

Conceptual framework on barriers and facilitators to implementing perinatal mental health care and treatment for women: the MATRIx evidence synthesis

Rebecca Webb,^{1*} Elizabeth Ford,² Judy Shakespeare,³ Abigail Easter,^{4,5} Fiona Alderdice,⁶ Jennifer Holly,⁷ Rose Coates,¹ Sally Hogg,⁸ Helen Cheyne,⁹ Sarah McMullen,⁷ Simon Gilbody,¹⁰ Debra Salmon¹ and Susan Ayers¹

¹Centre for Maternal and Child Health Research, School of Health Sciences, City, University of London, London, UK

²Department of Primary Care and Public Health, Brighton & Sussex Medical School, Falmer, UK

³Retired General Practitioner, Oxford, UK

⁴Department of Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College London, London, UK

⁵Section of Women's Mental Health, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

⁶Oxford Population Health, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit (NPEU), Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

⁷NCT, Brunel House, Bristol, UK

⁸The Parent-Infant Foundation, London, UK

⁹Nursing, Midwifery and Allied Health Professions Research Unit, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK

¹⁰Mental Health and Addictions Research Group, University of York, York, UK

*Corresponding author Rebecca.Webb.2@city.ac.uk

Disclosure of interests

Full disclosure of interests: Completed ICMJE forms for all authors, including all related interests, are available in the toolkit on the NIHR journals Library report publication page at <https://doi.org/10.3310/KQFE0107>.

Primary conflicts of interest: Fiona Alderdice, Susan Ayers, Helen Cheyne, Abigail Easter, Elizabeth Ford, Simon Gilbody, Debra Salmon, Judy Shakespeare and Rebecca Webb all received funding from the NIHR Health Services and Delivery Research Programme (NIHR128068) for this research project. In addition: Susan Ayers receives research funding from the NIHR, British Council, Public Health England and Barts Charity. Susan Ayers is chair of the Society of Reproductive and Infant Psychology. Helen Cheyne receives funding from the Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office and NIHR (NIHR HS&DR 17/105/16; NIHR127569; NIHR130619). Helen Cheyne is a trustee of the UK Sepsis Trust. Abigail Easter receives funding from the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration South London. Elizabeth Ford

receives research funding from the EPSRC and honorarium funding from the US National Institute of Aging. She is also a member of Sussex Integrated Dataset Programme Capability Board. Sally Hogg has no competing interests to declare. Jennifer Holly works for the NCT who received funding from the NIHR (NIHR128068) to complete this research. Sarah McMullen works for the NCT who received funding from the NIHR (NIHR128068) to complete this research. Debra Salmon receives research funding from the NIHR and Barts Charity.

Published January 2024
DOI: 10.3310/KQFE0107

Scientific summary

Conceptual framework on barriers and facilitators to implementing perinatal mental health care and treatment for women: the MATRix evidence synthesis

Health and Social Care Delivery Research 2024; Vol. 12: No. 2
DOI: 10.3310/KQFE0107

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background and objectives

Perinatal mental health (PMH) difficulties can occur during pregnancy or after birth. They commonly consist of anxiety disorders, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and stress-related conditions such as adjustment disorder. PMH difficulties are particularly important because of the potential negative impact on women, their partners and children. For example, they are associated with an increased risk of maternal suicide, a decline in relationship satisfaction and long-term impacts on children's development. It is therefore important that women with PMH difficulties can access care and treatment. However, research suggests only half of women with PMH problems are identified by health services and even fewer receive treatment.

This research therefore aimed to identify potential barriers and facilitators to PMH care across the care pathway, both in terms of women accessing care, and in terms of health services implementing new PMH assessment and treatment initiatives.

Our primary research objective was to develop a conceptual framework of barriers and facilitators to PMH care (defined as identification, assessment, care and treatment) to inform PMH services, and highlight where further research is needed. This was done through two systematic reviews which synthesised the evidence on: Review 1 (R1) barriers and facilitators to implementing PMH care; and Review 2 (R2) barriers to women accessing PMH care. Results were used to develop a conceptual framework which was then refined through consultations with stakeholders (e.g. women, general practitioners, midwives, health visitors, psychiatrists, commissioners, third-sector organisations, etc.). Results were used to inform recommendations for policy, practice and future research in PMH care.

Secondary research objectives were to: (1) determine the barriers and facilitators to implementing PMH care in health and social care services; (2) identify differences in barriers and facilitators across different health and social care settings; (3) evaluate the quality of this evidence; (4) extract recommendations for implementation, practice and research based on the barriers and facilitators identified; (5) determine the barriers and facilitators to women accessing PMH care; (6) evaluate the quality of these reviews; and (7) map the geographical distribution of the research to establish generalisability and gaps in the evidence.

