 Confidence interval [CI]: 1.055-1.092, *p*=0.002), the field of specialisation - dentists
243 (AOR=1.635, 95% CI: 1.064-2.511, *p*=0.002), and years of practicing experience > 5
244 years (AOR=2.254, 95% CI: 1.46-3.45, *p*=0.001) were significantly associated with
245 higher knowledge levels of periodontal health and adverse pregnancy outcomes[20].
246 One qualitative study from India on healthcare workers (n=45)[34] found that most
247 had some knowledge about preconception care, limited to adolescent health and
248 family planning services. A qualitative study from the UK on pharmacists (n=11)[35]
249 found that lower knowledge scores were related to a lack of training and a lack of
250 confidence in oneself.
251
252
253 Awareness of preconception risks and guidelines
254 HPs reported needing to be made aware of PCH risks and of existing CPGs designed
255 to assist them in screening for PCH risks and delivering PCH interventions[19-21, 23,
256 24, 26, 43]. This issue was highlighted in a study involving dentists and
257 gynaecologists (n=300), where only 79% were aware of the association between
258 periodontal health and preterm low birth weight[20]. In Australia, a study of GPs
259 (n=110) found that only 53% were aware of PCC-CPGs[24]. Similarly, a qualitative
260 study on healthcare providers (n=20) from the US[42] showed a lack of awareness of
261 published PCC guidelines. In contrast, healthcare workers (n=45) in a qualitative
262 study from India were aware that there is no formal PCC program in the country[34].
263 Even where HPs reported being aware of guidelines, familiarity with the
264 recommendations may pose another barrier, as indicated in an Australian cross-
265 sectional study where fewer HPs (including GPs, obstetricians and gynaecologists,

266 midwives and dietitians) were aware of the recommended dose (38%) or duration
267 (44%) of preconception iodine supplementation[21]. This was despite 71% of those
268 HPs being aware that the National Health and Medical Research Council
269 recommends this intervention[21]. In this Australian study, awareness of the
270 recommendation was positively associated with recommending iodine
271 supplements[21]. In contrast, in a cross-sectional study of GPs (n=200) in New
272 Zealand (NZ), most GPs reported being aware of the risks of obesity in pregnancy,
273 over 50% of these GPs reported practice that was inconsistent with guidelines, and
274 only 12% of these same GPs were aware of the New Zealand Ministry of Health
275 Guidance for Healthy Weight in Pregnancy[19]. A similar finding was found in a
276 Canadian cross-sectional study assessing periconceptional folic acid
277 recommendations of GPs (n=77), where only half knew the correct dose and duration
278 of folic acid for low-risk women[26]. In the Netherlands, most (64.2 %) but not all
279 the respondents in a cross-sectional study on midwives and obstetricians(n=83)[31]
280 believe the scientific proof of the effectiveness of PCC to be sufficient.
281
282
283 The desire for further training
284 HPs reported wanting more information and education on PCH risks and
285 interventions[21-23, 33, 39] to improve their confidence in delivering PCC[22, 23,
286 30]. For example, in a cross-sectional study of Australian health professionals
287 (n=396), HPs (including GPs, obstetricians and gynaecologists, midwives and
288 dietitians) indicated they would be interested in receiving new information relating
289 to iodine[21], and in another Australian cross-sectional study almost all maternal
290 child and family health nurses (MCaFHN) (n=192) agreed that more information and
291 formal education opportunities on the topic would increase their confidence to

292 discuss PCH[22]. Most (87%) nurses (n=152) in another cross-sectional study from
293 Australia[30] indicated that more education would increase their confidence in
294 delivering PCC. Most midwives (n=338) in a cross-sectional study from Australia[29]
295 desired further education on managing pre-existing health conditions (69%) and on
296 optimising reproductive health (66%). Healthcare workers (n=45) suggested the
297 need for program-specific guidelines and training in a qualitative study from
298 India[34]. There was a consensus among pharmacists (n=11) in a qualitative study
299 from the UK[35] that insufficient training opportunities exist. A majority (54.6%) of
300 Australian GPs (n=304) suggested that more information and education about
301 factors that affect male fertility would make them more confident to talk to male
302 patients about fertility[23]. Some studies specifically identified lack of training as the
303 barrier to providing PCC and an increased likelihood of HPs providing PCH
304 information and PCC to their patients if they had received further training[18, 25, 28,
305 32, 36, 41]. For example, in a cross-sectional study from the US, 15% of GPs (n=443)
306 reported they needed training before implementing PCC[25]. In another cross-
307 sectional study from the US, obstetricians and gynaecologists (n=297) reported
308 offering expanded carrier screening more commonly if they were fellowship-trained
309 (80%) compared to those who were not (70%)[18].
310
311 Access to resources
312 Ten studies reported findings related to clinician access to resources supporting PCC
313 delivery[21-24, 30, 38, 41, 43]. The types of resources participants suggested include
314 sample meal plans[21], screening guidelines, relevant research findings[21], online
315 tools[22, 30], factsheets, trustworthy websites[22, 23, 30], waiting room posters[23],
316 checklists, brochures[24], expert clinician champions, and medical record
317 prompts[41]. Two other qualitative studies reported structural resource

