

1 **Quality of Care at childbirth during the COVID-19 pandemic: findings of the IMAGiNE EURO study in**  
2 **Belgium**

3

4

5 Anna Galle<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Silke D'Hauwers<sup>2</sup>, Helga Berghman<sup>1,2</sup>, Nele Vaerewijck<sup>1</sup>, Emanuelle Pessa Valente<sup>3</sup>, Ilaria  
6 Mariani<sup>3</sup>, Arianna Bomben<sup>3</sup>, Stefano delle Vedove<sup>3</sup>, Marza Lazzerini<sup>3,4</sup>, the IMAGiNE EURO Study Group

7 1. International Centre for Reproductive Health, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Ghent  
8 University, Ghent, Belgium. +324943430

9 Email: [anna.galle@ugent.be](mailto:anna.galle@ugent.be)

10 \*Corresponding author

11 2. Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University  
12 Centre for Nursing and Midwifery, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

13 3. WHO Collaborating Centre for Maternal and Child Health, Institute for Maternal and Child Health  
14 IRCCS Burlo Garofolo, Trieste, Italy

15 4. Maternal Adolescent Reproductive and Child Health Care Centre, London School of Hygiene &  
16 Tropical Medicine London UK

17

18

19

20

21

22 Word count full text: 4605

23 Word count abstract: 300

24 Number of references: 49

25 Keywords: Quality of Care, Women Care, Newborn Care, Childbirth, Midwifery, COVID 19

26

27

28 Objectives

29 To examine quality of maternal and newborn care (QMNC) around childbirth in facilities in Belgium during the  
30 COVID-19 pandemic and trends over time.

31 Design

32 A cross-sectional observational study.

33 Setting

34 Data of the IMAGiNE EURO study in Belgium.

35 Participants

36 Women giving birth in a Belgian facility from March 1, 2020, to May 1, 2023, responded a validated online  
37 questionnaire based on 40 WHO standards-based quality measures organised in four domains: provision of  
38 care, experience of care, availability of resources, and organizational changes related to COVID-19.

39 Primary and secondary outcome measures

40 Quantile regression analysis was performed to assess predictors of QMNC; trends over time were tested  
41 with the Mann-Kendall test.

42 Results

43 897 women were included in the analysis, 67%(n=601) with spontaneous vaginal birth, 13.3%(n=119) with  
44 instrumental vaginal birth and 19.7%(n=177) with cesarean section. We found high QMNC scores but also  
45 specific gaps in all domains of QMNC. On provision of care, 21.0%(n=166) of women who experienced  
46 labor and 14.7%(n=26) of women with a cesarean reported inadequate pain relief; 64.7%(n=74) of women  
47 with an instrumental birth reported fundal pressure and 72.3% (n=86) reported that forceps or vacuum cup  
48 was used without their consent. On experience of care, 31.1%(n=279) reported unclear communication,  
49 32.9%(n=295) reported that they were not involved in choices, 11.5%(n=104) stated not being treated with  
50 dignity and 8.1%(n=73) experienced abuse. Related to resources, almost half of the women reported an  
51 inadequate number of healthcare professionals (46.2%, n=414). The multivariable analyses showed  
52 significantly lower QMNC scores for women with an instrumental vaginal birth. Over time there was a  
53 significant increase in QMNC score for 'experience of care' and 'key organizational changes due to COVID-  
54 19'.

55 Conclusions and relevance

56 Although overall QMNC scores were high, findings also suggest gaps in QMNC. Underlying causes of  
57 these gaps should be explored to design appropriate interventions and policies.

58

59

## 60 **BACKGROUND**

61 Childbirth should be a positive experience, ensuring women and their babies reach their full potential for  
62 health and wellbeing (1). When analyzing quality of maternity care worldwide, two extreme situations have  
63 been described: too little, too late (TLTL) and too much, too soon (TMTS) (2). While TLTL identifies care with  
64 inadequate resources, below evidence-based standards, or care withheld or unavailable until too late to help,  
65 TMTS identifies care characterized by over-medicalization, including the use of non-evidence-based  
66 interventions, or interventions not appropriate for the case (2). Typical examples of overused interventions  
67 during childbirth are caesarean sections, inductions or augmentation of labour, episiotomies, and fundal  
68 pressure. Both TLTL and TMTS are costly for health systems and can be dangerous for women and  
69 newborns ((3–5). In addition, the literature indicates that women, both in low- and high-income countries  
70 (HICs) are often not adequately informed and are minimally involved in decision-making prior to conducting  
71 these interventions during childbirth ((5–8). Also, other aspects of experience of care such as privacy, quality  
72 of communication, respect and dignity have been described as substandard both in low and HICs (9,10).

73

74 In Belgium, the quality of maternal and newborn health has been mainly explored focusing on clinical  
75 outcomes and the provision of care(11,12). Similar to neighboring European countries, maternal and  
76 newborn health outcomes (such mortality and morbidity) are among the best in the world (11,13,14).  
77 Nevertheless, reports also show high rates of interventions (such as cesarean sections and episiotomies)  
78 with a high variation between hospitals (11). This unexplained variation suggests that interventions are not  
79 always performed based on evidence and might be the result of organizational policies and health providers  
80 preferences (11). One pre-pandemic study also showed women often experience a lack of involvement in  
81 the decision-making process during childbirth in Belgium, negatively affecting experience of care (15).  
82 However, more research using validated instruments is needed to capture both experience and provision of  
83 childbirth care in Belgium.

84

85 On the 11th of March 2020, the WHO declared the COVID-19 pandemic as a public health emergency of  
86 international concern; which was declared as ended on May 5, 2023. Globally, studies have shown that  
87 COVID–19 negatively impacted the provision and experience of maternal and newborn healthcare,  
88 especially in the first year of the pandemic (16–18). Rapidly implemented measures (such as stringent  
89 lockdown measures, curfews, isolation of suspected and confirmed cases) to control the pandemic

90 negatively affected the availability, utilization and quality of essential maternal and newborn health services  
91 (17). A systematic review showed maternal and fetal outcomes worsened globally during the COVID-19  
92 pandemic, with an increase in maternal deaths, stillbirth, ruptured ectopic pregnancies, and maternal  
93 depression (19,20). However, outcomes show considerable disparity between different settings within and  
94 across countries (18–20) and changes over time are yet to be explored.