Review methods

For both reviews pre-planned searches were carried out in MEDLINE (1946–present), EMBASE (1974–present), PsychInfo (1806–present) and CINAHL (1982–present). R2 also used Scopus and Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (Issue 8 of 12, August 2021). MeSH terms (i.e. prenatal care/anxiety/diagnosis) and Boolean operators 'OR' and 'AND' were used.

Eligibility criteria for R1 were empirical studies that examined factors that either facilitated or impeded implementation of PMH care in health or social care services. These could be qualitative interviews with health professionals (HPs) or women about services; or studies describing the implementation of PMH care services. Eligibility criteria for R2 were reviews of literature on barriers and facilitators for women in the perinatal period (defined as conception to one year postpartum) to access assessment, care or treatment. Information on barriers and facilitators had to be directly drawn from perinatal women's experiences. Only systematic reviews with a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) search strategy were included.

Search results were imported into Endnote and duplicates were removed. Remaining studies were then imported into Eppi-Reviewer. In R1 10% of the results were double screened. In R2 all studies were double screened. For both reviews, 10% of included studies had their data extracted in duplicate.

Methodological quality appraisal was conducted using the Joanna Briggs Critical Appraisal Tools for R1, and dual appraisal was conducted for 35% of included papers. Most studies ($n = 44$) had a quality rating above 70% suggesting that studies were well-conducted with low risk of bias. For R2, methodological quality of reviews was appraised using A measurement tool to assess systematic reviews-2 (AMSTAR) tool, and dual appraisal was carried out for all included reviews. The majority of reviews were evaluated as having low ($n = 14$) or critically low ($n = 5$) confidence in their results. Therefore, a qualitative sensitivity analysis was carried out to assess whether themes remained consistent across all reviews regardless of their quality rating.

Only qualitative papers were identified. Results were analysed using a thematic synthesis and mapping themes on to a systems level model adapted from Ferlie and Shortell's Levels of Change framework (e.g. individual level factors, HP factors, organisational factors and larger system factors) (Ferlie EB, Shortell SM. Improving the quality of health care in the United Kingdom and the United States: a framework for change. *Milbank Q* 2001;79(2):281–315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.00206>) and then grouped to reflect different stages of the care pathway adapted from Goldberg and Huxley's Pathways to Care model (e.g. deciding to disclose, assessment, access to care, treatment) (Goldberg D, Huxley P. *Common Mental Disorders: A Bio-Social Model*. New York, NY: Tavistock/Routledge; 1992.).

Review results

Review 1 searches identified a total of 21,535 citations. After screening by title and abstract 10,130 records were excluded, leaving 931 papers to be screened by full text. Screening of full texts identified 43 studies to be included in the review. Forward and backward searches identified a further three papers. Therefore, 46 qualitative studies were included in the qualitative synthesis. Studies were mainly carried out in higher income countries (HICs). Implementation occurred in a wide range of settings including hospitals ($n = 14$); primary care ($n = 12$); and community-based care ($n = 12$). Most studies ($n = 22$) looked at the implementation of comprehensive care services (including screening, referral and treatment).

Review 2 searches identified a total of 4086 citations. After removing duplicates and studies not meeting inclusion criteria, 2028 articles were left to be screened. Screening by title and abstract led to 1962 records being excluded, leaving 66 papers to be screened by full text. Screening of full texts identified 32 reviews of qualitative studies to be included in the meta-review. Reviews were conducted between 2006 and 2021. The number of studies included in each review varied from 4 to 40 with a total of 344 studies included across all the reviews. The reviews included studies carried out in 24 different countries. Most reviews focused on perinatal depression. Qualitative sensitivity analysis found that most themes were supported in both the higher quality and lower quality reviews. Including all reviews meant the data was richer and included marginalised women, such as refugees, migrants and women living in sub-Saharan Africa. This suggests results from R2 can be interpreted with reasonable confidence.

Overall, in terms of geographical distribution and type of mental illness most studies were carried out in HICs (R1: $n = 38$; R2: $n = 28$), and the majority focused on perinatal depression (R1: $n = 32$; R2: $n = 23$).

Barriers and facilitators to PMH care were identified from R1 and R2. Results from both reviews were merged together and mapped on to seven levels informed by Ferlie and Shortell's (2001)⁴⁰ framework (Ferlie EB, Shortell SM. Improving the quality of health care in the United Kingdom and the United States: a framework for change. *Milbank Q* 2001;79(2):281–315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.00206>). These were: (1) *Individual* factors; (2) *HP* factors; (3) *Interpersonal* factors; (4) *Organisational*

factors; (5) *Commissioner* factors; (6) *Political* factors; and (7) *Societal* factors. Factors at these levels impacted on PMH care at different stages of the care pathway.