318 requirements such as PCC policy and procedures used to support them to implement
319 PCC programs into clinical practice settings, as reported in a study of HPs (n=92)
320 from the US[41] and a funding model through third-party reimbursement to improve
321 the delivery of PCC as described by HPs (n=30) in a study from the Netherlands[33].
322
323 **Clinical practicalities of preconception care**
324 Twenty studies reported findings related to the clinical practicalities of PCC[20-25,
325 27-30, 32-35, 37, 39-42, 44].
326 Coordination of care
327 In some studies, HPs reported that a lack of interprofessional referral and care
328 coordination was a barrier to providing PCC[20, 28, 29, 32-34, 37, 41, 44]. One
329 cross-sectional study of dentists and gynaecologists (n=300) from India, for
330 example, found that gynaecologists rarely refer to dentists despite being aware of the
331 link between periodontal health and preterm low birth weight, and only 12% of
332 gynaecologists referred patients to the dentists in the preconception period.*[20]*
333 Several studies[20, 28, 32, 33] reported HPs describing a desire for an integrated,
334 multi-disciplinary approach to providing PCC services, greater coordination and
335 referral networks between HPs[29, 33, 35, 37, 41, 44] and emphasised the
336 importance of patient follow-up[41]. In a study from the Netherlands, HPs (n=299)
337 suggested that while the responsibility for providing PCC consultations is best suited
338 to primary care, many other HPs involved may act as referrers towards PCC[44].
339
340 Role responsibility
341 Most HPs in the included studies believed it to be part of their role to provide
342 preconception risk screening, PCH promotion and provision or referral for PCH
343 interventions. These include GPs[23, 24, 30, 44], MCaFHNs[22], midwives[29, 44],

344 nurses[27], pharmacists[35], obstetricians and gynaecologists[42] and specialist
345 physicians[40]. In a qualitative study from the Netherlands, HPs (including
346 midwives, obstetricians and gynaecologists, fertility specialists, GPs, preventive child
347 health care workers, maternity health care providers, physiotherapists, pharmacists
348 and dieticians) (n=30) expressed that the provision of PCC is challenging due to
349 unclear allocation of responsibilities[33]. Although HPs (including midwives, nurses,
350 obstetricians and gynaecologists and GPs) acknowledged that the responsibility to
351 provide PCC consultations lies with all professions[39] in an Australian cross-
352 sectional study, 84% of GPs (n=110) reported that they should be the primary
353 providers of PCC[24]. In a mixed-methods study from the Netherlands, HPs
354 (including nurses, midwives, GPs, physiotherapists, preventive child healthcare
355 professionals, dieticians, policy officers, maternity care assistants, and
356 gynaecologists) (n=299) suggested that the responsibility for providing PCC
357 consultations lies within primary care, mainly GPs (95.6%) and midwives
358 (94.4%)[44]. In this same study, HPs found it significantly more challenging to start
359 a conversation about a wish to conceive than midwives (26.8% versus 20.2%,
360 p=0.006)[44]; they felt less competent to provide preconception information (32.3%
361 versus 15.1%, p=<0.001)[44]. Similar findings were reported in a cross-sectional
362 study from the US (n=443), where most GPs (88%) felt pregnancy intention
363 screening should be routinely included in primary care[25]. In contrast, in a
364 qualitative study from Nigeria, HPs (including nurses and specialist physicians)
365 (n=26) stated that PCC services should be offered at all levels of health care with
366 referral when needed[40]. Specialist physicians from this Nigerian study also
367 identified the relevance of PCC to their practice, stating that those with chronic
368 diseases would benefit more[40]. In a cross-sectional study from Australia on
369 midwives' (n=338), most (88%) reported that they often encounter health states that