95

96 IMAGiNE EURO is a multicountry project that started at the onset of the COVID 19 pandemic, exploring  
97 through online surveys the perspective of women and health care providers on the Quality of Maternal and  
98 Newborn Care (QMNC) at childbirth in hospital settings. Two validated questionnaires were developed for  
99 this project, containing 80 prioritized WHO Quality measures (out of the of more than 300 suggested by the  
100 WHO Standards for improving the quality of maternal and newborn care)(21). This paper presents detailed  
101 survey findings on QMNC and trends over time, from the perspective of women who gave birth in Belgium  
102 during the COVID-19 pandemic, between March 2020 and May 2023.

103

## 104 **METHODS**

105 A cross-sectional observational study was conducted and reported according to the STROBE Strengthening  
106 the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology guidelines and the checklist can be found in  
107 supplementary materials (Supplementary Material 1) (22). As first aim overall quality of care was explored  
108 according to the WHO Quality of Care Measures. As a secondary aim, trends over time were analyzed for  
109 the different subdomains.

### 110 **Participants**

111 Only women who gave birth in a Belgian facility between March 2020 and May 2023 were included in this  
112 study, corresponding to the period the pandemic was officially declared by WHO (23). Women needed to be  
113 18 years or older to be eligible for participation. Women who gave birth multiple times during the described  
114 period could fill in the questionnaire for each childbirth. Women were able to select their preferred language  
115 from 28 languages available for completing the questionnaire and participated by actively clicking on the link  
116 or scanning the QR code to access the questionnaire.

### 117 **Data collection**

118 We used a structured online questionnaire to collect data, recorded with Research Electronic Data Capture  
119 (REDCap 8.5.21) via a centralized platform (24). The process of questionnaire development, validation and  
120 previous use has been reported elsewhere (25,26) and the study was registered at the U.S. National Library  
121 of Medicine under NCT04847336. The questionnaire for women included 40 questions on one key indicator  
122 each, equally distributed in four domains: the three domains of the WHO Quality measures (21), namely  
123 provision of care, experience of care and availability of human and physical resources, plus an additional  
124 domain on key organizational changes related to the COVID-19 pandemic (26).

125 Two versions of the questionnaire were available, one tailored for women who experienced labor and one for  
126 women who did not (e.g., women with a planned cesarean section). Each included the 40 WHO standard-  
127 based prioritized quality measure with 34 measures in common. Labor was defined according to NICE  
128 guidelines (27). Questions on individual characteristics of the participants (e.g., socioeconomic background,  
129 parity) were included. As reported elsewhere (26) 40 indicators contributed to a composite QMNC index,  
130 ranging from 0 to 100 for each of the four domains, for a total score ranging from 0 to 400 points, and higher  
131 scores indicating higher adherence to the WHO Standards (28). The online questionnaire was disseminated  
132 by social media (Facebook and X) and by distributing leaflets in maternity wards, postnatal clinics and  
133 creches. Dissemination materials were available in Dutch, French and English.

134

### 135 **Data analysis**

#### 136 **Sample size**

137 A minimum required sample size of 300 women for each country was calculated, based on preliminary data  
138 from other studies on the hypothesis of an average QMNC Index (our primary outcome and dependent  
139 variable) of 75% +/-7.5% (300 +/-30 points, out of 400) and confidence level of 99.5%. Women were  
140 included when they had less than 20% cases missing on the 40 Quality measures and all questions on the  
141 individual characteristics. For the primary aim, we calculated absolute frequencies and percentages for  
142 sociodemographic variables and for each of the 40 key quality measures. The QMNC index was presented  
143 as median and interquartile range (IQR) because not normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk test for normality  
144  $P < 0.05$ ).

145 In addition, we performed a multivariable quantile regression analysis with the QMNC index as the  
146 dependent variable and with trimester, maternal age, parity, maternal education, type of facility, mode of birth  
147 and presence of an OB/GYN directly assisting childbirth as independent variables. Quantile regression was

148 chosen instead of linear regression since the QMNC index was not normally distributed and owing to  
149 evidence of heteroskedasticity ((29). We conducted a multivariable quantile regression with robust standard  
150 errors (SEs) and we modeled the median, the 0.25th and 0.75th quantile, given statistical evidence of  
151 heteroskedasticity for parity, mode of birth, place of birth of the woman (Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test  
152  $P < 0.05$ ,  $H_0$ : homoskedasticity). The categories with the highest frequency were used as reference. For  
153 our secondary aim, we assessed the hypothesis that the QMNC index improved over time during the  
154 pandemic period (30). We first evaluated time trends by trimester for total QMNC index and subsequently for  
155 the QMNC index by domain. Time trends were tested with the Mann-Kendall test. All the tests were two-  
156 tailed and a p-value  $< 0.05$  was considered statistically significant. Statistical analyses were performed using  
157 Stata version 14 (Stata Corporation) and R version 4.1.1 (31).

158

### 159 **Ethical aspects**

160 The international study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the coordinating center: the  
161 IRCCS “Burlo Garofolo” Trieste (IRB-BURLO 05/2020 15.07.2020) and the Commission Medical Ethics UZ  
162 Ghent (THE-2023-0075). The study was conducted according to General Data Protection Regulation  
163 requirements. Participation in the online survey was voluntary and anonymous. Prior to participation, women  
164 were informed of the objectives and methods of the study, including their rights in declining participation, and  
165 each participant provided consent before responding to the questionnaire. Anonymity in data collection  
166 during the survey phase was ensured by not collecting any information that could disclose participant  
167 identity, such as facility of birth or day of birth of the woman. Data transmission and storage were secured by  
168 encryption.

### 169 **RESULTS**

#### 170 *Sociodemographic characteristics*

171 Of 74 026 women accessing the online questionnaire in all participating countries, 52 632 women fulfilled the  
172 inclusion criteria, and responses from 897 women giving birth in Belgium were analyzed after data cleaning  
173 (Figure 1). The Dutch questionnaire was chosen by 83.8% (n=752) of women, the French questionnaire was  
174 chosen by 12.2% (n=109) of women, 1.7% (n=15) chose the English, and the rest opted for one of the other  
175 available languages (Table 1).

