Mental Well-Being During Stages of COVID-19 Lockdown Among Pregnant Women And New Mothers

Gritt Overbeck (✉ grio@sund.ku.dk)

   University of Copenhagen

Ida Scheel Rasmussen

   University of Copenhagen

Volkert Siersma

   University of Copenhagen

Jakob Kragstrup

   University of Copenhagen

Ruth Kirk Ertmann

   University of Copenhagen

Philip Wilson

   University of Copenhagen

Abstract

Background: Pregnancy and early motherhood are sensitive times where epidemic disease outbreaks can affect mental health negatively. Countries and health care systems handled the pandemic and lockdowns differently and knowledge about how the COVID-19 pandemic affected the mental well-being of pregnant women and new mothers is limited and points in different directions.

Aim. to investigate symptoms of anxiety and depression in a population of pregnant women and new mothers in various stages of infection pressure and lock down during the first 15 months of the COVID-19 pandemic in Denmark.

Methods: The study population was nested an inception cohort of women recruited in their first trimester of pregnancy. Data about mental health of the woman was obtained in relation to pregnancy and child development (first trimester, 8 weeks postpartum and 5 months postpartum), and data were analysed cross-sectionally according to calendar time (periods defined by infection rate and lock-down during the COVID-19 epidemic).

Results: No differences in reported levels of depressive symptoms between the six examined time periods of the pandemic were observed. Specifically, symptoms remained unchanged after the first lock-down. No major changes in anxiety symptoms were observed in relation to increased infection pressure or lockdowns, but a small increase was observed during the second lockdown in women 8 weeks postpartum.

Conclusion: No clear change in mood among pregnant women was seen between during the stages of Covid-19 pandemic in Denmark.

Introduction

Pregnancy and early motherhood are sensitive times where epidemic disease outbreaks can affect mental health negatively (1, 2). A feeling of vulnerability may be caused by the risk of infection posed to the child and the mother, but also by an increased need for a well-functioning health care system in pregnancy, childbirth and the early life of the child. In the first months of the COVID19 pandemic, it was uncertain to what extent the infection would affect the unborn child and the pregnant woman's physical condition. At the same time the health care system underwent profound changes due to COVID19 infections, introducing rules about social distancing, and the needs for preventive procedures in health care and in society.

Knowledge about how the COVID-19 pandemic affected pregnant women and new mothers is still fragmented. A systematic review of mainly Chinese studies found slightly elevated anxiety levels (3). Similarly, we found minor changes in symptoms of depression and anxiety among Danish pregnant women in the early stage of the pandemic (4), whereas a cross-national study including data from Norway, Switzerland, Netherlands and UK found high levels of depressive symptoms and generalized

anxiety in pregnant and breastfeeding women during the COVID-19 outbreak (5). Differences between countries may exist but it is also important to consider the many changes in infection pressure and lockdowns during the first 15 months of the epidemic. To our knowledge the effects of the various stages of the pandemic have not been investigated.

We aimed to investigate symptoms of anxiety and depression in a population of pregnant women and new mothers in various stages of infection pressure and lock down during the first 15 months of the COVID-19 pandemic in Denmark.

Methods

Setting

In December 2019, news media reported a viral outbreak in Wuhan, China. In early 2020 the World Health Organisation (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic with 110,000 confirmed cases of virus infection in 110 countries. Subsequently governments all over world responded with lockdowns and other preventive measures.