370 could be managed before pregnancy (88%)[29]. Pharmacists (n=11) in a qualitative
371 study from the UK[35] discussed how they are frequently asked for conception
372 advice, particularly by those experiencing difficulties in conceiving or those wanting
373 advice on optimising health to conceive.
374
375
376 Clinician time
377 HPs report that one of the barriers to providing effective PCC is an insufficient
378 amount of consultation time[21, 22, 24, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35]. For example, in an
379 Australian cross-sectional study[21], the main reason for not discussing dietary
380 sources of iodine with women was insufficient time[21]. Time constraints were also
381 reported by MCaFHNs (n=192)[22], GPs (n=110)[24], pharmacists[35], and a
382 broader range of HPs (n=32)[32, 34], as the most frequently endorsed barrier to
383 promoting PCH. Several of the MCaFHNs (n=192) suggested that adding a scheduled
384 visit dedicated to interconception health advice to those who want it would be
385 helpful[22].
386

387 **The role of the patient**

388 Twelve studies reported findings related to the role of the patient[18, 23, 31, 34, 35,
389 37-39, 41, 42, 44].
390
391 Community education and health promotion
392 Four studies indicated that HPs would like to see an increase in public health
393 education that improves their patients' knowledge of PCH risk factors and the
394 benefits of PCC[18, 37, 44] and perceive the absence of such community awareness
395 as a barrier to PCC[34, 37]. Most (56%) obstetricians and gynaecologists (n=297)

396 believed that offering expanded carrier screening to their patients should be
397 restricted to those diseases important to the couple, and 52% believed that screening
398 should only occur when the clinical significance of each disease being screened for is
399 understood by the couple[18]. In a qualitative study from the Netherlands, HPs
400 (including midwives, GPs, obstetricians and gynaecologists, cardiologists and
401 gastroenterologists) (n=20) stated that barriers affecting the uptake and delivery of
402 PCC included their belief that most future parents lacked awareness of the benefits of
403 PCC[37]. These findings were similar to another qualitative study from India[34],
404 where healthcare workers (n=45) found that preconception was not viewed as a
405 critical phase in the woman's reproductive cycle, and women would rarely think of
406 eating a balanced diet before pregnancy.
407
408 Patient-led conversations
409 Despite believing that PCC is a part of their role, HPs also perceive that the onus of
410 responsibility to seek PCH information and PCC is shared with the patient and that
411 improved public education on PCH risks and health behaviours and the benefits of
412 PCC would support this to occur more frequently in the absence of 'routine' PCH risk
413 screening and PCH promotion[23, 29-31, 34, 38, 39, 41, 42]. For example, in an
414 Australian cross-sectional study[23], approximately half of GPs' (n=304) stated that
415 they discuss fertility with male patients 'opportunistically' when consulted about a
416 reproductive health matter when a 'patient specifically asks for advice' and when
417 consulting with a couple who 'plan to have children;' very few said that they raise the
418 subject with men 'routinely'[23]. In another cross-sectional study (n=152) from
419 Australia[30], 74% of nurses stated they discuss PCC in their practice, although only
420 13% do so 'routinely', and of these, more preconception discussions are held with
421 women than with men. These findings were similar to a qualitative study[41] from

422 the US where the frequency with which HPs (n=92) engaged in conversations about
423 reproductive goals ranged from a 'routine' component of each visit to 'episodically' or
424 only in response to patients' 'question' or 'request.' In a qualitative study from Africa,
425 all the HPs (n=20) felt that women also have a role in demanding PCC services and
426 seeking the services[39]. Conversely, in a cross-sectional study from Australia,
427 midwives (n=338)[29] with a registered nursing qualification were less likely to
428 agree that planning to conceive is a personal decision that should only be discussed
429 when initiated by the woman (OR 0.55; 95% CI 0.35, 0.87).
430

431 ## Discussion

432 Findings from this systematic review provide up-to-date insights into the areas that
433 provide opportunities to improve PCC delivery within healthcare settings based on
434 HP's beliefs and attitudes. These include professional and public health education to
435 increase PCH knowledge and awareness, clinical resources to support HPs providing
436 PCC, and HP referral networks to support effective PCC delivery to prospective
437 parents.
438
439 One of the main findings of this review is that, overall, HPs report low PCH literacy
440 yet would like to receive training, suggesting that they may benefit from PCH
441 education. Our findings add to those reported in previous systematic reviews (e.g.,
442 HPs wanting more training to improve confidence to provide PCC and lack in
443 knowledge of PCH is a barrier to PCC)[6, 7] indicating little has changed and the
444 PCH education needs of HPs remains to be addressed. There is a high variability of
445 the content and recommendations across existing PCC-CPGs and a need for
446 guidelines that are yet to address all clinical PCC areas[11]. Comprehensive PCC-
447 CPGs that address all evidence-based PCC areas are needed to assist HPs in

448 delivering PCC[11]. However, more than simply developing CPGs to manage the PCH
449 knowledge of HPs is required. As supported by this review's findings, clinicians often
450 lack awareness of existing guidelines. While some studies have investigated
451 interventions that support the knowledge of HPs and effect changes to practice
452 behaviour[45, 46], further research is needed. Training interventions would benefit
453 from nuanced consideration of the skills, knowledge, time, and funding for targeted
454 HP groups. PCH knowledge may also need to be tiered so foundational training can
455 be included in clinical degrees, with more advanced training available for qualified
456 clinicians. To tailor and co-develop such interventions to specific HPs, further
457 understanding of their knowledge gaps and their current and potential scope of
458 practice concerning PCC is needed.
459
460 In this review, some HPs reported believing that the onus of responsibility should be
461 with the patient to seek PCH information and PCC without routine PCH risk
462 screening and PCH promotion. This belief assumes patient awareness of PCH risk
463 factors and the benefits of PCC. With the current level of public health education and
464 understanding of PCH risk factors, this belief may need to be challenged. Similar
465 findings have been reported by HPs in previous systematic reviews (e.g., client's lack
466 of awareness of PCC, the benefits of PCC and initiation for PCC)[6, 7]. A focus on
467 public education of PCH is also needed to increase the public's PCH literacy.
468 Adherence to guidelines during preconception is an issue previously described in a
469 systematic review reporting on dietary guideline adherence during preconception
470 and pregnancy[47]. This review also highlighted the importance of acknowledging
471 the influence of demographic and social factors on guideline adherence[47].
472 Implementation interventions are needed that support knowledge translation and
473 changes to health behaviour through strategies that improve whole population health

474 through the life course (e.g., PCH school education) as well as targeted interventions
475 to those life course phases where becoming pregnant is more likely or possible (e.g.,
476 PCH information resources and support tools) or intended (e.g., PCH education and
477 counselling programmes)[48]. As such, Hall and colleagues' proposed model for PCC
478 integrates education, digital health interventions, campaigns and social media for
479 raising PCH awareness among HPs and the public and includes the individualised
480 and specialised provision of PCC by a range of HPs able to provide clinic-based
481 counselling, motivational interviewing, provision of supplements and
482 interconception interventions[5].
483
484 Some HPs report that the need for clinical PCH resources and time are persistent
485 barriers to providing effective PCC. HPs would like access to PCH information
486 resources to support them in delivering PCC. Specifically, HPs identified a range of
487 resources they would find helpful in clinics, from clinician checklists and clinician
488 websites to patient information factsheets and patient websites. Clinicians report
489 that lack of consultation time to provide effective PCC is a barrier, and, in some
490 instances, clinicians would like to be better funded for PCC by receiving third-party
491 reimbursement. Similar findings have been reported by HPs in previous systematic
492 reviews (e.g., a lack of clinical time for PCC and reimbursement for that time,
493 needing physical space or clinically relevant information such as PCC tools checklists
494 and PCC guidelines)[6, 7]. Clinical resources are available, providing organisations
495 and clinicians with information pertinent to implementing PCC programmes[10] and
496 PCC-CPGs (e.g., PCH risk screening checklist or tool and PCC intervention
497 guidelines)[9], yet high-quality guidelines on PCC are lacking[11]. Future focus is
498 needed on assessing the PCH behaviour outcomes associated with healthcare
499 services that implement PCC programmes and when clinicians can access clinically