176 <<Figure 1 - Flowchart of the study sample of women>>

177

178 Overall, most women (93.7%, n=841) were aged between 25 and 39 years and 54.2% (n=486) of women  
 179 had university degree or higher. More than half of the women (61.2%, n=549) were primiparous (Table 1).  
 180 Frequencies of spontaneous vaginal birth (SVB) and instrumental vaginal birth (IVB) were 67.0% (n=601)  
 181 and 13.3% (n=119), respectively, while frequencies for cesarean during labor, elective, and emergency  
 182 cesarean before labor were 8% (n=72), 3.1% (n=28), and 8.6% (n=77), respectively. Most women gave birth  
 183 in a public hospital (89.1%, n=799). Almost all births were assisted by a midwife or nurse (96.8%, n=868)  
 184 and 87.2% (n=782) of births were assisted by an obstetrics or gynecology doctor. From all women, 11.4%  
 185 (n=102) had a newborn admitted to the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU), 1.6% (n=14) had multiple births  
 186 and 0.7 % (n=6) had a stillbirth.

187 **Table 1. Characteristics of responders (N=897)**

	n	%
<b>Year of birth</b>		
2020	313	34.9
2021	311	34.7
2022	178	19.8
2023	95	10.6
<b>Mother giving birth in the same country where she was born</b>		
Yes	816	91.0
No	81	9.0
<b>Age range (years)</b>		
18-24	21	2.3
25-30	298	33.2
31-35	436	48.6
36-39	107	11.9
≥40	35	3.9
<b>Educational level <sup>1</sup></b>		
None	0	0.0
Elementary school	6	0.7
Junior high school	94	10.5
High school	311	34.7



	n	%
University degree	194	21.6
Postgraduate degree / Master /Doctorate or higher	292	32.6
<b>Birth mode</b>		
spontaneous vaginal birth	601	67.0
Instrumental vaginal birth	119	13.3
Caesarian section	177	19.7
<b>Parity</b>		
1	549	61.2
>1	348	38.8
<b>Type of hospital</b>		
Public	799	89.1
Private	98	10.9
<b>Type of healthcare providers who directly assisted birth</b>		
Midwife or nurse	868	96.8
A student (i.g. before graduation)	302	33.7
Obstetrics registrar / medical resident (under post-graduation training)	285	31.8
Obstetrics and gynecology doctor	782	87.2
I don't know (healthcare providers did not introduce themselves)	33	3.7
Other	64	7.1
<b>Language in which questionnaire was filled</b>		
Dutch	752	83.8
French	109	12.2
English	15	1.7
Polish	5	0.6
German	3	0.3
Latvian	3	0.3
Swedish	3	0.3
Croatian	2	0.2
Greek	2	0.2
Portuguese	2	0.2
Italian	1	0.1

	n	%
<b>Other</b>		
Newborn admission to NICU	102	11.4
Maternal admission to ICU	6	0.7
Multiple births	14	1.6
Stillbirth	6	0.7

<sup>1</sup>Wording on education levels agreed among partners during the Delphi; questionnaire translated and back translated according to Wild et al. (2005). Abbreviations: NICU =Neonatal Intensive Care Unit

188

189 *WHO-based quality measures*

190 Key results for the domain of provision of care (Table 2) were as follows: 21.0% (n=166) of women who  
 191 experienced labor and 14.7% (n=26) of women who underwent a cesarean reported inadequate pain relief;  
 192 64.7% (n=77) of women with an instrumental vaginal birth reported fundal pressure during childbirth; 35.8%  
 193 (n=215) of women with spontaneous vaginal birth had an episiotomy; 4.6% (n=41) did not experience  
 194 skin-to-skin contact with their newborn; 12.5% (n=112) reported no early breastfeeding; 10.9% (n=98) were  
 195 not exclusively breastfeeding at discharge, and 18.6% (n=167) reported inadequate breastfeeding support.  
 196 One in three women reported they did not receive immediate attention when needed (29.2%, n=262).

197

198 For experience of care, 32.9% (n=295) women reported that they were not involved in choices, 72.3% (n=86)  
 199 were not asked for consent prior to an IVB. Overall, one in ten women stated that they were not treated with  
 200 dignity (11.6%, n=104), while 8.1% (n=73) were exposed to physical, verbal, or emotional abuse. Nearly one  
 201 in four women (23.9%, n=189) reported no freedom of movement during labor and 15.9% (n=143) reported a  
 202 lack of privacy while almost none (1.3%, n=12) reported they performed informal payments. One in three  
 203 women (31.1%, n=279) mentioned that the communication with healthcare professionals was unclear or  
 204 ineffective.

205

206 For availability of human and physical resources, about half of women (46.2%, n=414) observed that staff  
 207 were inadequate in number, while around half of women reported they received inadequate information on  
 208 maternal and newborn danger signs (43.9%, n=394 and 55.4%, n=497, respectively). Room comfort,  
 209 cleaning, and number of women per room were rated as “inadequate” by 25.9% (n=232), 18.7% (n=168),  
 210 and 8.9% (n=80) of women respectively, while 24.4% (n=219) respondents judged staff professionalism as  
 211 inadequate.

212

213 For reorganizational changes due to COVID-19, around one in three women (30.9%, n=277) reported that  
 214 COVID-19 had led to a reduction in QMNC and a high percentage of women reported difficulties in attending  
 215 routine antenatal checks and experienced barriers in accessing the facility (95.1%, n=853 and  
 216 97.5%, n=875, respectively). Regarding staff, 7.4% (n=66) women noted that healthcare personnel were not  
 217 always using personal protective equipment, while for one in four women (24%, n=215) the communication  
 218 did not contain their stress related to COVID-19-required procedures. Overall 17.6% (n=158) rated the info  
 219 graphics as inadequate or noted a lack of handwashing stations (3.8%, n=34).

220

221 **Table 2: Results for WHO standards-based quality measures**

	Women experiencing labor		Women not experiencing labor		Overall (women experiencing labor and women not experiencing labor)	
	N=792		N=105		N=897	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Provision of care						
1. No pain relief during labor	166	21	-	-	-	-
2. Mode of birth					-	-
2a. SVB	601	75.9	-	-	-	-
2b. IVB	119	15	-	-	-	-
2c. CS after labor	72	9.1	-	-	-	-
2d. CS before labor	-	-	28	26.7	-	-
2e. Elective cesarean	-	-	77	73.3	-	-
3a. Episiotomy (in SVB)	215/601	35.8	-	-	-	-
3b. Fundal pressure (in IVB)	77/119	64.7	-	-	-	-
3c. No pain relief after cesarean	9/72	12.5	17	16.2	26/177	14.6