In Denmark the epidemic got little publicity before March 2020. The government announced a first lockdown on the 11th of March. Schools and day-care centres were closed, and employees in the public sector and most of the private sector were sent home from work. Danish authorities encouraged social distancing from the start and set up rules for numbers meeting and travelling. Pregnant women were advised to follow the general recommendations, which in the spring 2020 and winter 2020-2021 involved social distancing. Pregnant women were also advised to follow recommendations for high risk patients which included talking to their employer about avoiding risk of infections at work. The National Board of Health recommended that pregnant women employed in the health and social sector were sent home in their third trimester (6). From July 2021 vaccination was recommended for all pregnant women in their second and third trimester (7). Pregnancy health consultations were considered as high priority health care and women were encouraged to take part in normal preventive care. Partners were still allowed to be present during the birth and while the mother and baby were in the hospital. As testing and PPE was introduced in summer 2020 women and their partners were also subject to these restrictions at the hospitals. A gradual re-opening began April 15th 2020, starting with day-care, schools and the private labour market. Infection rates declined during summer, but from the start of August 2020 hospital admissions for Covid-19 patients started to increase. Due to high admission rates a second lock-down was ordered on December 22nd. On March 1st 2021 a gradual reopening was started because of falling infection rates and increasing vaccination of the population. Based on these events, the time between October 2019 to June 2021 may be divided into 6 periods (Before first lockdown, First lockdown, First reopening, Rising incidence, Second lockdown, Second reopening). Each period represents specific risks and difficulties for pregnant women and young mothers (figure 1).

Design

Our study population was embedded in an inception cohort (women recruited in the beginning of pregnancy). Data about mental health of the woman was obtained in relation to pregnancy and child development (first trimester, 8 weeks postpartum and 5 months postpartum), and data were analysed cross-sectionally according to calendar time (periods defined by infection rate and lock-down during the COVID-19 epidemic). This design made it possible to observe changes in symptoms of anxiety and depression in pregnancy and the early motherhood as a function of events in the COVID-19 pandemic.

Participants

Pregnant women were recruited consecutively from October 2019 until June 2021 by their general practitioner (GP) at the first antenatal consultation (between 6 and 10 weeks gestation) Participants gave informed consent to take part in a cluster randomized trial designed to evaluate an online psycho-educational program designed for use by all pregnant women (clinicaltrials.gov registration number NCT04129359). No exclusion criteria were used, but knowledge of Danish language was necessary.

Data

After informed consent, electronic questionnaires were sent to the women in the first trimester, 8 weeks postpartum and 3 months postpartum. A secure electronic mail system (e-Boks) was used to approach participants about the survey, and questionnaires were completed and returned into the study database (REDCap) (8). Two reminders were sent in relation to each of the three questionnaires if they had not been received within two weeks. Answers received before June 1st. 2021 were included in the study. We also received a copy of the pregnancy health record from the GP by means of REDCap.

The level of depression and anxiety was assessed by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). HADS was developed for patients with somatic conditions (9), but it is often used as a self-rating scale to screen for anxiety and depression symptoms in the general population and across a range of patient groups. The instrument prioritises mental symptoms, rather than physical symptoms that can be confused with pregnancy-related symptoms or physical illness. The self-completed HADS contains 14 items in two subscales: anxiety (HADS-A) and depression (HADS-D), each with seven items. Each item is rated on a four-point scale from 0-3 (3 indicating maximum symptom severity), and the scores are summed (9). The scale has been translated into Danish and has proved to have high internal consistency in a large sample of Danish patients with cardiac disease (10). A 1.5 point change in HADS score has been considered clinically important (11). HADS was administered with the baseline questionnaire in the first trimester, again at eight weeks postpartum and a third time at five months postpartum.

We obtained information about the age of the women (≤25, 26-30, 31-35, >35 years) and cohabitation status (single/ living with partner) from the pregnancy health record provided by the GP. The electronic

patient questionnaire obtained in the first trimester contained information about occupational status (employed/ student/ unemployed/ sick leave/other) and whether other children were living at home (no/yes).

Statistical analysis

For each of the three assessments, the mean of the two HADS scales (anxiety and depression) were calculated in each of the six defined periods and plotted with corresponding 95% confidence intervals on a time line. In each of the graphs a moving average based on penalized B-splines was superimposed; the transparency proportional to the uncertainty. The means of the different periods were compared to the mean in period 5 in linear regression analyses adjusting for age, number of children in the household and employment status. Period 5 five was chosen because at that time responses from women in all three phases of motherhood were available and because it a priori could be expected to be the period of maximum stress (second lockdown).