500 relevant PCH information resources and PCC-CPGs informed by high-quality
501 evidence.
502
503
504 This review also found that many HPs believe they have a role in PCC. However, they
505 also attest that primary care HPs (primarily GPs) should be the leading providers.
506 There are two issues needing further consideration. First, a precedent exists for PCC
507 to be provided by a broader range of HPs, with the opportunity to improve referral
508 networks. Second, these HPs may be under the assumption that the patient's GP has
509 already provided PCC. These findings are barriers to delivering PCC and were
510 reported by HPs in previous systematic reviews (e.g., a lack of clarity regarding who
511 is responsible for providing PCC[6, 7] and poor communication between HPs)[7]. A
512 PCC model that supports collaboration between HPs and utilisation of all capable
513 HPs[49-51] provides an opportunity to deliver PCC that improves PCH outcomes
514 throughout the community, including at-risk populations and across the life
515 course[12]. Meaningful involvement of all key stakeholders is required to co-design
516 PCC healthcare services that support a coordinated healthcare workforce[50, 51].
517 Further research is needed to understand the outcomes of an integrated PCC
518 healthcare services delivery model on PCH risks, PCH behaviours and maternal and
519 child health outcomes[5].
520
521
522 Limitations
523 This review should be viewed within the context of its limitations. The authors
524 complied with an accepted review methodology[52], although only 10% of the data
525 extraction was verified by a second author. As the data being extracted was not
526 complex and there were no differences identified in the 10% of papers that were

527 checked, the impact of this difference is expected to be minimal. Although the studies
528 in this review represent a wide range of HPs from varied countries or regions, not all
529 HPs who may have a role in PCC were represented in the study populations. The
530 methodological quality of the qualitative studies was good. However, the quantitative
531 study quality was varied. The heterogeneous nature of the study aims and data
532 collection methods precluded the pooling of data for meta-analysis. We should also
533 acknowledge that three studies[19, 33, 37]were included in a previous review[7]. The
534 research question driving our study had a broader focus than the review by Goossens
535 and colleagues and identified an additional 24 papers; however, to avoid overlapping
536 between the two reviews, the findings of the three[19, 33, 37] articles were reported
537 only when other papers in our review shared similar results.

538 Conclusions

539 HPs report insufficient knowledge about PCH, lack PCH training, and want
540 education on PCH risks and interventions to improve their confidence in providing
541 PCC and enhanced access to clinical PCH information resources. One of the barriers
542 they experience to providing effective PCC is an insufficient amount of consultation
543 time. Most HPs believe it is their role to provide PCC, and referral networks could
544 improve the delivery of coordinated preconception interventions to identify and
545 support patients with preconception risks. HPs want increased public health
546 education that improves patient awareness of PCH risks and benefits of PCC. These
547 barriers and facilitators to the provision of PCC reported by HPs in studies
548 conducted in the past five years have remained very similar when compared to
549 previous reviews of earlier studies on the topic. To improve the provision of PCC
550 going forward, there is a need to co-develop professional and public PCH education,
551 PCC clinical resources, and an integrated PCC healthcare service model.

List of abbreviations

AXIS - Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies

CASP - Critical Appraisal Skills Programme

CPG – Clinical practice guideline

GP – General Practitioner

HP – Health professional

MCaFHN – Maternal child and family health nurses

PCC – Preconception Care

PCH – Preconception health

PROSPERO - Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews

UK – United Kingdom

US – United States

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].

Competing interests

The authors declare they have no competing interests.

Funding

The lead reviewer, CC, received an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship. DS is supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) through an NIHR Advanced Fellowship (NIHR302955) and the NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR203319). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. AS is supported by an Australian Research Council Future Fellowship (FT220100610). Funding sources have not had any role in conducting the systematic review.

Authors' contributions

CC designed the protocol, performed the searches, screening, quality appraisal, data extraction, and data analysis, and drafted, reviewed, and edited the manuscript. DS was the second reviewer for article screening at the title and abstract stage; AS was the second reviewer for article screening at the full-text stage, quality appraisal and data extraction; and AS, DS and EM reviewed and edited the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Supplementary File 1. Search Strategy

Supplementary File 2. Full-text articles excluded with reason

606
607
608 REFERENCES
609
610

611 1. Caut C, Schoenaker D, McIntyre E, Vilcins D, Gavine A, Steel A. Relationships
612 between Women's and Men's Modifiable Preconception Risks and Health Behaviors
613 and Maternal and Offspring Health Outcomes: An Umbrella Review. Semin Reprod
614 Med. 2022;40(03/04):170-83. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-1744257.
615 2. Daly M, Kipping RR, Tinner LE, Sanders J, White James W. Preconception
616 exposures and adverse pregnancy, birth and postpartum outcomes: Umbrella review
617 of systematic reviews. Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology. 2022;36(2):288-99.
618 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/ppe.12855.
619 3. Carter T, Schoenaker D, Adams J, Steel A. Paternal preconception modifiable risk
620 factors for adverse pregnancy and offspring outcomes: a review of contemporary
621 evidence from observational studies. BMC Public Health. 2023;23(1):509.
622 4. Christiansen C, Chandra-Mouli V, Ogbaselassie L, Willumsen J, Mason E. Meeting
623 to develop a global consensus on preconception care to reduce maternal and
624 childhood mortality and morbidity: World Health Organization Headquarters,
625 Geneva, 6–7 February 2012: meeting report. 2013.
626 5. Hall J, Chawla M, Watson D, Jacob CM, Schoenaker D, Connolly A, et al.
627 Addressing reproductive health needs across the life course: an integrated,
628 community-based model combining contraception and preconception care. The
629 Lancet Public Health. 2023;8(1):e76-e84. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-
630 2667(22)00254-7.
631 6. Steel A, Lucke J, Reid R, Adams J. A systematic review of women's and health
632 professional's attitudes and experience of preconception care service delivery. Family
633 Practice. 2016;33(6):588-95.
634 7. Goossens J, De Roose M, Van Hecke A, Goemaes R, Verhaeghe S, Beeckman D.
635 Barriers and facilitators to the provision of preconception care by healthcare
636 providers: a systematic review. International journal of nursing studies. 2018;87:113-
637 30.
638 8. Atrash H, Jack B. Preconception care to improve pregnancy outcomes: The
639 science. J Hum Growth Dev. 2020;30(3):334-41.
640 9. Atrash H, Jack B. Preconception care to improve pregnancy outcomes: clinical
641 practice guidelines. Journal of Human Growth and Development. 2020;30(3):407-
642 16.
643 10. Atrash H, Jack B. Preconception care: developing and implementing regional and
644 national programs. J Hum Growth Dev. 2020;30(3):363-71.
645 11. Dorney E, Boyle JA, Walker R, Hammarberg K, Musgrave L, Schoenaker D, et al.
646 A Systematic Review of Clinical Guidelines for Preconception Care. Semin Reprod
647 Med. 2022;40(03/04):157-69. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-1748190.
648 12. Boyle JA, Black K, Dorney E, Amor DJ, Brown L, Callander E, et al. Setting
649 Preconception Care Priorities in Australia Using a Delphi Technique. Semin Reprod
650 Med. 2022;40(03/04):214-26. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-1749683.
651 13. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al.
652 Updating guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA
653 2020 statement. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2021;134:103-12. doi:
654 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.02.003.
655 14. Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software. Melbourne,
656 Australia 2022.

15. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme: CASP Qualitative Checklist. https://casp-uk.net/images/checklist/documents/CASP-Qualitative-Studies-Checklist/CASP-Qualitative-Checklist-2018_fillable_form.pdf (2018). Accessed.
16. Downes MJ, Brennan ML, Williams HC, Dean RS. Development of a critical appraisal tool to assess the quality of cross-sectional studies (AXIS). BMJ Open. 2016;6(12):e011458. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011458.
17. Pope C, Ziebland S, Mays N. Analysing qualitative data. Bmj. 2000;320(7227):114-6.
18. Briggs A, Nouri PK, Galloway M, O'Leary K, Pereira N, Lindheim SR. Expanded carrier screening: a current survey of physician utilization and attitudes. J Assist Reprod Genet. 2018;35(9):1631-40. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10815-018-1272-8.
19. Fieldwick D, Smith A, Paterson H. General practitioners and preconception weight management in New Zealand. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2017;57(4):420-5. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajo.12609.
20. Ganganna A, Devishree G, Devishree G. Opinion of dentists and gynecologists on the link between oral health and preterm low birth weight: "Preconception care - treat beyond the box". Journal of the Indian Society of Pedodontics & Preventive Dentistry. 2017;35(1):47-50. doi: 10.4103/0970-4388.199231.
21. Guess K, Malek L, Anderson A, Makrides M, Zhou SJ. Knowledge and practices regarding iodine supplementation: A national survey of healthcare providers. Women Birth. 2017;30(1):e56-e60. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2016.08.007.
22. Hammarberg K, Taylor L. Survey of Maternal, Child and Family Health Nurses' attitudes and practice relating to preconception health promotion. Aust J Prim Health. 2019;25(1):43-8. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1071/PY18078.
23. Hogg K, Rizio T, Manocha R, McLachlan RI, Hammarberg K. Men's preconception health care in Australian general practice: GPs' knowledge, attitudes and behaviours. Aust J Prim Health. 2019;25(4):353-8. doi: 10.1071/py19069.
24. Kizirian NV, Black KI, Musgrave L, Hespe C, Gordon A. Understanding and provision of preconception care by general practitioners. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2019;59(6):799-804. doi: 10.1111/ajo.12962.
25. Manze MG, Calixte C, Romero DR, Roberts L, Perlman M, Langston A, et al. Physician perspectives on routine pregnancy intention screening and counseling in primary care. Contraception. 2020;101(2):91-6. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2019.11.004.
26. Mida LA, della Zazzera V, Fontaine-Bisson B. Knowledge, attitude and practice of physicians regarding periconceptional folic acid for women at low risk of a neural tube defect affected pregnancy. Preventive Medicine Reports. 2021;22 (no pagination). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2021.101327.
27. Ukoha WC, Dube M. Primary health care nursing students' knowledge of and attitude towards the provision of preconception care in KwaZulu-Natal. Afr. 2019;11(1):e1-e8. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.4102/phcfm.v11i1.1916.
28. Wang C, Luo S, Yang D, Yan J, Ding Y, Wang S, et al. Current practice and perspectives of healthcare providers regarding preconception care for women with type 1 diabetes in China. Diabetes Metab Res Rev. 2021;37(4):e3454. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dmrr.3454.
29. Bradfield Z, Leefhelm E, Soh SE, et al. The MidPIC study: Midwives' knowledge, perspectives and learning needs regarding preconception and interconception care. PLoS ONE. 2023;18(11).

30. Dorney E, Millard J, Hammarberg K, Griffin K, Gordon A, McGeechan K, et al. Australian primary health care nurses' knowledge, practice and attitudes relating to preconception care: learnings for service implementation. Aust J Prim Health. 2022;28(1):63-8. doi: 10.1071/PY21104.
31. Scheele J, Smith SM, Wahab RJ, Bais B, Steegers–Theunissen RPM, Gaillard R, et al. Current preconception care practice in the Netherlands — An evaluation study among birth care professionals. Midwifery. 2023;127:N.PAG-N.PAG. doi: 10.1016/j.midw.2023.103855.
32. Kurniawati W, Afiyanti Y, Prasetyo S, Achadi EL, Kumboyono K. The perspective of healthcare practitioners on preconception care at primary healthcare in Jakarta: A qualitative study. International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences. 2021;15 (no pagination). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2021.100351.
33. Poels M, Koster MP, Franx A, van Stel HF. Healthcare providers' views on the delivery of preconception care in a local community setting in the Netherlands. BMC Health Serv Res. 2017;17(1):92. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12913-017-2051-4.
34. Chutke AP, Doke PP, Gothankar JS, Pore PD, Palkar SH, Patil AV, et al. Perceptions of and challenges faced by primary healthcare workers about preconception services in rural India: A qualitative study using focus group discussion. Frontiers in public health. 2022;10:888708. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.888708.
35. Silverio SA, Karki P, Lakhani S, Alter M, Weinman J, Flynn AC. 'People still want a face and that's where we can fill in': a qualitative study of community pharmacists' experiences of providing healthcare advice about preconception and pregnancy. The International journal of pharmacy practice. 2023;31(1):38-45. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijpp/riac097.
36. Janssens S, Chokoshvili D, Vears DF, De Paepe A, Borry P. Pre- and post-testing counseling considerations for the provision of expanded carrier screening: exploration of European geneticists' views. BMC Med Ethics. 2017;18(1):46. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12910-017-0206-9.
37. M'Hamdi H I, van Voorst SF, Pinxten W, Hilhorst MT, Steegers EA. Barriers in the Uptake and Delivery of Preconception Care: Exploring the Views of Care Providers. Matern Child Health J. 2017;21(1):21-8. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10995-016-2089-7.
38. Molinaro ML, Evans M, Regnault TRH, de Vrijer B. Translating developmental origins of health and disease in practice: health care providers' perspectives. J Dev Orig Health Dis. 2021;12(3):404-10. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S2040174420000483.
39. Munthali M, Chiumia IK, Mandiwa C, Mwale S. Knowledge and perceptions of preconception care among health workers and women of reproductive age in Mzuzu City, Malawi: a cross-sectional study. Reprod Health. 2021;18(1):229. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12978-021-01282-w.
40. Ojifinni OO, Ibisomi L. Health care providers perceptions about preconception care in ibadan, southwest nigeria: A qualitative study. Maternal and Child Health Journal. 2022. doi: 10.1007/s10995-021-03305-1.
41. Simone J, Hoyt MJ, Storm DS, Finocchario-Kessler S. Models of HIV Preconception Care and Key Elements Influencing These Services: Findings from Healthcare Providers in Seven US Cities. AIDS Patient Care STDS. 2018;32(7):272-81. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1089/apc.2017.0299.
42. Nacev EC, Greene MZ, Taboada MP, Ehrenthal DB. Factors Influencing Provider Behavior Around Delivery of Preconception Care. Matern Child Health J. 2022;26(7):1567-75. doi: 10.1007/s10995-022-03411-8.

759 43. Devido JA, Doswell WM, Braxter BJ, et al. Experiences of Parish Nurses in
760 Providing Diabetes Education and Preconception Counseling to Women With
761 Diabetes. JOGNN: Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic and Neonatal Nursing.
762 2017;46(2):248-57.
763 44. Maas VYF, Poels M, Hölscher IM, van Vliet-Lachotzki EH, Franx A, Koster MPH.
764 How to improve preconception care in a local setting? Views from Dutch
765 multidisciplinary healthcare providers. Midwifery. 2022:103274. doi:
766 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2022.103274.
767 45. de Castro Nascimento N, Borges ALV, Fujimori E, Reis-Muleva B. Training in
768 preconception care focused on primary health care providers: Effects on
769 preconception care knowledge and provision. Heliyon. 2024;10(9).
770 46. Hauser KW, Lilly CM, Frías JL. Florida health care providers' knowledge of folic
771 acid for the prevention of neural tube defects. SOUTHERN MEDICAL JOURNAL-
772 BIRMINGHAM ALABAMA-. 2004;97:437-9.
773 47. Caut C, Leach M, Steel A. Dietary guideline adherence during preconception and
774 pregnancy: A systematic review. Maternal & Child Nutrition. 2020;16(2):e12916. doi:
775 https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12916.
776 48. Barker M, Dombrowski SU, Colbourn T, Fall CHD, Kriznik NM, Lawrence WT, et
777 al. Intervention strategies to improve nutrition and health behaviours before
778 conception. Lancet. 2018;391(10132):1853-64. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)30313-1.
779 49. Steel A, Schloss J, Leach M, Adams J. The naturopathic profession in Australia: A
780 secondary analysis of the Practitioner Research and Collaboration Initiative (PRACI).
781 Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice. 2020;40:101220. doi:
782 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctcp.2020.101220.
783 50. Walker R, Morris H, Lang S, Hampton K, Boyle J, Skouteris H. Co-designing
784 preconception and pregnancy care for healthy maternal lifestyles and obesity
785 prevention. Women and Birth. 2020;33(5):473-8. doi:
786 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2019.11.005.
787 51. Steel A. Creating a Vision for Family-Centered Health Services for the Five
788 'Trimesters': Co-Design Meeting Summary Report. University of Technology Sydney
789 2021.
790 52. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a
791 critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-
792 randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. bmj. 2017;358.
793


Identification of studies via databases and registers
Identification
Records identified from Databases (n=602) MEDLINE(OVID) (n=166); EMBASE(OVID) (n=253); MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE(OVID) (n=35); CINAHL(EBSCO) (n=119); PSYCHINFO(EBSCO) (n=29) Records identified from hand searches (n=2)
Records removed *before screening*: Duplicate records removed by human (n=223); by automation tool (n=5)
Screening
Records screened (n=376)
Records excluded by human (n=339)
Reports sought for retrieval (n=37)
Reports not retrieved (n=0)
Reports assessed for eligibility (n=37)
Reports excluded: (n=5) Not full text publication (e.g., conference abstract or poster) (n=2) Wrong outcomes (e.g., not beliefs and/or attitudes) (n=2) Wrong population (e.g., not health professional, not human) (n=1) Wrong exposure (e.g., does not include preconception care within scope of service)
Included
Studies included in review (n=27)