	Women experiencing labor		Women not experiencing labor		Overall (women experiencing labor and women not experiencing labor)	
	N=792		N=105		N=897	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
4. No skin-to-skin contact	23	2.9	18	17.1	41	4.6
5. No early breastfeeding	84	10.6	28	26.7	112	12.5
6. Inadequate breastfeeding support	149	18.8	18	17.1	167	18.6
7. No rooming-in	71	9	13	12.4	84	9.4
8. Not allowed to stay with the baby as wished	40	5.1	7	6.7	47	5.2
9. No exclusive breastfeeding at discharge	83	10.5	15	14.3	98	10.9
10. No immediate attention when needed	230	29	32	30.5	262	29.2
Experience of care	N	%	N	%		
1a. No freedom of movements during labor	189	23.9	-	-	-	-
1b. No consent requested for vaginal examination before prelabour cesarean	-	-	21	20	-	-
2a. No choice of birth position (in SVB)	276/601	45.9	-	-	-	-
2b. No consent requested (for IVB)	86/119	72.3	-	-	-	-
2c. No information on newborn (after cesarean)	16/72	22.2	16	15.2	32/172	18.1
3. No clear/effective communication from HCP	251	31.7	28	26.7	279	31.1
4. No involvement in choices	260	32.8	35	33.3	295	32.9
5. Companionship not allowed	74	9.3	10	9.5	84	9.4
6. Not treated with dignity	88	11.1	16	15.2	104	11.6
7. No emotional support	196	24.7	29	27.6	225	25.1

	Women experiencing labor		Women not experiencing labor		Overall (women experiencing labor and women not experiencing labor)	
	N=792		N=105		N=897	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
8. No privacy	128	16.2	15	14.3	143	15.9
9. Abuse (physical/verbal/emotional)	62	7.8	11	10.5	73	8.1
10. Informal payment	11	1.4	1	1	12	1.3
Availability of physical and human resources						
1a. No timely care by HCPs at facility arrival	71	9	11	10.5	82	9.1
2. No information on maternal danger signs	343	43.3	51	48.6	394	43.9
3. No information on newborn danger signs	442	55.8	55	52.4	497	55.4
4. Inadequate room comfort and equipment	203	25.6	29	27.6	232	25.9
5. Inadequate number of women per rooms	69	8.7	11	10.5	80	8.9
6. Inadequate room cleaning	145	18.3	23	21.9	168	18.7
7. Inadequate bathroom	134	16.9	16	15.2	150	16.7
8. Inadequate partner visiting hours	320	40.4	46	43.8	366	40.8
9. Inadequate number of HCPs	364	46	50	47.6	414	46.2
10. Inadequate HCP professionalism	197	24.9	22	21	219	24.4
Reorganizational changes due to COVID-19						
1. Difficulties in attending routine antenatal Visits	751	94.8	102	97.1	853	95.1
2. Any barriers in accessing the facility	770	97.2	105	100	875	97.5
3. Inadequate info graphics	137	17.3	21	20	158	17.6

	Women experiencing labor		Women not experiencing labor		Overall (women experiencing labor and women not experiencing labor)	
	N=792		N=105		N=897	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
4. Inadequate ward reorganization	116	14.6	17	16.2	133	18.7
5. Inadequate room reorganization	109	13.8	13	12.4	122	13.6
6. Lacking one functioning accessible handwashing station	28	3.5	6	5.7	34	40.8
7. HCP not always using PPE	59	7.4	7	6.7	66	7.4
8. Insufficient HCP number	205	25.9	33	31.4	238	26.5
9. Communication inadequate to contain COVID	191	24.1	24	22.9	215	24.0
10. Reduction in QMNC due to COVID-19	238	30.1	39	37.1	277	30.9

222

223 Notes: Indicators identified with letters (eg, 3a, 3b) were tailored to take into account different mode of birth (ie, spontaneous vaginal,  
 224 instrumental vaginal, and caesarean section). These were calculated on subsamples (e.g., 3a was calculated on spontaneous vaginal  
 225 births; 3b was calculated on instrumental vaginal births). Indicator 6 in the “reorganizational changes due to COVID-19” domain was  
 226 defined as: at least one functioning and accessible hand-washing station (near or inside the room where the mother was hospitalized)  
 227 supplied with water and soap or with disinfectant alcohol solution.

228 Abbreviations: CS =caesarean section; HCP =health care provider; IVB =instrumental vaginal birth; PPE =personal protective  
 229 equipment; QMNC =quality maternal and newborn care; SVB =spontaneous vaginal birth

230

### 231 *Predictors of QMNC indexes*

232 Multivariable analysis showed that when adjusting the QMNC index for other variables, only minor  
 233 differences among groups were observed, except for women who had an instrumental vaginal birth (Table  
 234 3). Significantly lower QMNC indexes were reported by women aged above 40 (-12 in the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile,  
 235 P=0.027) and women who had an instrumental vaginal birth (-23.1 in the 25<sup>th</sup> centile, P =0.009; -20.4 in the  
 236 50<sup>th</sup> centile, P<0.001; -20 in the 75<sup>th</sup> centile, P<0;001). Significantly higher QMNC index was reported on

237 selected centiles for women who were not born in Belgium (+12 in the 75th centile, P=0.004), with a  
 238 university degree (+9.4 in the 50th centile, P=0.042) or postgraduate degree (+12 in the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile,  
 239 P=0.013; +9 in the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile, P=0.02) and who gave birth in a facility with private offers (+8.7 in the 50<sup>th</sup>  
 240 percentile, P=0.046).