Individual level factors were the most influential in women's decision to consult. Women not understanding HPs roles ($n = 12$) or not understanding what perinatal mental illness (PMI) was ($n = 14$) were the most cited barriers. The largest individual level facilitator to deciding to consult was recognising something was wrong ($n = 8$).

In terms of first contact with HPs, the most commonly cited reason for women dropping out of the care pathway was if HPs were dismissive about mental illness or normalised women's symptoms ($n = 8$).

Assessment of PMH was influenced by multiple factors. At the individual level, the most cited barrier was the presence of family and friends with negative beliefs about mental illness ($n = 7$). At the HP level, assessment specific behaviours such as carrying it out in a tick box way ($n = 12$) was the most cited barrier. At the interpersonal level, women and HPs being able to speak openly and honestly about assessment was the most cited facilitator ($n = 5$). At the organisational level, the most common facilitator was the acceptability of assessment or screening for both HPs and women ($n = 17$).

Women deciding to disclose their symptoms was also affected by multiple factors. At the individual level, fear of being judged as a bad mother ($n = 7$) was the most cited barrier. HPs appearing too busy was the most cited barrier ($n = 5$) at the HP level. A lack of a trusting relationship between women and HPs ($n = 10$) was the most cited interpersonal barrier. Linked to this, at the organisational level, a lack of continuity of carer ($n = 8$) was the most cited barrier. Stigma ($n = 18$), culture ($n = 13$) and maternal norms ($n = 15$) were all societal level barriers preventing the disclosure of PMH symptoms.

The most commonly cited factors affecting referral were collaborative working across services ($n = 7$) and organisational referral procedures ($n = 7$).

Multiple factors influenced access to treatment. At the individual level, the most cited barriers to accessing care were logistical issues such as not having childcare ($n = 14$), the location of the care and difficulties travelling there ($n = 13$). Language barriers were the biggest interpersonal barrier to women accessing care ($n = 4$) and related to this, a lack of culturally sensitive care was the most cited organisational barrier to access ($n = 7$). At the commissioner level, the most cited barrier to access was a lack of appropriate or timely services for women ($n = 11$). At the political level a lack of financial resources to pay for health care ($n = 14$) was a barrier to access.

In terms of provision of optimal care, at the HP level, HPs possessing valued characteristics ($n = 9$), such as being trustworthy and caring, were facilitators to the provision of optimal care. At the interpersonal level, a lack of trusting relationship was a barrier to optimal care provision ($n = 5$). At the organisational level, the provision of individualised care ($n = 11$) that was appropriate to women's needs ($n = 12$) was a facilitator. A lack of training related to PMI and treatment was the most cited organisational barrier ($n = 15$). At the wider levels, immigration status ($n = 5$), stigma ($n = 8$) and culture ($n = 6$) were barriers to optimal care.

Multiple factors impacted women's experience of treatment or care. At the individual level, social isolation ($n = 7$) was a barrier to women's experience of care as it exacerbated their mental health difficulties further. HPs who provided hope to mothers, were caring, supportive, empathetic and went above and beyond meant women had a positive care experience ($n = 9$). Individualised and person-centred ($n = 11$) care was also associated with a positive care experience.

In terms of barriers and facilitators within different health and social care settings, within hospitals the most cited factors influencing implementation were lack of time or a heavy workload ($n = 8$), and whether HPs were positive about the care being implemented ($n = 8$). In primary care, the most commonly cited factors that influenced implementation were stigma ($n = 8$) and family presence ($n = 8$).

In community settings the most important factors were training ($n = 8$) and the characteristics of the person providing the care ($n = 6$).

Across low-income countries, stigma ($n = 4$) and lack of training ($n = 4$) were the most cited barriers to implementation. Similarly, when health services were located in higher income countries, but women from a refugee or different cultural background accessed them, stigma ($n = 6$) and lack of HP training ($n = 6$), along with HP's heavy workload ($n = 6$) and lack of collaborative working ($n = 6$) were the most cited barriers.

The MATRix conceptual frameworks

Results from both reviews were synthesised to develop two conceptual frameworks. Eight stages outlined by Jabareen were followed to develop the frameworks: (1) mapping the selected data sources; (2) extensive reading and categorising of the selected data; (3) identifying and naming concepts; (4) deconstructing and categorising the concepts; (5) integrating concepts; (6) synthesis, resynthesis and making it all make sense; (7) validating the conceptual framework using stakeholder meetings and the Confidence in the Evidence from the Reviews of Qualitative research (CERQual) approach; and (8) rethinking the conceptual framework.

Two MATRix conceptual frameworks were developed that highlight the importance of 66 barriers and 39 facilitators to PMH care at multiple levels and that intersect across the care pathway. These conceptual frameworks informed the development of evidence-based recommendations on how to address barriers to ensure that all women are able to access the care and support they need. Recommendations were made for health policy, practice and research.

Conclusions

The MATRix conceptual frameworks on barriers and facilitators highlight the need for women-centred, flexible care, delivered by well-trained, knowledgeable, and empathetic HPs working within an organisational and political structure that enables them to deliver quality care. Results also suggest a need for international efforts to reduce stigma associated with mental health difficulties. Recommendations for practice and policy were made. While recommendations are based on the evidence, they may be more or less achievable, depending on the local and national context and pressures on services.

Based on the evidence, it is suggested that policy makers: (1) review the conceptual frameworks and take comprehensive, strategic and evidence-based steps to ensure there is an effective system of PMH care; (2) ensure services are adequately funded and there are enough trained staff in order to ensure every woman with PMH difficulties is able to access appropriate treatment in a timely fashion; and (3) improve access to health care for all through free health care and a fair and easy-to-access welfare system.

The evidence suggests that recommendations for healthcare practice include: (1) designing care with women to ensure it meets their needs; (2) providing culturally sensitive care and increasing the accessibility of care through pictorial aids and translators; (3) ensuring chosen technology is fit for purpose, and co-designed with HPs; (4) services working together; (5) employment of enough staff from a variety of health disciplines; and (6) HPs receiving high-quality training, with protected time to complete it.

Limitations

In R1 only 10% of abstracts were double screened and, given the large number of citations to screen, some papers may have been missed. Similarly, in R1 only 10% of included papers were methodologically appraised by two reviewers. Both reviews only included papers published in academic journals and written in English. Relevant reviews from health services, charities, third-sector organisations and other grey literature may have been missed. Furthermore, the majority of reviews in R2 were evaluated as having low ($n = 14$) or critically low ($n = 5$) confidence in their results. However, this was mitigated through the use of a qualitative sensitivity analysis.

Future work

Further research is needed to examine access to PMH care for specific groups, such as fathers, immigrants or those in lower income countries. More research is needed on facilitators to implementing and accessing PMH care, as well as appropriate measures to help service managers assess whether a service is working effectively.

Trial registration

This trial is registered as PROSPERO: (R1) CRD42019142854; (R2) CRD42020193107.

Funding

This award was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Health and Social Care Delivery Research programme (NIHR award ref: NIHR 128068) and is published in full in *Health and Social Care Delivery Research*; Vol. 12, No. 2. See the NIHR Funding and Awards website for further award information.

Health and Social Care Delivery Research

ISSN 2755-0060 (Print)

ISSN 2755-0079 (Online)

Health and Social Care Delivery Research (HSDR) was launched in 2013 and is indexed by Europe PMC, DOAJ, INAHTA, Ulrichsweb™ (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), NCBI Bookshelf, Scopus and MEDLINE.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nhr.ac.uk

This journal was previously published as *Health Services and Delivery Research* (Volumes 1–9); ISSN 2050-4349 (print), ISSN 2050-4357 (online)

The full HSDR archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nhr.ac.uk/hsdr.

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health and Social Care Delivery Research* journal

Manuscripts are published in *Health and Social Care Delivery Research* (HSDR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HSDR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

HSDR programme

The HSDR programme funds research to produce evidence to impact on the quality, accessibility and organisation of health and social care services. This includes evaluations of how the NHS and social care might improve delivery of services.

For more information about the HSDR programme please visit the website at <https://www.nhr.ac.uk/explore-nhr/funding-programmes/health-and-social-care-delivery-research.htm>.

This manuscript

The research reported here is the product of an HSDR Evidence Synthesis Centre, contracted to provide rapid evidence syntheses on issues of relevance to the health service, and to inform future HSDR calls for new research around identified gaps in evidence. Other reviews by the Evidence Synthesis Centres are also available in the HSDR journal.

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HSDR programme or one of its preceding programmes as project number NIHR128068. The contractual start date was in September 2019. The final report began editorial review in December 2021 and was accepted for publication in October 2022. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HSDR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' manuscript and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final manuscript document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this manuscript.

This manuscript presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HSDR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HSDR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Copyright © 2024 Webb *et al.* This work was produced by Webb *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nhr.ac.uk), produced by Newgen Digitalworks Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India (www.newgen.co).

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Dr Cat Chatfield Director of Health Services Research UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HSDR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HSDR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Dr Peter Davidson Interim Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board, Consultant Advisor, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Consultant in Public Health, Delta Public Health Consulting Ltd, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Senior Adviser, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Reader in Trials, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Emeritus Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Consultant Advisor, School of Healthcare Enterprise and Innovation, University of Southampton, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, Child and Adolescent Mental Health, Palliative Care and Paediatrics Unit, Population Policy and Practice Programme, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk