

1 Article, Review

2 **Impact of COVID-19 related maternal stress on fetal brain development: A Multimodal MRI study**

3 **Vidya Rajagopalan^{1*}, William T. Reynolds², Jeremy Zepeda³, Jeraldine Lopez⁴, Skorn Ponrartana⁵, John Wood⁶,**
4 **Rafael Ceschin⁷ and Ashok Panigrahy⁸**

5 1 Department of Radiology Childrens Hospital Los Angeles, Keck School of Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles CA;
6 vragopalan@chla.usc.edu
7 2 Department of Biomedical Informatics University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15206, USA; William.reynolds@pitt.edu
8 3 Department of Radiology Childrens Hospital Los Angeles, Los Angeles CA ; jzepeda@chla.usc.edu
9 4 Neuropsychology Core, The Saban Research Institute, Childrens Hospital Los Angeles, jerlopez@chla.usc.edu
10 5 Department of Pediatric Radiology, Keck School of Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles CA sponrartana@chla.usc.edu
11 6 Departments of Radiology and Pediatrics, Childrens Hospital Los Angeles, Keck School of Medicine University of Southern California, Los
12 Angeles CA; jwood@chla.usc.edu
13 7 Department of Radiology, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA 15206; rafael.ceschin@pitt.edu
14 8 Department of Pediatric Radiology, Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh of UPMC, Pittsburgh, PA 15224, USA; ashok.panigrahy@chp.edu

15 * Correspondence: vragopalan@chla.usc.edu

16 **Abstract:**

17
18 Background: Disruptions in perinatal care and support due to the COVID-19 pandemic
19 was an unprecedented but significant stressor among pregnant women. Various
20 neurostructural differences have been re-ported among fetuses and infants born during
21 the pandemic compared to pre-pandemic counterparts. The relationship between ma-
22 ternal stress due to pandemic related disruptions and fetal brain is yet unexamined.

Citation: Lastname, F.; 23
Lastname, F.; Lastname, 24
F. Title. *J. Clin. Med.* 2022;25
11, x. 26
<https://doi.org/10.3390/xxx> 27
xxx 28

Academic Editor:

Firstname Lastname 29

Received: date 30

Accepted: date 31

Published: date 32

Publisher's Note: MDPI 33

stays neutral with regard 34
to jurisdictional claims in 35
published maps and insti- 36
tutional affiliations. 37



Copyright: © 2022 by the 39
authors. Submitted for 40
possible open access
publication under the
terms and conditions of 41

Methods: Pregnant participants with healthy pregnancies were prospectively recruited
in 2020-2022 in the greater Los Angeles Area. Participants completed multiple self-report
assessments for experiences of pandemic related disruptions, perceived stress, and cop-
ing behaviors and underwent fetal MRI. Maternal perceived stress exposures were cor-
related with quantitative multimodal MRI measures of fetal brain development using
multivariate models.

Results: Fetal brain stem volume increased with increased maternal perception of pan-
demic related stress positively correlated with normalized fetal brainstem volume (sug-
gesting accelerated brainstem maturation). In contrast, increased maternal perception of
pandemic related stress correlated with reduced global fetal brain temporal functional
variance (suggesting reduced functional connectivity).

Conclusions: We report alterations in fetal brainstem structure and global functional fetal
brain activity associated with increased maternal stress due to pandemic related disrup-
tions, suggesting altered fetal programming. Long term follow-up studies are required to
better understand the sequelae of these early multi-modal brain disruptions among in-
fants born during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords: fetal brain function, maternal stress, COVID-19 pandemic

1. Introduction

42 The COVID-19 pandemic created many, unprecedented disruptions to everyday life
43 particularly in 2020-2022 before vaccines were widespread. In addition to disruptions
44 around employment, childcare, housing, and nutrition, pregnant women also suffered
45 negative experiences related to support and care during pregnancy and childbirth. Social
46 isolation, reduced access to child and elder care, COVID-19 infection risk, and changes to
47 medical policies around pre and postpartum care were reported to be the most common
48 stressors among pregnant women [1,2]. Pregnant women are particularly vulnerable to
49 mood and anxiety related disorders [3] which are exacerbated during natural disasters or
50 stressful events [4,5]. Unsurprisingly, pregnant women indicated elevated levels of stress
51 during the COVID-19 pandemic [6]. In addition to health consequences for the mother,
52 increased maternal stress has an intergenerational impact on fetal development [7,8]. In-
53 creased maternal stress during pregnancy is known to alter the fetal brain and adversely
54 impact postnatal neurodevelopmental outcomes [9–12].

55 Studies of infants born during the COVID-19 pandemic have reported reduced cognitive,
56 motor, and emotional development compared to those born pre-pandemic [7,8], with
57 increased prenatal stress directly associated with adverse effect and temperament [13,14].
58 Simultaneously, changes to brain structure and function have also been reported in in-
59 fants born during the pandemic [15]. Lu et al.[16] reported volumetric reductions in the
60 brain among fetuses of women pregnant during the pandemic compared to a
61 pre-pandemic cohort. Their findings showed a negative relationship between general
62 ma-ternal stress and fetal brain volumes. However, their cohort did not show an increase
63 in maternal stress or anxiety during a pandemic, and they did not measure maternal
64 stress or anxiety specifically linked to the pandemic. Additionally, there is no data on if
65 or how emerging functional networks in the fetal brain, which are known to be sensitive
66 to ma-ternal stress, were impacted by pandemic related maternal stress. Early aberrations
67 to functional organization of the brain are well known to have deleterious downstream
68 ef-fects in brain and behavioral development. As such, a multimodal imaging study is im-
69 portant to better understand how prenatal maternal stress sets up the offspring's
70 brain for a trajectory of compounding aberrant development.

71 Understanding the impact of pandemic related maternal stress on fetal development
72 al-lows us to identify risk and resilience factors to mitigate maternal stress and conse-
73 quently minimize the intergenerational effect of pandemic related stress. Coping behav-
74 iors, in response to stressful events, are known to be modifiable targets to mitigate ma-
75 ternal stress and anxiety [17,18]. Given the extraordinary nature of pandemic related
76 stressors, there is little information on various coping behaviors that pregnant women
77 have adopted during the pandemic [19–21]. Despite its observational nature, information
78 on coping behaviors to pandemic related stressors allow clinical care teams to design and
79 implement support programs aimed at improving maternal mental health during preg-
80 nancy and child out-comes.

81 In this work, we investigated the impact of maternal stress due to pandemic related
82 dis-ruptions in pregnancy support and care on structural and functional development of
83 the human fetal brain. Our primary hypothesis is that increased maternal stress would
84 pre-dict quantitative alterations in structural and functional characteristics of the fetal
85 brain. Secondarily, we compared coping behaviors between pregnant women reporting
86 high vs low levels of pandemic related stress.

87 **2. Materials and Methods**

88 **2.1 Subject Demographics**

89 Pregnant mothers, living in the greater Los Angeles area were recruited using flyers, so-
90 cial media ads, and referrals from community partner clinics at Children's Hospital Los
91 Angeles (CHLA) from November 2020 – November 2021. Enrollment eligibility included

92 healthy, pregnant women between 18 – 45 years with singleton, uncomplicated preg-
93 nancies (confirmed by ultrasound) between 21 – 38 gestational weeks (GW). Exclusion
94 criteria were multiple gestation, fetal or genetic anomalies, congenital infection, and
95 maternal contraindication to MRI. Informed consent for the study was obtained under a
96 protocol approved by the Institutional Review Board at CHLA. Demographics, perinatal
97 health history, and self-assessment surveys of consented participants were gathered via
98 online survey within 24 hours prior to MRI.

99 2.2 Stress and Coping Behavioral Assessments

100 Participants were asked to complete the Coronavirus Perinatal Experiences - Impact
101 Survey[22] (COPE-IS). This is a self-assessment questionnaire, available in multiple
102 lan-guages, to assess feelings and experiences of pregnant women and new mothers in
103 rela-tion to disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Questions in this assessment
104 were adapted from multiple validated questionnaires such as the Brief Symptom Invent-
105 tory[23] PTSD checklist from DSM-5 [24], and the Johns Hopkins Mental Health Working
106 Group. In this study, we only included questions pertinent to the prenatal period. Per-
107 ceived maternal stress was computed as described here [21,22] and will be referred to as
108 COPE-Stress going forward. Participants also completed the Brief COPE question-
109 naire[25], which is an abbreviated form of the COPE (Coping Orientation to Problems
110 Exposed) questionnaire[26]. This is a self-assessment of a wide range of coping behaviors
111 including both maladaptive coping (includes substance use, venting, behavioral disen-
112 gagement, denial, self-blame, and self-distraction)[27] and adaptive coping (includes
113 humor, planning and seeking social support, use of emotional and instrumental support,
114 positive reframing, religion, and acceptance)[28,29]. This questionnaire has been vali-
115 dated in multiple languages and cultural contexts to be correlated to perceived stress and
116 mental well-being.

117 2.3 Child Opportunity Index (COI)

118 Neighborhood socio-economic environment (SEE) is a known modifier of overall
119 maternal stress during pregnancy[30], pandemic related stress[31], and offspring
120 out-comes[32]. Family income is often used to measure SEE. However, the quality of life
121 associated with absolute income number varies regionally based on cost of living, social
122 policies, environmental factors, etc. To overcome these limitations, we chose to represent
123 SEE using childhood opportunity index (COI). COI is a multi-dimensional, nationally
124 normed measure of the quality of social, environmental, health, and educational re-
125 sources available at each zip code[33]. We extracted maternal COI using self-reported zip
126 code at the time of the MRI visit and will be referred to as COI-SEE going forward.

127 2.4 Image Acquisition

128 Pregnant mothers were prospectively recruited between 24-38 GW and imaged on 3.0 T
129 Philips Achieva scanner (Netherlands). Multiplanar single-shot turbo spin echo imaging
130 was per-formed (TE = 160 ms, TR = 9000-12,000 ms, 3 mm slice thickness, no interslice
131 gap, 1 × 1 mm in plane resolution). Fetal brains were scanned in each of three planes for
132 three times resulting in nine images per subject and images were repeated if excessive
133 motion was present. Echo-planar imaging (EPI) BOLD images were also collected with
134 the following parameters: FOV = 300mm TR = 2000 ms, TE = 31-35 ms (set to shortest), flip
135 angle = 80o, with an in-plane resolution of 3x3 mm², slice thickness of 3.0 mm and 0.0
136 mm intra-slice gap. 150 timepoints were recorded for each BOLD image and two images
137 were collected for each subject.

138

139 2.5 Image Processing

140 2.5.1 Brain Structure

141 All structural brain images were verified as being typical for gestational age by a board
142 certified neuroradiologist (SP). For each subject, various 2D stacks of the T2 images were
143 visually assessed to identify and discard stacks with large, spontaneous fetal motion. In
144 each stack, the fetal brain was localized from surrounding tissue. For each subject, mul-
145 tiple 2D stacks were motion corrected and reconstructed, using a slice-to-volume recon-
146 struction [34] into a 3D volumetric T2 image with an isotropic resolution of 1 mm³. Re-
147 constructed fetal brains were processed through a bespoke, automated fetal segmenta-
148 tion pipeline. Each fetal brain was normalized (affine followed by non-rigid) to a proba-
149 bilistic atlas [35] of equivalent gestational age using Advanced Normalization tools[36].
150 Segmentations were manually inspected for accuracy and subjects with failed segmenta-
151 tions were discarded. The resulting segmentation maps were subsequently refined. To
152 ensure consistency across different gestational ages, transient structures only present in
153 the tissue atlas from 21 – 30 weeks of gestation such as the subplate, intermediate zone,
154 and ventricular zone were combined with the corpus colosum and labeled as developing
155 WM (WM). Cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) segmentation was refined as intra-ventricular
156 (within lateral ventricles) and extra-axial CSF. Due to the small size and relative difficulty
157 in segmenting the hippocampus and amygdala, both structures were combined into a
158 hippocampus-amygdala complex. Deep grey tissue was defined as the combination of
159 the caudate, putamen, thalamus, fornix, internal capsule, subthalamic nucleus, and hip-
160 pocampal commissure. Right and left hemispheric labels were combined into a single
161 volume for each structure. The final segmentation yielded volumes of the following
162 structures: cortical plate, developing white matter, intra-ventricular CSF, extra-axial CSF,
163 deep gray tis-sues, cerebellum, hippocampal-amygdala complex, and brainstem. A total
164 brain volume (TBV) was generated for each subject as the sum of all tissues.

165

166 2.5.2 Brain Function

167 BOLD imaging of the fetal brain is prone to spontaneous fetal motion which is
168 com-pounded by lower signal to noise ratio and spatial resolution. While modern motion
169 cor-rection algorithms effectively attenuate the effects of subject motion on the temporal
170 data, they are limited in effect beyond small degrees of motion. Any robust voxel-wise
171 approach to functional fetal imaging would yield a prohibitively low number of subjects
172 with usable data. We therefore chose to implement a whole-brain temporal signal ap-
173 proach to fetal functional imaging. Resting state images were first motion corrected using
174 FSL's MCFLIRT routine, using the first frame as the registration target, and a mean
175 framewise displacement threshold > 0.2 mm to eliminate frames with excessive motion.
176 As the intent of this study was to use minimally processed data using framewise
177 measures, as opposed to voxelwise measures, we made no prior assumptions on physi-
178 ological or nuisance frequency thresholds in fetal functional imaging, and did not apply
179 any bandpass filtering. A mean brain signal image was then generated by averaging
180 across every frame in the sequence. This mean signal image was used as the source image
181 for brain extraction to generate a brain mask. Brain extraction was done by using an
182 adaptive routine that iterated between using FSL's Brain Extraction Tool (BET)[37] and
183 AFNI's Skullstrip, using decreasingly smaller thresholds for brain tissue [38]. This ap-
184 proach yielded a good approximation of the fetal brain, with a minimal manual correc-
185 tion step required for final brain masking. The brain mask was then propagated across
186 each frame in the temporal sequence to extract only fetal brain voxels.

187 Using the mask generated above, we averaged the whole brain BOLD signal in each
188 frame and generated statistical measures across time. The measures generated were
189 temporal mean (average of the mean signal across frames), temporal variability (average
190 of the standard deviation of the signal across frames), variance of the mean (variance of
191 the mean signal in each frame), kurtosis of the mean (kurtosis of the mean signal in each
192 frame). Finally, to test for any signal or physiological drift, we calculated the autocorre-

193 lation of the mean signal in each frame, and the kurtosis and autocorrelation of the nor-
194 malized signal across frames.

195

196 2.6 Statistical Analysis

197 2.6.1 Brain Structure

198 Regression analysis was performed in Python (3.7) using the Statsmodel.api v0.13.2. We
199 used multiple, linear regression to model the relationship of COPE-Stress Score,
200 COI-SEE, and their interaction on TBV after adjusting for gestational age at MRI. Nested
201 models of the covariates without interaction were also tested. Models were deemed to be
202 significant if one or more of the covariates were statistically significant, and models
203 including the interaction term were only selected over the simpler counterpart if they
204 had a higher explained variance (R-squared) and/or lower Bayes' Information Criteria
205 (BIC). Using similar regression models, we individually tested the relationship of
206 COPE-Stress score and COI-SEE for each tissue volume listed in Section 2.4.1 (as a de-
207 pendent variable). Secondly, we also tested the relationship of COPE-Stress score and
208 COI-SEE on tissue volumes normalized by TBV after adjusting for gestational age.

209 2.6.2 Brain Function

210 Statistical analysis for brain functional metrics was similar to Section 2.5.1. A separate
211 regression model was tested for each, individual functional metric (Section 2.4.2) with
212 COPE Stress, COI-SEE, and their interaction as predictor variables after accounting for
213 GA at MRI.

214 2.6.3 Comparison of Coping Behaviors

215 Coping behaviors, both the Brief-COPE and COVID specific, were analyzed for differ-
216 ences between low and high stress mothers. Mothers were split into low, medium, and
217 high stress categories based on tertiles of COVID Stress scores. Using Fischer Exact test,
218 we compared if mothers reporting low and high stress used each coping behavior at sig-
219 nificantly different amounts.

220

221 3. Results

222 3.1 Subject Demographics

223 Pregnant mothers were recruited prospectively for this study with a total of 45 moth-
224 er-fetal dyads completed the MR imaging session. Three subjects had missing zip code
225 information, and which resulted in missing COI-SEE data and was thus excluded from
226 any analysis. After imaging, three subjects failed brain segmentation resulting in 39
227 sub-jects for structural regression results. A total of 43 subjects of the original 45 subjects
228 had analyzable BOLD imaging and were used for the functional regression results (Table
229 1).

230 3.2 Brain Structure

231 There were no significant associations between absolute volumes of the various brain
232 structures and perceived maternal stress, COI-SEE, or their interaction (Table 2). How-
233 ever, there was a significant positive association between normalized brain stem volume
234 and perceived maternal stress ($p = 0.03$) but not with COI-SEE and the interaction of
235 COI-SEE and maternal stress (Table 3) There were no significant associations between
236 normalized volumes of other structures with COPE-Stress or COI-SEE.

237 3.3 Brain Function

238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246

Lack of significant relationship between autocorrelation metrics and the predictor variable confirmed the absence of any systematic signal or physiological drifts. We found a significant negative relationship between temporal variability and COPE Stress ($p < 0.028$) (Table 4). The temporal variability model including the interaction term between Cope Stress Score and COI SES had a slightly improved R-squared (0.267) but lower BIC and reduced statistical significance of the covariates, likely due to co-linearity. We therefore report the original model without the interaction term. We found no other statistically significant relationships between fetal brain functional characteristics with COPE Stress or COI SEE.

247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258

3.4 Comparison of Coping Behaviors

We compared coping behaviors between participants reporting high and low stress in our cohort. Among general coping behaviors measured by Brief-COPE, humor (p -value = 0.025) and venting (p -value = 0.048) were used more commonly by participants reporting low stress compared to those reporting high stress (Figure 1). Among COVID specific coping behaviors that showed access to a mental health provider (p -value = 0.038), and information about how to reduce stress (p -value = 0.038) were chosen as being 'Very Important' to women reporting low stress at a high amount than in women reporting high stress (Figure 2). No other behaviors were found to be significantly different between high and low stress mothers. A full summary of the results can be seen in Figures 1 and 2.

259
260
261
262

3.5. Figures and Tables

Table 1. Study participant demographics including maternal parity and maternal race/ethnicity.

Characteristic	Total	
Total Participants	45	
Sex of fetus		
Female	18	
Male	20	
Unknown	7	
Total MRIs	45	
GA, median (range), wk		
At MRI	31.57	(22.57 to 38.42)
At Birth	39.14	(33 to 41.86)
Maternal age at MRI, median, yr	32	(18 to 43)
Maternal parity		
Primiparous	18	
Multiparous	22	
Unknown	5	
Infant Weight, median, kg	3.54	
Mother's race/ethnicity		
Caucasian	8	
Hispanic or Latino	28	
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	
African American	1	
Middle Eastern	0	
Other or unknown	1	

263
264

265

Table 2. Raw brain structure volumes relationship to COVID stress and COI-SEE

Volume (cm ³)	COVID Stress Score		COI Nationally Normed Value		COI Stress Interaction	
	β (CI)	P-Value	β (CI)	P-Value	β (CI)	P-Value
Brainstem	3.89E+00, (-7.62E+01, 8.40E+01)	0.97	-2.81E-01, (-1.41E+01, 1.35E+01)	0.99	4.06E-01, (-1.18E+00, 1.99E+00)	0.86
Cerebellum	1.54E+02, (-4.84E+01, 3.56E+02)	0.61	3.28E+01, (4.13E-01, 6.52E+01)	0.49	-1.95E+00, (-5.79E+00, 1.89E+00)	0.73
Cortical Plate	-7.33E+02, (-1.35E+03, -1.18E+02)	0.42	-3.78E+00, (-1.59E+02, 1.52E+02)	0.99	1.23E+01, (-1.43E+00, 2.60E+01)	0.55
Deep Grey	1.93E+01, (-1.83E+02, 2.22E+02)	0.95	2.76E+00, (-3.17E+01, 3.73E+01)	0.96	1.65E+00, (-2.28E+00, 5.58E+00)	0.78
Extra Axial CSF	-7.29E+02, (-1.74E+03, 2.81E+02)	0.63	-9.28E+01, (-3.06E+02, 1.21E+02)	0.77	1.76E+01, (-5.28E+00, 4.04E+01)	0.60
Hippocampus amygdala complex	-1.31E+00, (-2.72E+01, 2.46E+01)	0.97	-7.62E-01, (-6.21E+00, 4.69E+00)	0.92	2.17E-01, (-3.33E-01, 7.68E-01)	0.79
Intra ventricular CSF	2.59E+01, (-7.98E+01, 1.32E+02)	0.87	1.23E+01, (-1.15E+01, 3.60E+01)	0.73	-5.07E-01, (-2.81E+00, 1.79E+00)	0.88
White Matter	-5.17E+02, (-1.69E+03, 6.58E+02)	0.77	-8.47E+01, (-2.99E+02, 1.30E+02)	0.79	1.19E+01, (-1.25E+01, 3.63E+01)	0.74
Total Brain Volume	-2.51E+03, (-6.81E+03, 1.80E+03)	0.69	-2.27E+02, (-1.05E+03, 5.96E+02)	0.85	5.92E+01, (-3.03E+01, 1.49E+02)	0.66

266

267

Table 3. Brain structure volumes', after normalization to total brain volume, relationship to COVID stress, COI-SEE, and their interaction

268

269

Volume normalized by Total brain volume	Covid Stress		Overall COI by zip code		Covid Stress and COI interaction	
	β (CI)	P-Value	β (CI)	P-Value	β (CI)	P-Value
Brainstem	1.30E-04, (9.00E-05, 1.70E-04)	0.03*	1.00E-05, (0.00E+00,	0.65	0.00E+00, (0.00E+00,	0.31

			2.00E-05)		0.00E+00)	
Cerebellum	3.40E-04, (1.50E-04, 5.40E-04)	0.24	7.00E-05, (4.00E-05, 1.10E-04)	0.12	-1.00E-05, (-1.00E-05, 0.00E+00)	0.26
Cortical Plate	-1.42E-03, (-2.10E-03, -7.40E-04)	0.16	-1.00E-05, (-2.20E-04, 2.00E-04)	0.97	1.00E-05, (-1.00E-05, 3.00E-05)	0.64
Deep Grey	1.90E-04, (3.00E-05, 3.60E-04)	0.42	2.00E-05, (-3.00E-05, 6.00E-05)	0.82	0.00E+00, (0.00E+00, 1.00E-05)	0.90
Extra Axial CSF	1.10E-04, (-7.00E-05, 2.80E-04)	0.68	-5.00E-05, (-1.20E-04, 2.00E-05)	0.61	0.00E+00, (0.00E+00, 1.00E-05)	0.60
Hippocampus amygdala complex	4.00E-05, (2.00E-05, 6.00E-05)	0.22	0.00E+00, (-1.00E-05, 1.00E-05)	0.94	0.00E+00, (0.00E+00, 0.00E+00)	0.99
Intra ventricular CSF	1.20E-04, (-4.00E-05, 2.80E-04)	0.61	5.00E-05, (-1.00E-05, 1.00E-04)	0.55	0.00E+00, (-1.00E-05, 0.00E+00)	0.64
White Matter	3.80E-04, (-1.60E-04, 9.20E-04)	0.63	-3.00E-05, (-1.80E-04, 1.20E-04)	0.89	-1.00E-05, (-3.00E-05, 0.00E+00)	0.62

270


271

272

Table 4. Brain functional metrics' relationship to COVID stress and COI-SEE using linear modeling.


	Covid Stress		Overall COI by zip code	
	β (CI)	P-Value	β (CI)	P-Value
Temporal mean of BOLD Signal	135.369, (-509.52, 38.1)	0.09	316.9634, (-604.97, 1238.9)	0.49
Temporal variability of BOLD Signal	-113.94, (-215.18, -12.71)	0.03*	-19.5173, (-360.388, 321.354)	0.91
Variance of framewise mean BOLD signal	-5336.81, (-2.87e+04, 1.81e+04)	0.65	-5191.57, (-8.4e+04, 7.36e+04)	0.9
Kurtosis of framewise mean BOLD signal	0.329, (-0.144, 0.802)	0.17	0.457, (-1.135, 2.049)	0.57
Autocorrelation of framewise mean BOLD	-6.828e+06, (-1.41e+07, 4.89e+05)	0.07	1.005e+07, (-1.46e+07, 3.47e+07)	0.41

273



274

275 Figure 1. Comparison of general coping behaviors grouped by usage and analyzed for differences in incidence using a
 276 Fischer Exact Test.



277
278 Figure 2. Analysis of COVID specific coping behaviors grouped by usage and analyzed for differences in incidence
279 using a Fischer Exact Test.

280

281

4. Discussion

282

Our findings show that perceived maternal stress, in the setting of COVID-19 related care disruptions, impacts with structural and functional developmental of the fetal brain. Higher maternal stress was associated with increased brainstem volume (suggesting accelerated brainstem maturation) and globally decreased temporal variability of function (suggesting reduced functional connectivity) in the fetal brain. Additionally, we also found differences in the prevalence of specific coping behaviors between pregnant women who reported high stress compared to those who reported low stress.

289

We found that increased levels of maternal stress correlated with increased normalized brainstem volume suggesting relatively increased acceleration of brainstem maturation relative to cortical/supratentorial cerebral regions. Importantly, these results are consistent with prior studies that have correlated prenatal maternal stress and neonatal brainstem auditory evoked potentials (the speed at which the brainstem auditory evoked potential is conducted through the auditory nerve serves as a proxy for greater neural maturation)[39,40]. These studies have found significant relations between higher maternal prenatal distress and faster conductance, suggesting that greater maternal prenatal stress is associated with accelerated subcortical/brainstem neural maturation in neonates [41]. Our results are also consistent with the recent study by De Asis-Cruz et al. [42] which found that altered functional connectivity between brainstem and sensorimotor regionals were associated with high maternal anxiety scores.

300

301

302 We found that higher perceived maternal stress was associated with lower temporal
303 variability in the fetal brain suggesting aberrations to foundational characteristics of
304 con-nectivity and organization of emerging brain networks[43]. It has been
305 well-established that such perturbations to early brain connectivity architecture, during
306 the critical fetal period, has long-standing effects on behavioral and psychiatric devel-
307 opment among these children[44–46]. Our findings of altered brain connectivity agree
308 with previous findings of altered brain connectivity in infants of mothers who reported
309 higher stress during the pandemic[15]. Behavioral and functional deficits particularly in
310 the motor, cognitive and temperamental domain have been widely reported in various
311 studies investigating the impact of maternal stress during the pandemic on child out-
312 comes [7,8,13,14]. Increased maternal stress and anxiety traits (outside the setting of the
313 pandemic) have been shown to alter functional architecture of the fetal brain[47]. Collec-
314 tively, our and prior findings suggest that in utero alterations to brain architecture, asso-
315 ciated with maternal stress during the pandemic, could underlie developmental deficits
316 reported in these children. Further meta studies are needed to investigate the trajectory of
317 brain development in children conceived and born during the pandemic.

318 Our findings suggest key differences in coping behaviors between pregnant women who
319 reported low and high stress. Increased use of adaptive coping behaviors (particularly
320 humor and venting) was more common among pregnant women who reported lower
321 stress compared to those who reported higher stress. This association between in-creased
322 use of adaptive, active coping and lower stress perception was reported across multiple
323 studies of mental health in peripartum women during COVID-19 pandemic [21,48,49].
324 Our findings are also in agreement with generalized findings of positive relationship
325 between active coping behaviors and improved mental well-being in pregnant wom-
326 en[50]. In questions regarding COVID-19 specific coping behaviors, pregnant moth-ers
327 reporting low stress endorsed access to mental health information and providers as being
328 key to wellness. Routine screening for prenatal stress, provision of stress manage-ment
329 information, and improved access to prenatal mental health care provide potential ave-
330 nues for improving mental health and associated outcomes in pregnant women
331 re-gardless of pandemic conditions.

332 This study's limitations include small sample size and recruitment limited to a single
333 geographical area in the USA during the pandemic. Since the greater Los Angeles area
334 was disproportionately affected by pandemic related disruptions, comparison to a mul-
335 ti-site cohort will provide greater statistical power thereby increasing the generalizability
336 of our findings. The cross-sectional nature of prenatal stress assessment limits our ability
337 to associate time-varying stress levels and fetal outcomes. But all participating women
338 became pregnant after pandemic-related restrictions were put in place. Lack of a
339 pre-pandemic cohort limits our ability to pin-point if the differences in coping behaviors
340 between pregnant women reporting low and high stress are specific adaptations to stress
341 experienced during the pandemic.

342 **5. Conclusions**

343 Here, we reported the first multi-modal study of the impact of COVID-19 pandemic re-
344 lated maternal stress on fetal brain development. Our findings showed that increased
345 maternal stress due to pandemic related disruptions was associated with structural and
346 functional disruptions to fetal brain development and is suggestive of altered fetal
347 pro-gramming. Comparing coping behaviors between pregnant women reporting higher
348 and lower stress, our study provides insight into potential avenues for improved stress
349 management and mental health outcomes among pregnant women.

350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400

6. Patents

This section is not mandatory but may be added if there are patents resulting from the work reported in this manuscript.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, VR, RC, and WR; methodology, VR, RC, and WR; validation, RC, SP, and WR.; resources, VR; data curation, VR, JZ, and JL; writing—original draft preparation, VR, RC, WR, and JZ; writing—review and editing, VR, WR, JZ, JW, RC, SP, JW and AP; visualization, VR, RC, WR and JZ.; supervision, AP and VR; funding acquisition, VR, AP. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This work was funded NIH/NHLBI K01HL153942 and the Saban Research Institute Research Career Development Award to VR. Funding for WR was provided by the National Library of Medicine T15 Training program grant; award number 2T15LM007059-36. AP reported receiving grants from the Department of Defense (W81XWH-16-1-0613), the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (R01 HL152740-1, R01 HL128818-05), and Additional Ventures.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Institutional Review Board (or Ethics Committee) of Childrens Hospital Los Angeles (protocol code CHLA-17-00292 and 9/14/2017).

Informed Consent Statement: Any research article describing a study involving humans Written informed consent to include deidentified data has been obtained from the patient(s) to publish this paper

Data Availability Statement: Due to limitations of informed consent, data from the study cannot be shared. But Methodologies and techniques from the study will be made available via direct email to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: We would like to acknowledge all the women and families who participated in the study during an unprecedented global pandemic. We would like to thank Rosa Rangel, Teddy Aguilar, and Veronica Gonzalez for their help with the study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

References


1. Zhou, J.; Havens, K.L.; Starnes, C.P.; Pickering, T.A.; Brito, N.H.; Hendrix, C.L.; Thomason, M.E.; Vatalaro, T.C.; Smith, B.A. Changes in Social Support of Pregnant and Postnatal Mothers during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Mid-wifery* 2021, 103, 103162, doi:10.1016/J.MIDW.2021.103162.
2. Barbosa-Leiker, C.; Smith, C.L.; Crespi, E.J.; Brooks, O.; Burduli, E.; Ranjo, S.; Carty, C.L.; Hebert, L.E.; Waters, S.F.; Gartstein, M.A. Stressors, Coping, and Resources Needed during the COVID-19 Pandemic in a Sample of Peri-natal Women. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2021, 21, 1–13, doi:10.1186/S12884-021-03665-0/TABLES/4.
3. Shorey, S.; Chee, C.Y.I.; Ng, E.D.; Chan, Y.H.; Tam, W.W.S.; Chong, Y.S. Prevalence and Incidence of Postpartum Depression among Healthy Mothers: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Psychiatr Res* 2018, 104, 235–248, doi:10.1016/J.JPSYCHIRES.2018.08.001.
4. King, S.; Dancause, K.; Turcotte-Tremblay, A.M.; Veru, F.; Laplante, D.P. Using Natural Disasters to Study the Effects of Prenatal Maternal Stress on Child Health and Development. *Birth Defects Res C Embryo Today* 2012, 96, 273–288, doi:10.1002/BDRC.21026.
5. Salm Ward, T.; Kanu, F.A.; Robb, S.W. Prevalence of Stressful Life Events during Pregnancy and Its Association with Postpartum Depressive Symptoms. *Arch Womens Ment Health* 2017, 20, 161–171, doi:10.1007/S00737-016-0689-2.

6. Motrico, E.; Domínguez-Salas, S.; Rodríguez-Domínguez, C.; Gómez-Gómez, I.; Rodríguez-Muñoz, M.F.; Gómez-Baya, D. The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Perinatal Depression and Anxiety: A Large Cross-Sectional Study in Spain. *Psicothema* 2022, 34, 200–208, doi:10.7334/PSICOTHEMA2021.380.
7. Bianco, C.; Sania, A.; Kyle, M.H.; Beebe, B.; Barbosa, J.; Bence, M.; Coskun, L.; Fields, A.; Firestein, M.R.; Goldman, S.; et al. Pandemic beyond the Virus: Maternal COVID-Related Postnatal Stress Is Associated with Infant Temperament. *Pediatric Research* 2022, 1–7, doi:10.1038/s41390-022-02071-2.
8. Shuffrey, L.C.; Firestein, M.R.; Kyle, M.H.; Fields, A.; Alcántara, C.; Amso, D.; Austin, J.; Bain, J.M.; Barbosa, J.; Bence, M.; et al. Association of Birth During the COVID-19 Pandemic With Neurodevelopmental Status at 6 Months in Infants With and Without In Utero Exposure to Maternal SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA Pediatr* 2022, 176, e215563–e215563, doi:10.1001/JAMAPEDIATRICS.2021.5563.
9. Schuurmans, C.; Kurrasch, D.M. Neurodevelopmental Consequences of Maternal Distress: What Do We Really Know? *Clin Genet* 2013, 83, 108–117, doi:10.1111/CGE.12049.
10. Talge, N.M.; Neal, C.; Glover, V. Antenatal Maternal Stress and Long-Term Effects on Child Neurodevelopment: How and Why? *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2007, 48, 245–261, doi:10.1111/J.1469-7610.2006.01714.X.
11. Wu, Y.; Lu, Y.C.; Jacobs, M.; Pradhan, S.; Kapse, K.; Zhao, L.; Niforatos-Andescavage, N.; Vezina, G.; du Plessis, A.J.; Limperopoulos, C. Association of Prenatal Maternal Psychological Distress With Fetal Brain Growth, Metabolism, and Cortical Maturation. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020, 3, e1919940–e1919940, doi:10.1001/JAMANETWORKOPEN.2019.19940.
12. van den Heuvel, M.I.; Hect, J.L.; Smarr, B.L.; Qawasmeh, T.; Kriegsfeld, L.J.; Barcelona, J.; Hijazi, K.E.; Thomason, M.E. Maternal Stress during Pregnancy Alters Fetal Cortico-Cerebellar Connectivity in Utero and Increases Child Sleep Problems after Birth. *Scientific Reports* 2021, 11, 1–12, doi:10.1038/s41598-021-81681-y.
13. Griffin, M.; Ghassabian, A.; Majbri, A.; Brubaker, S.G.; Thomason, M. Evaluating the Association Between Maternal Peripartum Care Interruptions and Infant Affect: A Longitudinal Study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2022, 226, S310, doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2021.11.521.
14. Provenzi, L.; Grumi, S.; Altieri, L.; Bensi, G.; Bertazzoli, E.; Biasucci, G.; Cavallini, A.; Decembrino, L.; Falcone, R.; Freddi, A.; et al. Prenatal Maternal Stress during the COVID-19 Pandemic and Infant Regulatory Capacity at 3 Months: A Longitudinal Study. *Dev Psychopathol* 2021, 1–9, doi:10.1017/S0954579421000766.
15. Manning, K.Y.; Long, X.; Watts, D.; Tomfohr-Madsen, L.; Giesbrecht, G.F.; Lebel, C. Prenatal Maternal Distress During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Associations With Infant Brain Connectivity. *Biol Psychiatry* 2022, doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2022.05.011.
16. Lu, Y.-C.; Andescavage, N.; Wu, Y.; Kapse, K.; Andersen, N.R.; Quistorff, J.; Saeed, H.; Lopez, C.; Henderson, D.; Barnett, S.D.; et al. Maternal Psychological Distress during the COVID-19 Pandemic and Structural Changes of the Human Fetal Brain Plain Language Summary., doi:10.1038/s43856-022-00111-w.
17. Varescon, I.; Leignel, S.; Poulain, X.; Gerard, C. Coping Strategies and Perceived Stress in Pregnant Smokers Seeking Help for Cessation. *J Smok Cessat* 2011, 6, 126–132, doi:10.1375/JSC.6.2.126.
18. Razurel, C.; Kaiser, B.; Sellenet, C.; Epiney, M. Relation between Perceived Stress, Social Support, and Coping Strategies and Maternal Well-Being: A Review of the Literature. *Women Health* 2013, 53, 74–99, doi:10.1080/03630242.2012.732681.
19. Rimal, S.P.; Thapa, K.; Shrestha, R. Psychological Distress and Coping among Pregnant Women during the COVID 19 Pandemic. *J Nepal Health Res Counc* 2022, 20, 234–240, doi:10.33314/JNHRC.V20I01.4063.
20. Kinser, P.A.; Jallo, N.; Amstadter, A.B.; Thacker, L.R.; Jones, E.; Moyer, S.; Rider, A.; Karjane, N.; Salisbury, A.L. Depression, Anxiety, Resilience, and Coping: The Experience of Pregnant and New Mothers during the First Few Months of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Womens Health* 2021, 30, 654–664, doi:10.1089/JWH.2020.8866/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/JWH.2020.8866_FIGURE1.JPEG.
21. Werchan, D.M.; Hendrix, C.L.; Ablow, J.C.; Amstadter, A.B.; Austin, A.C.; Babineau, V.; Anne Bogat, G.; Cioffredi, L.A.; Conradt, E.; Crowell, S.E.; et al. Behavioral Coping Phenotypes and Associated Psychosocial Outcomes of Pregnant and Postpartum Women during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Scientific Reports* 2022, 12, 1–12, doi:10.1038/s41598-022-05299-4.
22. Thomason, M.; Graham, A.; Sullivan, E.; Heuvel, M.I. van den COVID-19 and Perinatal Experiences Study Available online: <https://osf.io/uqhcv/> (accessed on 28 August 2022).
23. Brief Symptom Inventory - PsycNET Available online: <https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2F00789-000> (accessed on 16 September 2022).
24. Blevins, C.A.; Weathers, F.W.; Davis, M.T.; Witte, T.K.; Domino, J.L. The Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5): Development and Initial Psychometric Evaluation. *J Trauma Stress* 2015, 28, 489–498, doi:10.1002/JTS.22059.

- 456 25. Carver, C.S. You Want to Measure Coping but Your Protocol's Too Long: Consider the Brief COPE. *Int J Behav*
457 *Med* 1997, 4, 92–100, doi:10.1207/S15327558IJBM0401_6.
- 458 26. Carver, C.S.; Scheier, M.F.; Weintraub, J.K. Assessing Coping Strategies: A Theoretically Based Approach. *J Pers*
459 *Soc Psychol* 1989, 56, 267–283, doi:10.1037//0022-3514.56.2.267.
- 460 27. Connor-Smith, J.K.; Flachsbart, C. Relations between Personality and Coping: A Meta-Analysis. *J Pers Soc Psychol*
461 2007, 93, 1080–1107, doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.6.1080.
- 462 28. García, F.E.; Barraza-Peña, C.G.; Wlodarczyk, A.; Alvear-Carrasco, M.; Reyes-Reyes, A. Psychometric Properties of
463 the Brief-COPE for the Evaluation of Coping Strategies in the Chilean Population. *Psicologia: Reflexao e Critica*
464 2018, 31, 1–11, doi:10.1186/S41155-018-0102-3/TABLES/7.
- 465 29. Carver, C.S.; Scheier, M.F.; Weintraub, J.K. Assessing Coping Strategies: A Theoretically Based Approach. *J Pers*
466 *Soc Psychol* 1989, 56, 267–283, doi:10.1037//0022-3514.56.2.267.
- 467 30. Lefmann, T.; Combs-Orme, T. Prenatal Stress, Poverty, and Child Outcomes. *Child and Adolescent Social Work*
468 *Journal* 2014 31:6 2014, 31, 577–590, doi:10.1007/S10560-014-0340-X.
- 469 31. Silverman, M.E.; Medeiros, C.; Burgos, L. Early Pregnancy Mood before and during COVID-19 Community
470 Re-strictions among Women of Low Socioeconomic Status in New York City: A Preliminary Study. *Arch Womens*
471 *Ment Health* 2020, 23, 779, doi:10.1007/S00737-020-01061-9.
- 472 32. Sandel, M.; Faugno, E.; Mingo, A.; Cannon, J.; Byrd, K.; Garcia, D.A.; Collier, S.; McClure, E.; Jarrett, R.B.
473 Neigh-borhood-Level Interventions to Improve Childhood Opportunity and Lift Children Out of Poverty. *Acad*
474 *Pediatr* 2016, 16, S128–S135, doi:10.1016/J.ACAP.2016.01.013.
- 475 33. Acevedo-Garcia, D.; McArdle, N.; Hardy, E.F.; Crisan, U.I.; Romano, B.; Norris, D.; Baek, M.; Reece, J. The Child
476 Opportunity Index: Improving Collaboration between Community Development and Public Health. *Health Aff*
477 2014, 33, 1948–1957, doi:10.1377/HLTHAFF.2014.0679/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/2014.0679FIGEX5.JPEG.
- 478 34. Ebner, M.; Wang, G.; Li, W.; Aertsen, M.; Patel, P.A.; Aughwane, R.; Melbourne, A.; Doel, T.; Dymarkowski, S.; de
479 Coppi, P.; et al. An Automated Framework for Localization, Segmentation and Super-Resolution Reconstruction
480 of Fetal Brain MRI. *Neuroimage* 2020, 206, 116324, doi:10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2019.116324.
- 481 35. Gholipour, A.; Rollins, C.K.; Velasco-Annis, C.; Oualam, A.; Akhondi-Asl, A.; Afacan, O.; Ortinau, C.M.; Clancy,
482 S.; Limperopoulos, C.; Yang, E.; et al. A Normative Spatiotemporal MRI Atlas of the Fetal Brain for Automatic
483 Segmentation and Analysis of Early Brain Growth. *Scientific Reports* 2017 7:1 2017, 7, 1–13,
484 doi:10.1038/s41598-017-00525-w.
- 485 36. Avants, B.B.; Tustison, N.J.; Song, G.; Cook, P.A.; Klein, A.; Gee, J.C. A Reproducible Evaluation of ANTs
486 Similarity Metric Performance in Brain Image Registration. *Neuroimage* 2011, 54, 2033–2044,
487 doi:10.1016/J.NEUROIMAGE.2010.09.025.
- 488 37. Smith, S.M. Fast Robust Automated Brain Extraction. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2002, 17, 143–155, doi:10.1002/HBM.10062.
- 489 38. Cox, R.W. AFNI: Software for Analysis and Visualization of Functional Magnetic Resonance Neuroimages.
490 *Computers and Biomedical Research* 1996, 29, 162–173, doi:10.1006/cbmr.1996.0014.
- 491 39. Amin, S.B.; Orlando, M.S.; Dalzell, L.E.; Merle, K.S.; Guillet, R. Morphological Changes in Serial Auditory Brain
492 Stem Responses in 24 to 32 Weeks' Gestational Age Infants during the First Week of Life. *Ear Hear* 1999, 20,
493 410–418, doi:10.1097/00003446-199910000-00004.
- 494 40. Jiang, Z.D.; Xiu, X.; Brosi, D.M.; Shao, X.M.; Wilkinson, A.R. Sub-Optimal Function of the Auditory Brainstem in
495 Term Infants with Transient Low Apgar Scores. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2007, 5, 1088–1096,
496 doi:10.1016/J.CLINPH.2007.01.018.
- 497 41. DiPietro, J.A.; Kivlighan, K.T.; Costigan, K.A.; Rubin, S.E.; Shiffler, D.E.; Henderson, J.L.; Pillion, J.P. Prenatal
498 Antecedents of Newborn Neurological Maturation. *Child Dev* 2010, 81, 115–130,
499 doi:10.1111/J.1467-8624.2009.01384.X.
- 500 42. de Asis-Cruz, J.; Krishnamurthy, D.; Zhao, L.; Kapse, K.; Vezina, G.; Andescavage, N.; Quistorff, J.; Lopez, C.;
501 Limperopoulos, C. Association of Prenatal Maternal Anxiety With Fetal Regional Brain Connectivity. *JAMA Netw*
502 *Open* 2020, 3, e2022349–e2022349, doi:10.1001/JAMANETWORKOPEN.2020.22349.
- 503 43. Garrett, D.D.; Kovacevic, N.; McIntosh, A.R.; Grady, C.L. The Importance of Being Variable. *J Neurosci* 2011, 31,
504 4496–4503, doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5641-10.2011.
- 505 44. Rogers, C.E.; Lean, R.E.; Wheelock, M.D.; Smyser, C.D. Aberrant Structural and Functional Connectivity and
506 Neurodevelopmental Impairment in Preterm Children. *J Neurodev Disord* 2018, 10,
507 doi:10.1186/S11689-018-9253-X.
- 508 45. Evans, T.M.; Kochalka, J.; Ngoon, T.J.; Wu, S.S.; Qin, S.; Battista, C.; Menon, V. Brain Structural Integrity and
509 Intrinsic Functional Connectivity Forecast 6 Year Longitudinal Growth in Children's Numerical Abilities. *J*
510 *Neuro-sci* 2015, 35, 11743–11750, doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0216-15.2015.


- 511 46. Barch, D.M.; Belden, A.C.; Tillman, R.; Whalen, D.; Luby, J.L. Early Childhood Adverse Experiences, Inferior
512 Frontal Gyrus Connectivity, and the Trajectory of Externalizing Psychopathology. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc*
513 *Psychiatry* 2018, 57, 183–190, doi:10.1016/J.JAAC.2017.12.011.
- 514 47. Thomason, M.E.; Hect, J.L.; Waller, R.; Curtin, P. Interactive Relations between Maternal Prenatal Stress, Fetal
515 Brain Connectivity, and Gestational Age at Delivery. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2021 46:10 2021, 46, 1839–1847,
516 doi:10.1038/s41386-021-01066-7.
- 517 48. Han, L.; Bai, H.; Lun, B.; Li, Y.; Wang, Y.; Ni, Q. The Prevalence of Fear of Childbirth and Its Association With
518 In-tolerance of Uncertainty and Coping Styles Among Pregnant Chinese Women During the COVID-19 Pandemic.
519 *Front Psychiatry* 2022, 13, doi:10.3389/FPSYT.2022.935760.
- 520 49. Anderson, M.R.; Salisbury, A.L.; Uebelacker, L.A.; Abrantes, A.M.; Battle, C.L. Stress, Coping and Silver Linings:
521 How Depressed Perinatal Women Experienced the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Affect Disord* 2022, 298, 329–336,
522 doi:10.1016/J.JAD.2021.10.116.
- 523 50. Giurgescu, C.; Penckofer, S.; Maurer, M.C.; Bryant, F.B. Impact of Uncertainty, Social Support, and Prenatal
524 Cop-ing on the Psychological Well-Being of High-Risk Pregnant Women. *Nurs Res* 2006, 55, 356–365,
525 doi:10.1097/00006199-200609000-00008.

Brief Cope Coping Behaviors Percentages within Different Categories of Covid Stress




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.26.22281575>; this version posted October 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.


Acceptance




Active Coping



Behavioral Disengagement




Denial




Humor*


Not Doing: P-value = 0.025, Little Amount: P-value = 0.025




Planning




Positive Reframing




Religion




Self-Blame



Self Distraction




Use Of Emotional Support




Venting*

Medium Amount: P-value = 0.048




COVID Specific Coping Behaviors Percentages within Different Categories of Covid Stress




Access To A Mental Health Provider*


Very Important: P-value = 0.038



Examples Of How Other Women Are Planning For Potential Changes In Their Pregnancy Birth And Postpartum Care




Help With Planning For Potential Changes In My Pregnancy Birth Plan And Postpartum Care




Information About How To Reduce Stress*


Very Important: P-value = 0.038




Interaction With Other Pregnant People



More One-On-One Conversations With My Prenatal Care Provider



Online Support Groups



Rapid Response To Questions And Concerns