241

242 **Table 3: Multivariate analysis predictors QMNC index**

	25th percentile		50th percentile		75th percentile	
	Coefficient (95%CI)	p-value	Coefficient (95%CI)2	p-value2	Coefficient (95%CI)3	p-value3
Study trimester	1.55 (0.9; 2.2)	0.019	0.93 (0.4; 1.5)	0.102	0.5 (0.1; 0.9)	0.261
Parity						
>1	-7.8 (-13.1; -2.5)	0.144	-4.8 (-8.9; -0.7)	0.239	0.5 (-2.6; 3.6)	0.87
1	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Mother giving birth in the same country where she was born						
No	12.2 (3.1; 21.4)	0.182	11.3 (2.3; 20.3)	0.209	12 (7.8; 16.2)	0.004
Yes	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Type of facility						
Private	12.6 (3.8; 21.3)	0.151	8.7 (4.4; 13.1)	0.046	8.5 (3.8; 13.2)	0.072
Public	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Maternal age						
18-24	-7.1 (-39.5; 25.4)	0.827	-0.4 (-18.6; 17.8)	0.984	-1.5 (-17.5; 14.5)	0.925
25-30	-12.1 (-18.3; -5.8)	0.055	-4.6 (-9.6; 0.3)	0.352	1.5 (-2; 5)	0.669
31-35	Ref		Ref		Ref	
36-39	8.4 (-0.1; 17)	0.322	6.3 (0.6; 12)	0.267	1.5 (-2.2; 5.2)	0.687
≥40	7.6 (-0.2; 15.4)	0.333	-5.7 (-12.9; 1.4)	0.424	-12 (-17.4; -6.6)	0.027
Maternal education						
Elementary school	4 (-43.7; 51.6)	0.934	-22.8 (-55.2; 9.6)	0.482	-3 (-27.2; 21.2)	0.901
Junior high school	-15.7 (-29; -2.4)	0.240	-11.7 (-19.4; -3.9)	0.132	-8 (-17; 1)	0.374
High school	Ref		Ref		Ref	
University degree	4.7 (-2.4; 11.7)	0.510	9.4 (4.8; 14.1)	0.042	5 (1.1; 8.9)	0.203
Postgraduate degree / Master /Doctorate or higher	10.2 (5; 15.3)	0.050	12 (7.2; 16.9)	0.013	9 (5.1; 12.9)	0.020
Mode of birth						
Spontaneous vaginal birth	Ref		Ref		Ref	
Instrumental vaginal birth	-23.1 (-31.9; -14.3)	0.009	-20.4 (-25.2; -15.5)	<0.001	-20 (-24.5; -15.5)	<0.001

	25th percentile		50th percentile		75th percentile	
	Coefficient (95%CI)	p-value	Coefficient (95%CI)2	p-value2	Coefficient (95%CI)3	p-value3
Caesarian section	-12.2 (-20.4; -4.1)	0.132	-6.1 (-11.3; -0.9)	0.24	-3 (-6.8; 0.8)	0.432
Presence of an OB/GYN directly assisting childbirth						
Yes	17.2 (10.2; 24.2)	0.014	16.1 (8.8; 23.4)	0.028	9 (4.7; 13.3)	0.039
No	Ref		Ref		Ref	

243 Abbreviations: OB/GYN=obstetrician/gynecologist

244 *Trends over time for QMNC indexes*

245 For the QMNC index of experience of care and key organizational changes related to the COVID-19  
 246 pandemic, a steady increase over time was observed. Experience of care increased from a median score of  
 247 85 points in the first study trimester to 95 points at study end, and key organizational changes related to the  
 248 COVID-19 pandemic evolved from a median score of 90 points in the first trimester to 95 points at study  
 249 (trend test  $P < 0.05$ ) (Figure 2). The QMNC indexes in the domains of provision of care and availability of  
 250 human and physical resources did not show any significant trend over time (see supplementary material 2).

251 <<Figure 2: Lineplot showing the Experiences of care and reorganizational changes due to COVID-19 indexes by  
 252 study trimester>>

253 **DISCUSSION**

254 This is the first study exploring the perceived QMNC care at birth facilities in Belgium during COVID-19,  
 255 using a set of 40 Quality measures based on WHO Standards. Many of the quality measures explored, such  
 256 as those related to the high rate of early breastfeeding, skin-to-skin contact, privacy and timely care, suggest  
 257 high QMNC in Belgium. This is in line with the literature showing high satisfaction with maternity care in  
 258 Belgium and high rankings of maternal and newborn health outcomes in Europe (14,32–34). However, gaps  
 259 in QMNC were also reported in our study for each domain: provision of care (e.g. no pain relief after  
 260 cesarean and inadequate breastfeeding support); experience of care (lack of consent request and  
 261 involvement in choices); availability of resources (inadequate number of HCPs and HCP professionalism)  
 262 and reorganizational changes (barriers in accessing the facility and reduction in QMNC due to COVID-19).  
 263 Reports showed an improved trend over time in the domains of reorganizational changes due to COVID-19  
 264 and experience of care suggesting that the impact of COVID-19 was most severe in the first months of the  
 265 pandemic.



266 Some study findings are of particular concern. In the domain of provision of care, the results showed that  
267 64.6% of women with an IVB are subjected to fundal pressure. This is surprising, since both WHO and FIGO  
268 do not recommend this practice, given its safety is yet unproven ((35,36). Also, national guidelines state that  
269 “there are no medically validated indications for the application of fundal pressure. The traumatic experience  
270 of patients and their families and the occurrence of rare but serious complications are reasons for  
271 discontinuing its use” (37). More research will be needed to explore the underlying reasons for the high rates  
272 of fundal pressure in this study and how adherence to national and international guidelines can be improved.  
273 Also in the immediate post-partum period, we observed shortcomings in provision of care: a relative high  
274 proportion of women with a cesarean did not receive any pain relief and breastfeeding support seem  
275 inadequate. While quality of childbirth care is often evaluated by internal audits and registry data, the  
276 (immediate) postpartum care is often receiving less attention. Maternity wards might need more close  
277 feedback and audit mechanisms of women and their families to improve quality of (immediate) postpartum  
278 care and identify specific breaches in their organization (38,39). Especially since there has been a continuing  
279 tendency in Belgium to improve efficiency and close smaller maternity units, which might have affected  
280 quality of care in a negative way (40,41).

281 With respect to experience of care, a high proportion of women state involvement in decisions was limited,  
282 communication was inadequate, and consent was not requested before performing interventions. Women  
283 with an instrumental birth also reported lower QMNC scores. In addition, 11.6% of women reported she did  
284 not feel treated with dignity and 8.1% reported a form of abuse. Lack of communication and autonomy during  
285 childbirth is a serious concern and should be tackled to improve women’s experience. A recent review  
286 showed that communication skills can be enhanced by training and using additional communication tools,  
287 however, the importance of an enabling environment cannot be underestimated (42). The health care system  
288 in which health providers operate undoubtedly impacts the ability to effectively communicate and respect  
289 women’s choices. Enabling factors can include a non-excessive workload (allowing time to communicate),  
290 availability of adequate space and resources, and a work atmosphere where teamwork, empathy and good  
291 communication are the norm (42). More research into these environmental factors and providers’  
292 perspectives is highly needed in the Belgian context to tackle these shortcomings in childbirth care.

293 Related to the availability of human resources (inadequate number of HCPs and HCP professionalism) and  
294 reorganizational changes (barriers in accessing the facility and reduction in QMNC due to COVID-19) our

295 study shows similar results as neighboring countries. These findings confirm the numerous studies  
296 highlighting the indirect effects of COVID 19 on QMNC (43–49). A study from the UK showed how mitigation  
297 measures caused social isolation of women and delays in care (46), while global reports show overall higher  
298 levels of fear and stress among both health providers and women (43,45).

299 Our findings also showed that for the domains of experience of care and key organizational changes due to  
300 COVID-19 the QMNC indexes increased over time, which can be explained by several factors, including a  
301 better organization of care over time, downscaling of restrictions, and better anticipation of women on  
302 mitigation measures. Unfortunately, the lack of previous studies investigating comprehensively maternal  
303 perceptions of the QMNC (with the same WHO Quality measures used in this study) make it impossible to  
304 further assess to which extend the study findings may be associated with the pandemic. The IMAGiNE EURO  
305 study will perform other rounds of data collection, which will allow us to explore if quality gaps persist beyond  
306 the COVID- 19 pandemic.

307

#### 308 **LIMITATIONS AND STRENGTHS**

309 Limitations and strengths of the multicounty IMAGiNE EURO survey have been described elsewhere (5).  
310 Specific limitations to this study in Belgium are related to the convenience sampling procedure. Our study  
311 sample is highly comparable to the overall population (based on national registry data of women giving birth  
312 in Belgium) but we observed a slightly higher proportion of younger (<25) and primiparous women (11,12).  
313 This difference might be related to the recruitment by social media, which might be more accessible to the  
314 younger population. In addition, only data from women was collected in this study. Data from health  
315 providers is needed, as well as qualitative data from women, to understand the underlying mechanisms  
316 causing the different gaps in quality of care in Belgium.

#### 317 **CONCLUSION**

318 While the evidence overall suggests high QMNC in Belgium, our findings also highlighted several gaps in  
319 care. These gaps include inadequate and/or unclear communication from health care providers, lack of  
320 involvement in choices, inadequate staff number, frequent use of fundal pressure and inadequate pain  
321 management. These reported gaps in care should be analyzed more in depth from a health system-based  
322 perspective to identify underlying causes and design appropriate interventions and policies. We also found

323 that women's experience of QMNC improved during the study period, but further research is needed to gain  
324 knowledge on QMNC beyond the pandemic and trends over time.

325

## 326 **DECLARATIONS**

### 327 **Funding**

328 This work was supported by the Italian Ministry of Health, through the contribution given to the Institute for  
329 Maternal and Child Health IRCCS Burlo Garofolo, Trieste, Italy

330

### 331 **Availability of data and materials**

332 Data are available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

333

### 334 **Author contributions**

335 ML conceived the IMAGiNE EURO study, with major inputs from EPV. AG and SD promoted the survey in  
336 Belgium. AG wrote a first draft with input from SDV and IM for the methods and data analysis. IM and SDV  
337 analyzed the data. AG wrote the final draft, with major input from all authors. All authors approved the final  
338 version of the manuscript for submission.

### 339 **Competing interests**

340 The authors have no competing interests.

### 341 **Acknowledgements**

342 This work was supported by the Ministry of Health, Rome, Italy, in collaboration with the Institute for Maternal  
343 and Child Health IRCCS "Burlo Garofolo", Trieste, Italy. We would like to thank all women who took their time  
344 to respond to this survey. We thank our colleagues from the Department of Public Health and Primary Care  
345 Ghent University, the involved maternity hospitals, and others who helped in the dissemination of the  
346 invitation to participate in the survey. Special thanks to the IMAGiNE EURO study group for their contribution  
347 to the development of this project and support for this manuscript.

## 348 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

349 **FIGURE 1**

350 Figure Title: Flowchart of the study sample of women

351 **FIGURE 2**

352 Figure Title: Lineplot showing the Experiences of care and reorganizational changes due to COVID-19  
353 indexes by study trimester

354

355 **Disclaimer**

356 The authors are responsible for the views expressed in this article and do not necessarily represent the  
357 views, decisions, or policies of the institutions they are affiliated with.

358

## 359 REFERENCES

- 360 1. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations. Intrapartum care for a positive childbirth  
361 experience. 200AD;200.
- 362 2. Miller S, Abalos E, Chamillard M, Ciapponi A, Colaci D, Comandé D, et al. Beyond too little, too late  
363 and too much, too soon: a pathway towards evidence-based, respectful maternity care worldwide.  
364 The Lancet [Internet]. 2016 Oct 29 [cited 2024 Feb 20];388(10056):2176–92. Available from:  
365 <http://www.thelancet.com/article/S0140673616314726/fulltext>
- 366 3. Seijmonsbergen-Schermer AE, Van Den Akker T, Rydahl E, Beeckman K, Bogaerts A, Binfa L, et al.  
367 Variations in use of childbirth interventions in 13 high-income countries: A multinational cross-  
368 sectional study. PLoS Med [Internet]. 2020 May 1 [cited 2024 Feb 20];17(5). Available from:  
369 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32442207/>
- 370 4. Maaløe N, Kujabi ML, Nathan NO, Skovdal M, Dmello BS, Wray S, et al. Inconsistent definitions of  
371 labour progress and over-medicalisation cause unnecessary harm during birth. BMJ. 2023;
- 372 5. Lazzerini M, Covi B, Mariani I, Drglin Z, Arendt M, Nedberg IH, et al. Quality of facility-based  
373 maternal and newborn care around the time of childbirth during the COVID-19 pandemic: online  
374 survey investigating maternal perspectives in 12 countries of the WHO European Region. The Lancet  
375 regional health Europe [Internet]. 2022 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Feb 20];13. Available from:  
376 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34977838/>
- 377 6. Simionescu AA, Horobeț A, Marin E, Belașcu L. Who indicates caesarean section? A cross-sectional  
378 survey in a tertiary level maternity on patients and doctors' profiles at childbirth. Obstet Gynecol  
379 (Bucur). 2021;2(69):62.
- 380 7. Otelea MR, Simionescu AA, Mariani I, Valente EP, Nanu MI, Nanu I, et al. Women's assessment of  
381 the quality of hospital-based perinatal care by mode of birth in Romania during the COVID-19  
382 pandemic: Results from the IMAGINE EURO study. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics  
383 [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Feb 20];159(S1):126–36. Available from:  
384 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ijgo.14482>
- 385 8. de Labrusse C, Abderhalden-Zellweger A, Mariani I, Pfund A, Gemperle M, Grylka-Baeschlin S, et al.  
386 Quality of maternal and newborn care in Switzerland during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-  
387 sectional study based on WHO quality standards. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics  
388 [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Feb 20];159(S1):70–84. Available from:  
389 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ijgo.14456>
- 390 9. Lazzerini M, Covi B, Mariani I, Drglin Z, Arendt M, Hersoug Nedberg I, et al. Quality of facility-based  
391 maternal and newborn care around the time of childbirth during the COVID-19 pandemic: online  
392 survey investigating maternal perspectives in 12 countries of the WHO European Region. 2022 [cited  
393 2022 Jul 8]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.>
- 394 10. Shakibazadeh E, Namadian M, Bohren MA, Vogel JP, Rashidian A, Nogueira Pileggi V, et al.  
395 Respectful care during childbirth in health facilities globally: a qualitative evidence synthesis. BJOG  
396 [Internet]. 2018 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Jan 19];125(8):932–42. Available from:  
397 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29117644/>
- 398 11. Goemaes R, Fomenko L, Laubach M, De Coen K, Roelens K, Bogaerts A. Perinatale gezondheid in  
399 Vlaanderen: jaar 2021. 2022 [cited 2024 Jan 19]; Available from: [http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-](http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-01GJN23SZCDSYZD3C7XND45BDV)  
400 [01GJN23SZCDSYZD3C7XND45BDV](http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-01GJN23SZCDSYZD3C7XND45BDV)

- 401 12. Elizaveta F. Perinatale gezondheid in Vlaanderen Jaar 2022.
- 402 13. EUROPEAN PERINATAL HEALTH REPORT. [cited 2022 Jul 8]; Available from: [www.europeristat.com](http://www.europeristat.com)
- 403 14. Trends in maternal mortality 2000 to 2020: estimates by WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank Group  
404 and UNDESA/Population Division [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 29]. Available from:  
405 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240068759>
- 406 15. Deherder E, Delbaere I, Macedo A, Nieuwenhuijze MJ, Van Laere S, Beeckman K. Women’s view on  
407 shared decision making and autonomy in childbirth: cohort study of Belgian women. BMC Pregnancy  
408 Childbirth [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Feb 20];22(1). Available from:  
409 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35804308/>
- 410 16. Galle A, Semaan A, Huysmans E, Audet C, Asefa A, Delvaux T, et al. A double-edged sword—  
411 telemedicine for maternal care during COVID-19: findings from a global mixed-methods study of  
412 healthcare providers. BMJ Glob Health [Internet]. 2021 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Jan 31];6(2):e004575.  
413 Available from: <https://gh.bmj.com/content/6/2/e004575>
- 414 17. Semaan Id A, Dey Id T, Kikula Id A, Id AA, Rèse Delvaux T, Langlois Id E V, et al. “Separated during the  
415 first hours”—Postnatal care for women and newborns during the COVID-19 pandemic: A mixed-  
416 methods cross-sectional study from a global online survey of maternal and newborn healthcare  
417 providers. PLOS Global Public Health [Internet]. 2022 Apr 28 [cited 2024 Jan 31];2(4):e0000214.  
418 Available from:  
419 <https://journals.plos.org/globalpublichealth/article?id=10.1371/journal.pgph.0000214>
- 420 18. De Curtis M, Villani L, Polo A. Increase of stillbirth and decrease of late preterm infants during the  
421 COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal editor. 2020 Jul 1;106(4):F456.
- 422 19. Chmielewska B, Barratt I, Townsend R, Kalafat E, van der Meulen J, Gurol-Urganci I, et al. Effects of  
423 the COVID-19 pandemic on maternal and perinatal outcomes: a systematic review and meta-  
424 analysis. Lancet Glob Health. 2021 Jun 1;9(6):e759–72.
- 425 20. Townsend R, Chmielewska B, Barratt I, Kalafat E, van der Meulen J, Gurol-Urganci I, et al. Global  
426 changes in maternity care provision during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-  
427 analysis. EClinicalMedicine [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Jan 31];37:100947. Available from:  
428 <http://www.thelancet.com/article/S2589537021002273/fulltext>
- 429 21. STANDARDS FOR IMPROVING QUALITY OF MATERNAL AND NEWBORN CARE IN HEALTH FACILITIES.
- 430 22. STROBE - Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology [Internet]. [cited  
431 2024 Feb 20]. Available from: <https://www.strobe-statement.org/>
- 432 23. Lenharo M. WHO declares end to COVID-19’s emergency phase. Nature. 2023 May 5;
- 433 24. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture  
434 (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational  
435 research informatics support. J Biomed Inform [Internet]. 2009 Apr [cited 2024 Feb 20];42(2):377–  
436 81. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18929686/>
- 437 25. Lazzerini M, Mariani I, Semenzato C, Valente EP. Original research: Association between maternal  
438 satisfaction and other indicators of quality of care at childbirth: a cross-sectional study based on the  
439 WHO standards. BMJ Open [Internet]. 2020 Sep 14 [cited 2024 Feb 20];10(9):e037063. Available  
440 from: [/pmc/articles/PMC7490935/](https://pmc/articles/PMC7490935/)

- 441 26. Lazzerini M, Argentini G, Mariani I, Covi B, Semenzato C, Lincetto O, et al. WHO standards-based tool  
442 to measure women’s views on the quality of care around the time of childbirth at facility level in the  
443 WHO European region: development and validation in Italy. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2022 Feb 16 [cited  
444 2024 Feb 20];12(2). Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35172991/>
- 445 27. Blix E, Huitfeldt AS, Øian P, Straume B, Kumle M. Recommendations | Intrapartum care | Guidance |  
446 NICE. *Sexual and Reproductive Healthcare*. 2012 Dec;3(4):147–53.
- 447 28. Standards for improving quality of maternal and newborn health care in health facilities. Geneva;
- 448 29. Williams R. Heteroskedasticity. [cited 2024 Feb 20]; Available from:  
449 <https://www3.nd.edu/~rwilliam/>
- 450 30. WHO chief declares end to COVID-19 as a global health emergency | UN News [Internet]. [cited  
451 2024 Jan 19]. Available from: <https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/05/1136367>
- 452 31. The Stata Blog 2013 [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 20]. Available from: <https://blog.stata.com/2013/>
- 453 32. Kuipers Y, De Bock V, Van de Craen N, Bosmans V. ‘Naming and faming’ maternity care providers: A  
454 mixed-methods study. *Midwifery*. 2024 Mar 1;130:103912.
- 455 33. Galle A, Van Parys AS, Roelens K, Keygnaert I. Expectations and satisfaction with antenatal care  
456 among pregnant women with a focus on vulnerable groups: A descriptive study in Ghent. *BMC*  
457 *Womens Health* [Internet]. 2015 Dec 2 [cited 2024 Feb 29];15(1):1–12. Available from:  
458 <https://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-015-0266-2>
- 459 34. Christiaens W, Gouwy A, Bracke P. Does a referral from home to hospital affect satisfaction with  
460 childbirth? A cross-national comparison. *BMC Health Serv Res* [Internet]. 2007 Jul 12 [cited 2024 Feb  
461 29];7(1):1–9. Available from: [https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-](https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6963-7-109)  
462 [6963-7-109](https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6963-7-109)
- 463 35. Wright A, Nassar AH, Visser G, Ramasauskaite D, Theron G. FIGO good clinical practice paper:  
464 management of the second stage of labor. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*  
465 [Internet]. 2021 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Feb 28];152(2):172–81. Available from:  
466 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ijgo.13552>
- 467 36. WHO Labour Care Guide User’s Manual.
- 468 37. Richtlijn voor goede klinische praktijk bij laag risico bevallingen KCE reports 139A. [cited 2024 Feb  
469 29]; Available from: <http://www.kce.fgov.be>
- 470 38. Nijagal MA, Wissig S, Stowell C, Olson E, Amer-Wahlin I, Bonsel G, et al. Standardized outcome  
471 measures for pregnancy and childbirth, an ICHOM proposal. *BMC Health Serv Res* [Internet]. 2018  
472 Dec 11 [cited 2024 Mar 1];18(1). Available from: [https://www.ichom.org/patient-centered-](https://www.ichom.org/patient-centered-outcome-measure/pregnancy-and-childbirth/)  
473 [outcome-measure/pregnancy-and-childbirth/](https://www.ichom.org/patient-centered-outcome-measure/pregnancy-and-childbirth/)
- 474 39. Depla AL, Lamain-De Ruyter M, Laureij LT, Ernst-Smelt HE, Hazelzet JA, Franx A, et al. Patient-  
475 Reported Outcome and Experience Measures in Perinatal Care to Guide Clinical Practice:  
476 Prospective Observational Study. *J Med Internet Res* [Internet]. 2022 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Mar  
477 1];24(7):e37725. Available from: <https://www.jmir.org/2022/7/e37725>
- 478 40. Cuellar AE, Gertler PJ. How the expansion of hospital systems has affected consumers. *Health Aff.*  
479 2005 Jan;24(1):213–9.

- 480 41. The Effect of Hospital Size and Teaching Status on Patient Experiences with Hospital Care: A  
481 Multilevel Analysis on JSTOR [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 29]. Available from:  
482 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40221409>
- 483 42. Olde Loohuis ID KM, de Kok BC, Bruner WI, Jonker A, Salia EI, Tunç alp zge I, et al. Strategies to  
484 improve interpersonal communication along the continuum of maternal and newborn care: A  
485 scoping review and narrative synthesis. PLOS Global Public Health [Internet]. 2023 Oct 11 [cited  
486 2024 Feb 29];3(10):e0002449. Available from:  
487 <https://journals.plos.org/globalpublichealth/article?id=10.1371/journal.pgph.0002449>
- 488 43. Asefa A, Semaan A, Delvaux T, Huysmans E, Galle A, Sacks E, et al. The impact of COVID-19 on the  
489 provision of respectful maternity care: Findings from a global survey of health workers. Women and  
490 Birth [Internet]. 2022 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Mar 1];35(4):378. Available from:  
491 </pmc/articles/PMC9179099/>
- 492 44. Lalor J, Ayers S, Celleja Agius J, Downe S, Gouni O, Hartmann K, et al. Balancing restrictions and  
493 access to maternity care for women and birthing partners during the COVID-19 pandemic: the  
494 psychosocial impact of suboptimal care. BJOG. 2021 Oct 1;128(11):1720–5.
- 495 45. Semaan A, Audet C, Huysmans E, Afolabi B, Assarag B, Banke-Thomas A, et al. Voices from the  
496 frontline: findings from a thematic analysis of a rapid online global survey of maternal and newborn  
497 health professionals facing the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Glob Health. 2020 Jun 24;5(6).
- 498 46. Jones IHM, Thompson A, Dunlop CL, Wilson A. Midwives' and maternity support workers'  
499 perceptions of the impact of the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic on respectful maternity care in  
500 a diverse region of the UK: a qualitative study. BMJ Open [Internet]. 2022 Sep 1 [cited 2024 Mar  
501 1];12(9):e064731. Available from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/12/9/e064731>
- 502 47. Townsend R, Chmielewska B, Barratt I, Kalafat E, van der Meulen J, Gurol-Urganci I, et al. Global  
503 changes in maternity care provision during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-  
504 analysis. EClinicalMedicine [Internet]. 2021 Jul 1 [cited 2024 Mar 1];37. Available from:  
505 <http://www.thelancet.com/article/S2589537021002273/fulltext>
- 506 48. Flaherty SJ, Delaney H, Matvienko-Sikar K, Smith V. Maternity care during COVID-19: a qualitative  
507 evidence synthesis of women's and maternity care providers' views and experiences. BMC  
508 Pregnancy Childbirth [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Mar 1];22(1). Available from:  
509 </pmc/articles/PMC9132752/>
- 510 49. Vasilevski V, Sweet L, Bradfield Z, Wilson AN, Hauck Y, Kuliukas L, et al. Receiving maternity care  
511 during the COVID-19 pandemic: Experiences of women's partners and support persons. Women and  
512 Birth [Internet]. 2022 May 1 [cited 2024 Mar 1];35(3):298. Available from:  
513 </pmc/articles/PMC8075817/>

514

## 515 **Supplementary Materials**

- 516 - Supplementary Material 1: STROBE Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in  
517 Epidemiology Checklist
- 518 - Supplementary Material 2: Time trends analysis QMNC index by trimester


519




520

521

<< **Figure 1 - Flowchart of the study sample of women** >>



<<Figure 2: Lineplot showing the Experiences of care and reorganizational changes due to COVID-19 indexes by study trimester>>



**Note:** Figure shows the median (full line) and IQR (dotted line); the p-values are obtained with Mann-Kendall test for monotonic trend (H0: no monotonic trend)