Results

Table I shows the characteristics of the women in the study group at the three points in early motherhood where they answered the questionnaire. All questionnaires answered before July 1, 2021 were included for analysis. In average the response rate was 71.6%. Among 804 women, who received a questionnaire in first trimester, 669 (83%) answered, 222 women out of 343 (65%), who received it at 8 weeks postpartum and 170 of 254 (67%) returned the questionnaire at 5 months postpartum.

Table 2 shows the differences in HADS scores in the six time periods during 15 months of the pandemic.

The cohort comprised 804 women. Table 1 shows number of sent questionnaires, response rates and characteristics of the women who completed the HADS in first trimester (n=669), 8 weeks postpartum (n=222) and 5 months postpartum (n=170).

We found no statistically significant differences in reported levels of depressive symptoms between the six examined time periods of the pandemic. Specifically, symptoms remained unchanged before and after the first lock-down.

No major changes in anxiety symptoms were observed in relation to increased infection pressure (COVID-19 hospitalizations) or lockdowns, but a statistically significant small increase of 1.23 points was observed during the second lockdown (compared to the previous 6 months) in women 8 weeks postpartum.

No statistically significant differences in the response to infection pressure and lock down were found between the two arms of the randomized controlled trial.

Discussion

No significant differences were found in scores of anxiety and depression among the pregnant women before and after the onset of the pandemic and no major differences in scores were observed between the different stages of the pandemic among pregnant women and mothers of new-born. The only statistically significant change was an increase of 1.23 points (on a 28 point scale) in anxiety symptoms at 8 weeks postpartum during the second lockdown in the winter 2020/2021. Changes in HADS scores are considered clinically significant in individuals when they exceed 1.5 points (11), and we, therefore, consider the observed change in the population as minor.

We need, however, to consider a number of limitations, which may lead to underestimation of the effects of the various elements in the epidemic. First of all, the various stages in the pandemic were not sharply defined. The infection rate changed continuously, and some elements of lockdown came unrelated to the major events. This may have reduced the observed differences between the stages of the pandemic in our study, but cannot explain the lack of difference in scores before and after the onset of the pandemic. Secondly, sampling in our study may have favoured well educated and employed women. The participating GPs were asked to invite all women attending their first preventive pregnancy consultation, but it has previously been shown, that vulnerable women are likely to be underrepresented (12). A similar bias is, however, likely to exist for all surveys of pregnant women and young mothers.

Previous studies have shown varying effects of the epidemic on mental health and mood. Some have reported high levels of depressive symptoms and generalized anxiety in pregnant and breastfeeding women during the COVID-19 outbreak (5, 13–15), while others have shown no or milder effects (4, 16). National differences may be important. Denmark never faced a curfew such as that seen in some other countries and the health care system was never overwhelmed by patients with infection. The health care system, therefore, gave priority to preventive consultations and health care for pregnant women during the pandemic, and only small changes were made (e.g. increased use of internet consultations). Furthermore, since all pregnant women were considered at risk during the first 15 months of the pandemic they could stay at home without losing income. All women had paid maternity leave min. 6 weeks before expected date of birth and at least 24 weeks after birth. This together with the experience that health care system never broke down, because infection rate was manageable, might have served as protecting factors. Our findings might therefore not be replicated in societies with a larger sickness burden from COVID 19 or a less comprehensive welfare safety net. A systematic review of risk factors during the first year of COVID-19 found that financial strain and low education were key sociodemographic factors associated with increased depression and anxiety in perinatal women (17).

Conclusion

We could not demonstrate a clear change in mood among pregnant women between during the stages of Covid-19 pandemic in Denmark. Potential long term consequences of the pandemic and its severe societal impact should be monitored over the next year.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

All participants were recruited with written informed consent. The project was approved by the Research Ethics Committee at University of Copenhagen, Nov. 2019 (reference number: 504-0111/19-5000). All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

Contribution of Authorship

Conception (GO, JK, PW), planning (GO, JK, PW), carrying out (GO, VDS), analysing (GO, VDS, ISR, JK), writing up (GO, ISR, VDS, JK, RKE, PW). The author(s) read and approved the final manuscript

Acknowledgments

References

1. Hawryluck L, Gold WL, Robinson S, Pogorski S, Galea S, Styra R. SARS control and psychological effects of quarantine, Toronto, Canada. Emerg Infect Dis. 2004;10(7):1206–12.

2. Chrzan-Dętkoś M, Walczak-Kozłowska T, Lipowska M. The need for additional mental health support for women in the postpartum period in the times of epidemic crisis. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2021;21(1):114.

3. Hashim M, Coussa A, Al Dhaheri AS, Al Marzouqi A, Cheaib S, Salame A, et al. Impact of coronavirus 2019 on mental health and lifestyle adaptations of pregnant women in the United Arab Emirates: a cross-sectional study. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2021;21(1):515.

4. Overbeck G, Rasmussen IS, Siersma V, Andersen JH, Kragstrup J, Wilson P, et al. Depression and anxiety symptoms in pregnant women in Denmark during COVID-19. Scand J Public Health. 2021:14034948211013271.

5. Ceulemans M, Foulon V, Ngo E, Panchaud A, Winterfeld U, Pomar L, et al. Mental health status of pregnant and breastfeeding women during the COVID-19 pandemic—A multinational cross-sectional study. 2021;100(7):1219–29.

6. Sundhedsstyrelsen. Opdateret retningslinje: Hvordan skal medarbejdere i risikogrupper, som arbejder i sundheds-, social- og ældresektoren, håndteres? [Updated guidline: How should employees in high risk groups working in health-, social, and elderly sector be handles?]. 2020.

7. Sundhedsstyrelsen. Gravide og ammende [Pregnant and breastfeedng] 2021 [Available from: https://www.sst.dk/da/corona/vaccination/grupper-for-vaccination/gravide-og-ammende.

8. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)–a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform. 2009;42(2):377–81.

9. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica. 1983;67(6):361–70.

10. Christensen AV, Dixon JK, Juel K, Ekholm O, Rasmussen TB, Borregaard B, et al. Psychometric properties of the Danish Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale in patients with cardiac disease: results from the DenHeart survey. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2020;18(1):9.

11. Puhan MA, Frey M, Büchi S, Schünemann HJ. The minimal important difference of the hospital anxiety and depression scale in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2008;6:46.

12. Ertmann RK, Nicolaisdottir DR, Kragstrup J, Siersma V, Overbeck G, Wilson P, et al. Selection bias in general practice research: analysis in a cohort of pregnant Danish women. Scand J Prim Health Care. 2020;38(4):464–72.

13. Fukase Y, Ichikura K, Murase H, Tagaya H. Depression, risk factors, and coping strategies in the context of social dislocations resulting from the second wave of COVID-19 in Japan. BMC Psychiatry. 2021;21(1):33.

14. Ahmad M, Vismara L. The Psychological Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Women's Mental Health during Pregnancy: A Rapid Evidence Review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(13).

15. Yassa M, Yassa A, Yirmibes C, Birol P, Unlu UG, Tekin AB, et al. Anxiety levels and obsessive compulsion symptoms of pregnant women during the COVID-19 pandemic. Turk J Obstet Gynecol.

2020;17(3):155–60.

16. Wang Y, Chen L, Wu T, Shi H, Li Q, Jiang H, et al. Impact of Covid-19 in pregnancy on mother's psychological status and infant's neurobehavioral development: a longitudinal cohort study in China. BMC Med. 2020;18(1):347.

17. Iyengar U, Jaiprakash B, Haitsuka H, Kim S. One Year Into the Pandemic: A Systematic Review of Perinatal Mental Health Outcomes During COVID-19. Front Psychiatry. 2021;12:674194.

Tables

Table I shows the characteristics of the women in the study group at the three points in early motherhood where they answered the questionnaire.

	First trimester	Eight weeks postpartum	Five months postpartum
	(n=669)	(n=222)	(n=170)
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Period			
1	240 (35.9)		
2	60 (9.0)		
3	172 (25.7)	10 (4.5)	
4	101 (15.1)	108 (48.7)	31 (18.2)
5	71 (10.6)	56 (25.2)	85 (50.0)
6	25 (3.7)	48 (21.6)	54 (31.8)
Age			
≤25 years	40 (6.0)	8 (3.6)	5 (2.9)
26-30 years	208 (31.1)	72 (32.4)	52 (30.6)
31-35 years	259 (38.7)	95 (42.8)	71 (41.8)
>35 years	162 (24.2)	47 (21.2)	42 (24.7)
Number of children in the household	(1 missing)	(6 missing)	(6 missing)
No children	273 (40.9)	106 (49.1)	74 (45.1)
One child	305 (45.7)	88 (40.7)	73 (44.5)
Two or more children	90 (13.5)	22 (10.2)	17 (10.4)
Employment status	(2 missing)	(6 missing)	(7 missing)
Employed	546 (81.9)	172 (79.6)	129 (79.1)
Under education	59 (8.9)	23 (10.7)	16 (9.8)
Unemployed or sick leave	62 (9.3)	21 (9.7)	18 (11.0)

Table 2: Differences in HADS scores (anxiety and depression) between defined periods in the pandemic at three points in motherhood (first trimester of pregnancy, 8 weeks postpartum and 5 months postpartum).

		First trimester			Eight weeks postpartum			Five months postpartum		
		mean diff1 (95%CI)	p-value	p-value	mean diff1 (95%CI)	p-value	p-value	mean diff1 (95%CI)	p-value	p-value
HADS Anxiety				0.2046			0.1172			0.5175
	1	-0.79 (-1.66 ; 0.08)	0.0742							
	2	0.12 (-1.00 ; 1.24)	0.8334							
	3	-0.78 (-1.69 ; 0.12)	0.0900		-0.71 (-2.92 ; 1.50)	0.5294				
	4	-0.39 (-1.38 ; 0.60)	0.4411		-1.23 (-2.30 ; -0.15)	0.0251		-0.34 (-1.57 ; 0.90)	0.5955	
	5	(ref)			(ref)			(ref)		
	6	-0.14 (-1.65 ; 1.37)	0.8575		-0.22 (-1.55 ; 1.10)	0.7408		0.41 (-0.64 ; 1.45)	0.4457	
HADS Depression				0.7888			0.4883			0.5667
	1	-0.36 (-1.07 ; 0.35)	0.3224							
	2	-0.46 (-1.37 ; 0.45)	0.3183							
	3	-0.27 (-1.00 ; 0.47)	0.4804		-0.37 (-2.31 ; 1.57)	0.7103				
	4	-0.15 (-0.95 ; 0.67)	0.7154		-0.67 (-1.57 ; 0.23)	0.1441		-0.50 (-1.59 ; 0.58)	0.3637	
	5	(ref)			(ref)			(ref)		
	6	0.25 (-0.91 ; 1.45)	0.6852		-0.16 (-1.26 ; 0.94)	0.7749		0.09 (-0.82 ; 1.01)	0.8424	

1adjusted for age, work status and number of children in the household

Figures

Figure 1

Each period represents specific risks and difficulties for pregnant women and young mothers (figure 1).

Figure 2

a-f show anxiety and depression symptoms reported by the women at first trimester, 8 weeks postpartum and 5 months postpartum, in relation to COVID-19-hospital admissions during the observation period. The vertical lines in each figure illustrates each of the six stages in the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown.