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.

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 five 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 five years ago.

Methods

Five databases were searched between 27/01/2016 and 27/01/2022. 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-one studies were included (n=8 qualitative, n=11 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

Women's and men'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 27/01/2022 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 within a five-year limit up to 27/01/2022. 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. 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 by CC, with 10% of studies screened for reliability by DS. Full-text articles were downloaded and screened by CC, with 10% of studies screened for reliability by AS before final inclusion for review. Disagreements were discussed until a consensus was reached. A third reviewer (DS, AS or EM) was invited to adjudicate if unresolved. 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 extracted data from eligible studies into a customised form, with data from 10% of studies extracted 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. 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 394 articles. After removing duplicates, 237 titles and abstracts were screened (Figure 1). Thirty-one full-text articles were checked for eligibility; 21

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=21) were published in English between 2017 and 2022 (Table 1). Eleven studies[18-28] employed a cross-sectional study design and survey method for data collection. Eight qualitative studies were identified utilising focus groups (n=2)[29, 30] or interviews (n=6)[31-36]. Two studies[37, 38] collected data using mixed methods; Devido et al. [37] employed a focus group and survey, and Mass et al. [38] a survey and interactive workshop. The included studies were conducted in the United States (US; n=4)[18, 25, 36, 37]; Australia (n=4)[21-24], the Netherlands (n=3)[30, 32, 38]; and one study each in New Zealand[19], India[20], Europe[31], Indonesia[29], Canada[26], United Kingdom (UK)[33], Malawi[34], South Africa[27], Nigeria[35], and China[28]. A range of HPs were represented, including but not limited to nurses, midwives, general practitioners, obstetricians and gynaecologists. Sample size varied among the qualitative (n=16 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.

186 Most of the qualitative studies fulfilled all the CASP checklist[15] criteria for
187 assessing methodological quality. One study[34] needed to be more transparent on
188 the appropriateness of the recruitment strategy, consideration of researcher bias and
189 rigour of data analysis. The methodological quality of the quantitative studies was
190 varied[16]. Sample size justification, non-response bias and funding sources or
191 conflicts of interest were the most poorly reported criteria, followed by the use of
192 instruments or measurements that had been trialled, piloted, or published
193 previously.

194

195 **[Item Table 2. CASP Quality Assessment]**

196 **[Item Table 3. AXIS Quality Assessment]**

197

198 Results of syntheses

199 Three common thematic categories across the findings from the reviewed studies
200 were identified and defined: *addressing preconception care health literacy, clinical*
201 *practicalities of preconception care*, and *the role of the patient*.

202

203 **Addressing preconception care health literacy**

204 Seventeen studies reported findings related to addressing PCC health literacy[18-26,
205 28-31, 33, 34, 36, 37]. These studies addressed PCH knowledge, clinical training
206 needs and access to resources.

207

208 Preconception health knowledge gaps

209 Insufficient knowledge about PCH as a barrier to HPs' PCC practices was commonly
210 reported. For example, an Australian cross-sectional study of GPs (n=110) found
211 their lack of knowledge of PCC guidelines to be one of the most common barriers to

212 their delivery of PCC[24]; this view was shared by 40% of midwives in a second
213 Australian study[21] and a broader group of HPs from a UK qualitative study.[33]
214 The lack of knowledge as a barrier to PCC provision also applied to GPs (n=304) in
215 Australia providing care to men[23], of whom almost all respondents (90%)
216 indicated that they did not feel confident about their knowledge of the factors
217 affecting male fertility[23]. In contrast, a study[28] of HPs in China found that
218 26.9% of those providing care to women with type 1 diabetes felt they lacked the
219 knowledge to deliver PCC to this population. At the same time, a US study reported a
220 significant positive association between teaching self-efficacy and preconception
221 counselling knowledge among parish nurses (n=48) providing diabetes education to
222 women with diabetes[37]. Only one cross-sectional study sampling dentists and
223 gynaecologists (n=300) from India investigated clinician characteristics associated
224 with PCH knowledge[20]. It was found in logistic regression analyses that older age
225 doctors (Adjusted odds ratio [AOR]=1.055 (95% Confidence interval [CI]: 1.055-
226 1.092, p=0.002), the field of specialisation - dentists (AOR=1.635, 95% CI: 1.064-
227 2.511, p=0.002), and years of practicing experience > 5 years (AOR=2.254, 95% CI:
228 1.46-3.45, p=0.001) were significantly associated with higher knowledge levels of
229 periodontal health and adverse pregnancy outcomes[20].
230
231 Awareness of preconception risks and guidelines
232 HPs reported needing to be made aware of PCH risks and of existing CPGs designed
233 to assist them in screening for PCH risks and delivering PCH interventions[19-21, 23,
234 24, 26, 37]. This issue was highlighted in a study involving dentists and
235 gynaecologists (n=300), where only 79% were aware of the association between
236 periodontal health and preterm low birth weight[20]. In Australia, a study of GPs
237 (n=110) found that only 53% were aware of PCC-CPGs[24]. Even where HPs reported

238 being aware of guidelines, familiarity with the recommendations may pose another
239 barrier, as indicated in an Australian cross-sectional study where fewer HPs
240 (including GPs, obstetricians and gynaecologists, midwives and dietitians) were
241 aware of the recommended dose (38%) or duration (44%) of preconception iodine
242 supplementation[21]. This was despite 71% of those HPs being aware that the
243 National Health and Medical Research Council recommends this intervention[21]. In
244 this Australian study, awareness of the recommendation was positively associated
245 with recommending iodine supplements[21]. In contrast, in a cross-sectional study
246 of GPs (n=200) in New Zealand (NZ), most GPs reported being aware of the risks of
247 obesity in pregnancy, over 50% of these GPs reported practice that was inconsistent
248 with guidelines, and only 12% of these same GPs were aware of the New Zealand
249 Ministry of Health Guidance for Healthy Weight in Pregnancy[19]. A similar finding
250 was found in a Canadian cross-sectional study assessing periconceptional folic acid
251 recommendations of GPs (n=77), where only half knew the correct dose and duration
252 of folic acid for low-risk women[26].
253
254 The desire for further training
255 HPs reported wanting more information and education on PCH risks and
256 interventions[21-23, 30, 34] to improve their confidence in delivering PCC[22, 23].
257 For example, in a cross-sectional study of Australian health professionals (n=396),
258 HPs (including GPs, obstetricians and gynaecologists, midwives and dietitians)
259 indicated they would be interested in receiving new information relating to
260 iodine[21], and in another Australian cross-sectional study almost all maternal child
261 and family health nurses (MCaFHN) (n=192) agreed that more information and
262 formal education opportunities on the topic would increase their confidence to
263 discuss PCH[22]. A majority (54.6%) of Australian GPs (n=304) suggested that more

information and education about factors that affect male fertility would make them more confident to talk to male patients about fertility[23]. Some studies specifically identified lack of training as the barrier to providing PCC and an increased likelihood of HPs providing PCH information and PCC to their patients if they had received further training[18, 25, 28, 29, 31, 36]. For example, in a cross-sectional study from the US, 15% of GPs (n=443) reported they needed training before implementing PCC[25]. In another cross-sectional study from the US, obstetricians and gynaecologists (n=297) reported offering expanded carrier screening more commonly if they were fellowship-trained (80%) compared to those who were not (70%)[18].

Access to resources

Nine studies reported findings related to clinician access to resources supporting PCC delivery[21-24, 33, 36, 37]. The types of resources participants suggested include sample meal plans[21], screening guidelines, relevant research findings[21], online tools[22], factsheets, trustworthy websites[22, 23], waiting room posters[23], checklists, brochures[24], expert clinician champions, and medical record prompts[36]. Two other qualitative studies reported structural resource requirements such as PCC policy and procedures used to support them to implement PCC programs into clinical practice settings, as reported in a study of HPs (n=92) from the US[36] and a funding model through third-party reimbursement to improve the delivery of PCC as described by HPs (n=30) in a study from the Netherlands[30].

288 **Clinical practicalities of preconception care**

289 Fifteen studies reported findings related to the clinical practicalities of PCC[20-25,
290 27-30, 32, 34-36, 38].

291 Coordination of care

292 In some studies, HPs reported that a lack of interprofessional referral and care
293 coordination was a barrier to providing PCC[20, 28-30, 32, 36, 38]. One cross-
294 sectional study of dentists and gynaecologists (n=300) from India, for example,
295 found that gynaecologists rarely refer to dentists despite being aware of the link
296 between periodontal health and preterm low birth weight, and only 12% of
297 gynaecologists referred patients to the dentists in the preconception period.*[20]*
298 Several studies[20, 28-30] reported HPs describing a desire for an integrated, multi-
299 disciplinary approach to providing PCC services, greater coordination and referral
300 networks between HPs[30, 32, 36, 38] and emphasised the importance of patient
301 follow-up[36]. In a study from the Netherlands, HPs (n=299) suggested that while
302 the responsibility for providing PCC consultations is best suited to primary care,
303 many other HPs involved may act as referrers towards PCC[38].

304

305 Role responsibility

306 Most HPs in the included studies believed it to be part of their role to provide
307 preconception risk screening, PCH promotion and provision or referral for PCH
308 interventions. These include GPs[23, 24, 38], MCaFHNs[22], midwives[38],
309 nurses[27] and specialist physicians[35]. In a qualitative study from the Netherlands,
310 HPs (including midwives, obstetricians and gynaecologists, fertility specialists, GPs,
311 preventive child health care workers, maternity health care providers,
312 physiotherapists, pharmacists and dieticians) (n=30) expressed that the provision of

313 PCC is challenging due to unclear allocation of responsibilities[30]. Although HPs
314 (including midwives, nurses, obstetricians and gynaecologists and GPs)
315 acknowledged that the responsibility to provide PCC consultations lies with all
316 professions[34] in an Australian cross-sectional study, 84% of GPs (n=110) reported
317 that they should be the primary providers of PCC[24]. In a mixed-methods study
318 from the Netherlands, HPs (including nurses, midwives, GPs, physiotherapists,
319 preventive child healthcare professionals, dieticians, policy officers, maternity care
320 assistants, and gynaecologists) (n=299) suggested that the responsibility for
321 providing PCC consultations lies within primary care, mainly GPs (95.6%) and
322 midwives (94.4%)[38]. In this same study, HPs found it significantly more
323 challenging to start a conversation about a wish to conceive than midwives (26.8%
324 versus 20.2%, p=0.006)[38]; they felt less competent to provide preconception
325 information (32.3% versus 15.1%, p=<0.001)[38]. Similar findings were reported in a
326 cross-sectional study from the US (n=443), where most GPs (88%) felt pregnancy
327 intention screening should be routinely included in primary care[25]. In contrast, in
328 a qualitative study from Nigeria, HPs (including nurses and specialist physicians)
329 (n=26) stated that PCC services should be offered at all levels of health care with
330 referral when needed[35]. Specialist physicians from this Nigerian study also
331 identified the relevance of PCC to their practice, stating that those with chronic
332 diseases would benefit more[35].
333
334 Clinician time
335 HPs report that one of the barriers to providing effective PCC is an insufficient
336 amount of consultation time[21, 22, 24, 29]. For example, in an Australian cross-
337 sectional study[21], the main reason for not discussing dietary sources of iodine with
338 women was insufficient time[21]. Time constraints were also reported by MCaFHNs

339 (n=192)[22], GPs (n=110)[24] and a broader range of HPs (n=32)[29], as the most
340 frequently endorsed barrier to promoting PCH. Several of the MCaFHNs (n=192)
341 suggested that adding a scheduled visit dedicated to interconception health advice to
342 those who want it would be helpful[22].
343

344 **The role of the patient**

345 Seven studies reported findings related to the role of the patient[18, 23, 32-34, 36,
346 38].
347

348 Community education and health promotion

349 Three studies indicated that HPs would like to see an increase in public health
350 education that improves their patients' knowledge of PCH risk factors and the
351 benefits of PCC[18, 32, 38] and perceive the absence of such community awareness
352 as a barrier to PCC[32]. Most (56%) obstetricians and gynaecologists (n=297)
353 believed that offering expanded carrier screening to their patients should be
354 restricted to those diseases important to the couple, and 52% believed that screening
355 should only occur when the clinical significance of each disease being screened for is
356 understood by the couple[18]. In a qualitative study from the Netherlands, HPs
357 (including midwives, GPs, obstetricians and gynaecologists, cardiologists and
358 gastroenterologists) (n=20) stated that barriers affecting the uptake and delivery of
359 PCC included their belief that most future parents lacked awareness of the benefits of
360 PCC[32].
361

362 Patient-led conversations

363 Despite believing that PCC is a part of their role, HPs also perceive that the onus of
364 responsibility to seek PCH information and PCC is shared with the patient and that

365 improved public education on PCH risks and health behaviours and the benefits of
366 PCC would support this to occur more frequently in the absence of 'routine' PCH risk
367 screening and PCH promotion[23, 33, 34, 36]. For example, in an Australian cross-
368 sectional study[23], approximately half of GPs' (n=304) stated that they discuss
369 fertility with male patients 'opportunistically' when consulted about a reproductive
370 health matter when a 'patient specifically asks for advice' and when consulting with a
371 couple who 'plan to have children;' very few said that they raise the subject with men
372 'routinely'[23]. These findings were similar to a qualitative study[36] from the US
373 where the frequency with which HPs (n=92) engaged in conversations about
374 reproductive goals ranged from a 'routine' component of each visit to 'episodically' or
375 only in response to patients' 'question' or 'request.' In a qualitative study from Africa,
376 all the HPs (n=20) felt that women also have a role in demanding PCC services and
377 seeking the services[34].
378

379 # Discussion

380 Findings from this systematic review provide up-to-date insights into the areas that
381 provide opportunities to improve PCC delivery within healthcare settings based on
382 HP's beliefs and attitudes. These include professional and public health education to
383 increase PCH knowledge and awareness, clinical resources to support HPs providing
384 PCC, and HP referral networks to support effective PCC delivery to prospective
385 parents.
386
387 One of the main findings of this review is that, overall, HPs report low PCH literacy
388 yet would like to receive training, suggesting that they may benefit from PCH
389 education. Our findings add to those reported in previous systematic reviews (e.g.,
390 HPs wanting more training to improve confidence to provide PCC and lack in

391 knowledge of PCH is a barrier to PCC)[6, 7] indicating little has changed and the
392 PCH education needs of HPs remains to be addressed. There is a high variability of
393 the content and recommendations across existing PCC-CPGs and a need for
394 guidelines that are yet to address all clinical PCC areas[11]. Comprehensive PCC-
395 CPGs that address all evidence-based PCC areas are needed to assist HPs in
396 delivering PCC[11]. However, more than simply developing CPGs to manage the PCH
397 knowledge of HPs is required. As supported by this review's findings, clinicians often
398 lack awareness of existing guidelines. Interventions that support the knowledge of
399 HPs and effect changes to practice behaviour are needed. Training interventions
400 would benefit from nuanced consideration of the skills, knowledge, time, and
401 funding for targeted HP groups. PCH knowledge may also need to be tiered so
402 foundational training can be included in clinical degrees, with more advanced
403 training available for qualified clinicians. To tailor and co-develop such interventions
404 to specific HPs, further understanding of their knowledge gaps and their current and
405 potential scope of practice concerning PCC is needed.
406
407 In this review, some HPs reported believing that the onus of responsibility should be
408 with the patient to seek PCH information and PCC without routine PCH risk
409 screening and PCH promotion. This belief assumes patient awareness of PCH risk
410 factors and the benefits of PCC. With the current level of public health education and
411 understanding of PCH risk factors, this belief may need to be challenged. Similar
412 findings have been reported by HPs in previous systematic reviews (e.g., client's lack
413 of awareness of PCC, the benefits of PCC and initiation for PCC)[6, 7]. A focus on
414 public education of PCH is also needed to increase the public's PCH literacy.
415 Adherence to guidelines during preconception is an issue previously described in a
416 systematic review reporting on dietary guideline adherence during preconception

417 and pregnancy[39]. This review also highlighted the importance of acknowledging
418 the influence of demographic and social factors on guideline adherence[39].
419 Implementation interventions are needed that support knowledge translation and
420 changes to health behaviour through strategies that improve whole population health
421 through the life course (e.g., PCH school education) as well as targeted interventions
422 to those life course phases where becoming pregnant is more likely or possible (e.g.,
423 PCH information resources and support tools) or intended (e.g., PCH education and
424 counselling programmes)[40]. As such, Hall and colleagues' proposed model for PCC
425 integrates education, digital health interventions, campaigns and social media for
426 raising PCH awareness among HPs and the public and includes the individualised
427 and specialised provision of PCC by a range of HPs able to provide clinic-based
428 counselling, motivational interviewing, provision of supplements and
429 interconception interventions[5].
430
431 Some HPs report that the need for clinical PCH resources and time are persistent
432 barriers to providing effective PCC. HPs would like access to PCH information
433 resources to support them in delivering PCC. Specifically, HPs identified a range of
434 resources they would find helpful in clinics, from clinician checklists and clinician
435 websites to patient information factsheets and patient websites. Clinicians report
436 that lack of consultation time to provide effective PCC is a barrier, and, in some
437 instances, clinicians would like to be better funded for PCC by receiving third-party
438 reimbursement. Similar findings have been reported by HPs in previous systematic
439 reviews (e.g., a lack of clinical time for PCC and reimbursement for that time,
440 needing physical space or clinically relevant information such as PCC tools checklists
441 and PCC guidelines)[6, 7]. Clinical resources are available, providing organisations
442 and clinicians with information pertinent to implementing PCC programmes[10] and

443 PCC-CPGs (e.g., PCH risk screening checklist or tool and PCC intervention
444 guidelines)[9], yet high-quality guidelines on PCC are lacking[11]. Future focus is
445 needed on assessing the PCH behaviour outcomes associated with healthcare
446 services that implement PCC programmes and when clinicians can access clinically
447 relevant PCH information resources and PCC-CPGs informed by high-quality
448 evidence.
449
450
451 This review also found that many HPs believe they have a role in PCC. However, they
452 also attest that primary care HPs (primarily GPs) should be the leading providers.
453 There are two issues needing further consideration. First, a precedent exists for PCC
454 to be provided by a broader range of HPs, with the opportunity to improve referral
455 networks. Second, these HPs may be under the assumption that the patient's GP has
456 already provided PCC. These findings are barriers to delivering PCC and were
457 reported by HPs in previous systematic reviews (e.g., a lack of clarity regarding who
458 is responsible for providing PCC[6, 7] and poor communication between HPs)[7]. A
459 PCC model that supports collaboration between HPs and utilisation of all capable
460 HPs[41-43] provides an opportunity to deliver PCC that improves PCH outcomes
461 throughout the community, including at-risk populations and across the life
462 course[12]. Meaningful involvement of all key stakeholders is required to co-design
463 PCC healthcare services that support a coordinated healthcare workforce[42, 43].
464 Further research is needed to understand the outcomes of an integrated PCC
465 healthcare services delivery model on PCH risks, PCH behaviours and maternal and
466 child health outcomes[5].
467
468

469 Limitations

470 Although the studies in this review represent a wide range of HPs from varied
471 countries or regions, not all HPs who may have a role in PCC were represented in the
472 study populations. The methodological quality of the qualitative studies was good.
473 However, the quantitative study quality was varied. The heterogeneous nature of the
474 study aims and data collection methods precluded the pooling of data for meta-
475 analysis. We should also acknowledge that three studies[19, 30, 32]were included in
476 a previous review[7]. The research question driving our study had a broader focus
477 than the review by Goossens and colleagues and identified an additional 18 papers;
478 however, to avoid overlapping between the two reviews, the findings of the three[19,
479 30, 32] articles were reported only when other papers in our review shared similar
480 results.

481 Conclusions

482 HPs report insufficient knowledge about PCH, lack PCH training, and want
483 education on PCH risks and interventions to improve their confidence in providing
484 PCC and enhanced access to clinical PCH information resources. One of the barriers
485 they experience to providing effective PCC is an insufficient amount of consultation
486 time. Most HPs believe it is their role to provide PCC, and referral networks could
487 improve the delivery of coordinated preconception interventions to identify and
488 support patients with preconception risks. HPs want increased public health
489 education that improves patient awareness of PCH risks and benefits of PCC. These
490 barriers and facilitators to the provision of PCC reported by HPs in studies
491 conducted in the past five years have remained very similar when compared to
492 previous reviews of earlier studies on the topic. To improve the provision of PCC

493 going forward, there is a need to co-develop professional and public PCH education,
494 PCC clinical resources, and an integrated PCC healthcare service model.
495

496 List of abbreviations

497 AXIS - Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies
498 CASP - Critical Appraisal Skills Programme
499 CPG – Clinical practice guideline
500 GP – General Practitioner
501 HP – Health professional
502 MCaFHN – Maternal child and family health nurses
503 PCC – Preconception Care
504 PCH – Preconception health
505 PROSPERO - Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews
506 UK – United Kingdom
507 US – United States

508 Declarations

509 Ethics approval and consent to participate

510 Not applicable.

511 Consent for publication

512 Not applicable.

513 Availability of data and materials

514 All data generated during this study are included in this published article [and its
515 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

544 REFERENCES
545
546
547 1. Caut C, Schoenaker D, McIntyre E, Vilcins D, Gavine A, Steel A. Relationships
548 between Women's and Men's Modifiable Preconception Risks and Health Behaviors
549 and Maternal and Offspring Health Outcomes: An Umbrella Review. Semin Reprod
550 Med. 2022;40(03/04):170-83. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-1744257.
551 2. Daly M, Kipping RR, Tinner LE, Sanders J, White James W. Preconception
552 exposures and adverse pregnancy, birth and postpartum outcomes: Umbrella review
553 of systematic reviews. Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology. 2022;36(2):288-99.
554 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/ppe.12855.
555 3. Carter T, Schoenaker D, Adams J, Steel A. Paternal preconception modifiable risk
556 factors for adverse pregnancy and offspring outcomes: a review of contemporary
557 evidence from observational studies. BMC Public Health. 2023;23(1):509.
558 4. Christiansen C, Chandra-Mouli V, Ogbaselassie L, Willumsen J, Mason E. Meeting
559 to develop a global consensus on preconception care to reduce maternal and
560 childhood mortality and morbidity: World Health Organization Headquarters,
561 Geneva, 6–7 February 2012: meeting report. 2013.
562 5. Hall J, Chawla M, Watson D, Jacob CM, Schoenaker D, Connolly A, et al.
563 Addressing reproductive health needs across the life course: an integrated,
564 community-based model combining contraception and preconception care. The
565 Lancet Public Health. 2023;8(1):e76-e84. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-
566 2667(22)00254-7.
567 6. Steel A, Lucke J, Reid R, Adams J. A systematic review of women's and health
568 professional's attitudes and experience of preconception care service delivery. Family
569 Practice. 2016;33(6):588-95.
570 7. Goossens J, De Roose M, Van Hecke A, Goemaes R, Verhaeghe S, Beeckman D.
571 Barriers and facilitators to the provision of preconception care by healthcare
572 providers: a systematic review. International journal of nursing studies. 2018;87:113-
573 30.
574 8. Atrash H, Jack B. Preconception care to improve pregnancy outcomes: The
575 science. J Hum Growth Dev. 2020;30(3):334-41.
576 9. Atrash H, Jack B. Preconception care to improve pregnancy outcomes: clinical
577 practice guidelines. Journal of Human Growth and Development. 2020;30(3):407-
578 16.
579 10. Atrash H, Jack B. Preconception care: developing and implementing regional and
580 national programs. J Hum Growth Dev. 2020;30(3):363-71.
581 11. Dorney E, Boyle JA, Walker R, Hammarberg K, Musgrave L, Schoenaker D, et al.
582 A Systematic Review of Clinical Guidelines for Preconception Care. Semin Reprod
583 Med. 2022;40(03/04):157-69. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-1748190.
584 12. Boyle JA, Black K, Dorney E, Amor DJ, Brown L, Callander E, et al. Setting
585 Preconception Care Priorities in Australia Using a Delphi Technique. Semin Reprod
586 Med. 2022;40(03/04):214-26. doi: 10.1055/s-0042-1749683.
587 13. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al.
588 Updating guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA
589 2020 statement. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2021;134:103-12. doi:
590 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.02.003.
591 14. Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software. Melbourne,
592 Australia 2022.

593 15. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme: CASP Qualitative Checklist. https://casp-
594 uk.net/images/checklist/documents/CASP-Qualitative-Studies-Checklist/CASP-
595 Qualitative-Checklist-2018_fillable_form.pdf (2018). Accessed.
596 16. Downes MJ, Brennan ML, Williams HC, Dean RS. Development of a critical
597 appraisal tool to assess the quality of cross-sectional studies (AXIS). BMJ Open.
598 2016;6(12):e011458. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011458.
599 17. Pope C, Ziebland S, Mays N. Analysing qualitative data. Bmj.
600 2000;320(7227):114-6.
601 18. Briggs A, Nouri PK, Galloway M, O'Leary K, Pereira N, Lindheim SR. Expanded
602 carrier screening: a current survey of physician utilization and attitudes. J Assist
603 Reprod Genet. 2018;35(9):1631-40. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10815-018-
604 1272-8.
605 19. Fieldwick D, Smith A, Paterson H. General practitioners and preconception
606 weight management in New Zealand. Australian & New Zealand Journal of
607 Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2017;57(4):420-5. doi:
608 https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajo.12609.
609 20. Ganganna A, Devishree G, Devishree G. Opinion of dentists and gynecologists on
610 the link between oral health and preterm low birth weight: "Preconception care -
611 treat beyond the box". Journal of the Indian Society of Pedodontics & Preventive
612 Dentistry. 2017;35(1):47-50. doi: 10.4103/0970-4388.199231.
613 21. Guess K, Malek L, Anderson A, Makrides M, Zhou SJ. Knowledge and practices
614 regarding iodine supplementation: A national survey of healthcare providers.
615 Women Birth. 2017;30(1):e56-e60. doi:
616 https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2016.08.007.
617 22. Hammarberg K, Taylor L. Survey of Maternal, Child and Family Health Nurses'
618 attitudes and practice relating to preconception health promotion. Aust J Prim
619 Health. 2019;25(1):43-8. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1071/PY18078.
620 23. Hogg K, Rizio T, Manocha R, McLachlan RI, Hammarberg K. Men's
621 preconception health care in Australian general practice: GPs' knowledge, attitudes
622 and behaviours. Aust J Prim Health. 2019;25(4):353-8. doi: 10.1071/py19069.
623 24. Kizirian NV, Black KI, Musgrave L, Hespe C, Gordon A. Understanding and
624 provision of preconception care by general practitioners. Australian & New Zealand
625 Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2019;59(6):799-804. doi: 10.1111/ajo.12962.
626 25. Manze MG, Calixte C, Romero DR, Roberts L, Perlman M, Langston A, et al.
627 Physician perspectives on routine pregnancy intention screening and counseling in
628 primary care. Contraception. 2020;101(2):91-6. doi:
629 https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2019.11.004.
630 26. Mida LA, della Zazzera V, Fontaine-Bisson B. Knowledge, attitude and practice of
631 physicians regarding periconceptional folic acid for women at low risk of a neural
632 tube defect affected pregnancy. Preventive Medicine Reports. 2021;22 (no
633 pagination). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2021.101327.
634 27. Ukoha WC, Dube M. Primary health care nursing students' knowledge of and
635 attitude towards the provision of preconception care in KwaZulu-Natal. Afr.
636 2019;11(1):e1-e8. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.4102/phcfm.v11i1.1916.
637 28. Wang C, Luo S, Yang D, Yan J, Ding Y, Wang S, et al. Current practice and
638 perspectives of healthcare providers regarding preconception care for women with
639 type 1 diabetes in China. Diabetes Metab Res Rev. 2021;37(4):e3454. doi:
640 https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dmrr.3454.
641 29. Kurniawati W, Afiyanti Y, Prasetyo S, Achadi EL, Kumboyono K. The perspective
642 of healthcare practitioners on preconception care at primary healthcare in Jakarta: A

643 qualitative study. International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences. 2021;15 (no
644 pagination). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2021.100351.
645 30. Poels M, Koster MP, Franx A, van Stel HF. Healthcare providers' views on the
646 delivery of preconception care in a local community setting in the Netherlands. BMC
647 Health Serv Res. 2017;17(1):92. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12913-017-2051-4.
648 31. Janssens S, Chokoshvili D, Vears DF, De Paepe A, Borry P. Pre- and post-testing
649 counseling considerations for the provision of expanded carrier screening:
650 exploration of European geneticists' views. BMC Med Ethics. 2017;18(1):46. doi:
651 https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12910-017-0206-9.
652 32. M'Hamdi H I, van Voorst SF, Pinxten W, Hilhorst MT, Steegers EA. Barriers in
653 the Uptake and Delivery of Preconception Care: Exploring the Views of Care
654 Providers. Matern Child Health J. 2017;21(1):21-8. doi:
655 https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10995-016-2089-7.
656 33. Molinaro ML, Evans M, Regnault TRH, de Vrijer B. Translating developmental
657 origins of health and disease in practice: health care providers' perspectives. J Dev
658 Orig Health Dis. 2021;12(3):404-10. doi:
659 https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S2040174420000483.
660 34. Munthali M, Chiumia IK, Mandiwa C, Mwale S. Knowledge and perceptions of
661 preconception care among health workers and women of reproductive age in Mzuzu
662 City, Malawi: a cross-sectional study. Reprod Health. 2021;18(1):229. doi:
663 https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12978-021-01282-w.
664 35. Ojifinni OO, Ibisomi L. Health care providers perceptions about preconception
665 care in ibadan, southwest nigeria: A qualitative study. Maternal and Child Health
666 Journal. 2022. doi: 10.1007/s10995-021-03305-1.
667 36. Simone J, Hoyt MJ, Storm DS, Finocchario-Kessler S. Models of HIV
668 Preconception Care and Key Elements Influencing These Services: Findings from
669 Healthcare Providers in Seven US Cities. AIDS Patient Care STDS. 2018;32(7):272-
670 81. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1089/apc.2017.0299.
671 37. Devido JA, Doswell WM, Braxter BJ, et al. Experiences of Parish Nurses in
672 Providing Diabetes Education and Preconception Counseling to Women With
673 Diabetes. JOGNN: Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic and Neonatal Nursing.
674 2017;46(2):248-57.
675 38. Maas VYF, Poels M, Hölscher IM, van Vliet-Lachotzki EH, Franx A, Koster MPH.
676 How to improve preconception care in a local setting? Views from Dutch
677 multidisciplinary healthcare providers. Midwifery. 2022:103274. doi:
678 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2022.103274.
679 39. Caut C, Leach M, Steel A. Dietary guideline adherence during preconception and
680 pregnancy: A systematic review. Maternal & Child Nutrition. 2020;16(2):e12916. doi:
681 https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12916.
682 40. Barker M, Dombrowski SU, Colbourn T, Fall CHD, Kriznik NM, Lawrence WT, et
683 al. Intervention strategies to improve nutrition and health behaviours before
684 conception. Lancet. 2018;391(10132):1853-64. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)30313-1.
685 41. Steel A, Schloss J, Leach M, Adams J. The naturopathic profession in Australia: A
686 secondary analysis of the Practitioner Research and Collaboration Initiative (PRACI).
687 Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice. 2020;40:101220. doi:
688 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctcp.2020.101220.
689 42. Walker R, Morris H, Lang S, Hampton K, Boyle J, Skouteris H. Co-designing
690 preconception and pregnancy care for healthy maternal lifestyles and obesity
691 prevention. Women and Birth. 2020;33(5):473-8. doi:
692 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2019.11.005.

43. Steel A. Creating a Vision for Family-Centered Health Services for the Five 'Trimesters': Co-Design Meeting Summary Report. University of Technology Sydney 2021.


Identification of studies via databases and registers
Identification
Records identified from Databases (n=392) MEDLINE(OVID) (n=102); EMBASE(OVID) (n=156); MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE(OVID) (n=29); CINAHL(EBSCO) (n=76); PSYCHINFO(EBSCO) (n=29) Records identified from hand searches (n=2)
Records removed before screening: Duplicate records removed by human (n=154); by automation tool (n=3)
Screening
Records screened (n=237)
Records excluded by human (n=206)
Reports sought for retrieval (n=31)
Reports not retrieved (n=0)
Reports assessed for eligibility (n=31)
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=21)