

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLOK)

Title	A consensus statement on child and family health during the COVID-19 pandemic and recommendations for post-pandemic recovery and re-build
Type	Article
URL	https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/id/eprint/54203/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.3389/frcha.2025.1520291
Date	2025
Citation	Redhead, Caroline A. B., Silverio, Sergio A., Payne, Elana, Greenfield, Mari, Barnett, Sara Melanie, Chiumento, Anna, Holder, Beth, Skirrow, Helen, Torres, Ofelia et al (2025) A consensus statement on child and family health during the COVID-19 pandemic and recommendations for post-pandemic recovery and re-build. <i>Frontiers in Child and Adolescent Psychiatry</i> , 4.
Creators	Redhead, Caroline A. B., Silverio, Sergio A., Payne, Elana, Greenfield, Mari, Barnett, Sara Melanie, Chiumento, Anna, Holder, Beth, Skirrow, Helen, Torres, Ofelia, Power, Carmen, Weiss, Staci, Magee, Laura A, Downe, Soo, Frith, Lucy and Cameron, Claire

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/frcha.2025.1520291>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLOK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Lisa Amalia Denza Webster,
Leeds Trinity University, United Kingdom

REVIEWED BY

Junko Okuyama,
Tohoku University, Japan

*CORRESPONDENCE

Sergio A. Silverio
✉ sergio.silverio@kcl.ac.uk

[†]These authors share first authorship

[‡]These authors share senior authorship

RECEIVED 31 October 2024

ACCEPTED 13 January 2025

PUBLISHED 29 January 2025

CITATION

Redhead CAB, Silverio SA, Payne E, Greenfield M, Barnett SM, Chiumento A, Holder B, Skirrow H, Torres O, Power C, Weiss SM, Magee LA, Downe S, Frith L and Cameron C (2025) A consensus statement on child and family health during the COVID-19 pandemic and recommendations for post-pandemic recovery and re-build. *Front. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 4:1520291. doi: 10.3389/frcha.2025.1520291

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Redhead, Silverio, Payne, Greenfield, Barnett, Chiumento, Holder, Skirrow, Torres, Power, Weiss, Magee, Downe, Frith and Cameron. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](#). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

A consensus statement on child and family health during the COVID-19 pandemic and recommendations for post-pandemic recovery and re-build

Caroline A. B. Redhead^{1†} , Sergio A. Silverio^{2,3*†} , Elana Payne^{2,3} , Mari Greenfield^{2,4} , Sara M. Barnett⁵ , Anna Chiumento⁶ , Beth Holder⁵ , Helen Skirrow⁷ , Ofelia Torres², Carmen Power⁸ , Staci M. Weiss⁹ , Laura A. Magee² , Soo Downe¹⁰ , Lucy Frith^{1†} and Claire Cameron^{11†}

¹Centre for Social Ethics and Policy, Department of Law, The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom, ²Department of Women & Children's Health, School of Life Course & Population Sciences, King's College London, London, United Kingdom, ³Department of Psychology, Institute of Population Health, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom, ⁴Faculty of Wellbeing, Education & Language Studies, The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom, ⁵Faculty of Medicine, Institute of Reproductive and Developmental Biology, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom, ⁶School of Social and Political Science, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, ⁷School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom, ⁸Independent Researcher, Bristol, United Kingdom, ⁹School of Psychology, University of Roehampton London, London, United Kingdom, ¹⁰School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom, ¹¹Thomas Coram Research Unit, Social Research Institute, University College London, London, United Kingdom

Introduction: As health systems struggled to respond to the catastrophic effects of SARS-CoV-2, infection prevention and control measures significantly impacted on the delivery of non-COVID children's and family health services. The prioritisation of public health measures significantly impacted supportive relationships, revealed their importance for both mental and physical health and well-being. Drawing on findings from an expansive national collaboration, and with the well-being of children and young people in mind, we make recommendations here for post-pandemic recovery and re-build.

Methods: This consensus statement is derived from a cross-disciplinary collaboration of experts. Working together discursively, we have synthesised evidence from collaborative research in child and family health during the COVID-19 pandemic. We have identified and agreed priorities areas for both action and learning, which we present as recommendations for research, healthcare practice, and policy.

Results: The synthesis led to immediate recommendations grouped around what to retain and what to remove from "pandemic" provision and what to reinstate from pre-pandemic, healthcare provision in these services. Longer-term recommendations for action were also made. Those relevant to children's well-being concern equity and relational healthcare.

Discussion: The documented evidence-base of the effects of the pandemic on children's and family services is growing, providing foundations for the post-pandemic recovery and re-setting of child and family health services and care provision. Recommendations contribute to services better aligning with the values of equity and relational healthcare, whilst providing wider consideration of care and support for children and families in usual vs. extra-ordinary health system shock circumstances.

KEYWORDS

consensus statement, COVID-19, children's services, children and families, relationality

1 Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic represented an unprecedented global health system shock. Between January 2020 and May 2023, when the WHO concluded that COVID-19 no longer constituted a public health emergency of international concern (1), concerns about mortality and spread of the novel coronavirus prompted a global, co-ordinated implementation of social and physical distancing restrictions. Meanwhile, research efforts turned towards vaccine development (2), understanding the health system shock, its implications for healthcare decision-making (3) and the possible ramifications for short-, medium-, and long-term health, especially as the world braced for the impact of the inevitable rise in mental health issues caused or exacerbated by the virus, and associated fears, bereavements, and restrictions (4). Social and physical distancing restrictions interrupted child and family health services and routine perinatal care (5, 6) and strict requirements relating to the wearing of personal protective equipment (PPE) in hospitals literally changed the face of healthcare from a child's perspective. Worryingly, social and physical distancing restrictions also led to families being isolated at home (7), increased instances of child neglect, child abuse, and domestic abuse (8), and a deterioration in mental health amongst children and adolescents (9).

The full extent of the longer-term, intergenerational impacts of the pandemic on children and families is yet fully to be realised and may take years to be understood completely. It is clear, however, that from a systemic perspective, the health of the population engaging with child and family health services has, and continues to be, deleteriously impacted by the pandemic (10). These abrupt changes in lifestyle, service provision, family support networks, and nursery closures were associated with an increase in parental stress and mental health, leading to poorer parent-child bonding, with potentially long-term impacts on children's wellbeing and development (11).

In this article, we present a consensus statement developed from research undertaken during the COVID-19 pandemic to investigate its impact on child and family healthcare services, with a broad interpretation of "health". Our research has engaged with families from preconception to the pregnancy-to-pre-school lifestages, as well as with healthcare professionals working in associated healthcare services. The empirical evidence collected has been synthesised to inform the consensus and to underpin our recommendations. We

suggest that some changes made to child and family health services during the pandemic should be retained and others should be removed from care provision as we move through the period of post-pandemic recovery and re-build. We also identify some services which were offered routinely pre-pandemic and then were withdrawn, but that should, as soon as possible, be reinstated. Finally, with the well-being of children and families in mind, we offer suggestions on longer-term recommendations for practice in both "usual" and "extra-ordinary" circumstances.

2 Methods

A consensus statement on perinatal mental health has already been published by some members of this group (12), within which we have published details of our network and a detailed methodology [see also (13)]. In brief, a group of more than 60 researchers, academics, policy makers, and members of third sector organisations from more than 25 institutions formed a national collaborative called The Parent-Infant Covid Organisational Academic Learning Collaborative (PIVOT-AL; Figure 1). Our research was iteratively synthesised during the pandemic, and our regular on-line meetings informed a dissemination event held at The Royal Society of Medicine (RSM) in London on 22 September 2022 (funded by the Society for Reproductive and Infant Psychology, via a Research Development Workshop Grant (ref:- SRIP/DWA/01). At The RSM event, a formal synthesis of a spectrum of evidence relating to maternity and child healthcare services was presented and discussed. This consensus statement summarises of these



FIGURE 1
The PIVOT-AL logo.

evidence-based deliberations, identifying priorities for future research, policy, and healthcare practice.

3 Available evidence

Various teams from within the PIVOT-AL Collaborative have focused efforts on attempting to understand the impact of the pandemic health system shock and associated reconfigurations of service provision on child and family health services, widely construed. We have amassed a cross-disciplinary evidence base, drawn from research investigations including the impact of the pandemic on maternity services, neonatology and hospital-based paediatric services as well as the place-based societal impacts on families and young children. Much of the research takes a family-centred approach, exploring, for instance, the impact of vaccination, of changed hospital service provision for newborns with significant complications and of long-stay paediatric patients (12), and diminished support for important issues that new parents may need help with such as parent-infant bonding (15, 16), as well as more generally for the generation of pandemic-born babies who lived their first months and their early years during, or in the wake of, the pandemic (17, 18). Our research teams also studied the ethical challenges resulting from “re-setting” non-pandemic maternity and children’s services to run concurrently with pandemic services. The impacts of these ethical dilemmas affected children, families and healthcare professionals in different ways (19–21). Critically, they all relate to the importance of parent-infant relationships as well as those with child and family health services, and this common factor underpins our recommendations for the future of these services, as set out below.

3.1 Re-organising child and family healthcare services

In re-organising non-COVID-19 healthcare services alongside a continuing pandemic response, ethical considerations had to underpin healthcare decision-makers’ choices about integrating infection prevention and control measures into routine healthcare practice. New kinds of ethical issues and dilemmas arose as assessments were made as to how best to balance patients’ and families’ access to healthcare services with the protection of both hospital communities and the wider public from COVID-19. The ethical challenges of (re)organising healthcare services to facilitate the continued provision of maternity and paediatric services during COVID-19 was the focus of the multi-disciplinary Reset Ethics Project, which found distinct and different ethical issues are associated with acute and “reset” phases of a pandemic (5).

Qualitative data, collected as part of the Reset Project between November 2020 and July 2021, indicated significant challenges were encountered by healthcare professionals in their struggle to comply with (sometimes rapidly changing) infection prevention and control measures and, at the same time, offer the level of

patient care they felt their personal standards and professional obligations required. In decision-making about re-organising maternity and paediatric services, engagement with ethical principles was found to be *ethics-lite*, with sources mentioning principles in passing rather than explicitly applying them (3). The mandating of personal protective equipment (PPE), the social distancing requirements and the measures imposed to reduce footfall within hospitals (such as banning birth partners and allowing only one parent at a time to be with a hospitalised child) were experienced by healthcare professionals as barriers to their engagement with patients and their families; barriers which impeded on the creation and development of supportive, caring relationships with family, friends, and healthcare professionals (19). The Reset data indicate that, for healthcare professionals, offering care as part of a relational interaction was experienced as an ethically important dimension of healthcare delivery (20, 21).

Further qualitative data from the Changing Children’s Healthcare Study in London demonstrated racial and ethnic discrimination amongst children’s healthcare staff, with micro-aggressions occurring between ethnic in-groups and out-groups who were otherwise meant to be working together in the most difficult of times (22). The research also found responsibility for health and psychological well-being was being discharged to individual staff rather than clinical management (22). Neither maternity care staff (23), children’s healthcare staff were not prepared for the gravity of the pandemic health system shock. However, the latter were more likely to break the instituted rules to provide care for the children in their clinics and their wider family units, than their colleagues in maternity care (24, 25).

3.2 Child and family health and social care systems and networks

PIVOT-AL researchers investigating place-based impacts of the pandemic worked with families and young children in Tower Hamlets and Newham (boroughs of London situated on the north bank of the River Thames and of the City of London), and Bradford (a city in the North of England), both places with substantial south Asian populations (among other ethnic groups) and high levels of poverty. Low-income families were least likely to be employed, own their own home, or have sufficient indoor space or access to outdoor space. South Asian parents and fathers of all ethnicities were found to have more significant levels of depression, which was also exacerbated by a lack of access to outside space (26). Pre-pandemic uneven distribution of material assets was exacerbated for some ethnic groups and housing quality was poor. For those unemployed and on furlough, in terms of time available for children and family life, the experience was quite different from that of those working from (or away from) home. The research across the three areas found that the pandemic exacerbated existing inequalities, having a greater impact on those already vulnerable. Financial insecurity, loneliness, levels of social support, and location of residency were all associated with clinically important depression and anxiety during the pandemic (27). Work led by the Parent-Infant

Foundation echoed these findings, suggesting that the pandemic exacerbated experiences of isolation, a lack of support and mental health challenges. Mothers were also found to have struggled to initiate breastfeeding during lockdown restrictions without in-person support. Whilst caregiving interactions were found not to have suffered from a reduction in social exposure, some babies born in lockdowns did demonstrate lower responsiveness to sensory stimuli, although mediated through caregiving quality and other social interactions (17, 18). We do not yet know how parent perceptions of their infants as “COVID babies” might have consequences on parenting, parent-child attachment, parent and child mental health and school adjustment. Longitudinal research in the coming years will reveal if the significance of the lack of social exposure and increased stress has an enduring impact on parents and children; whilst the severe reduction in vital services may have already led to long-term negative impacts on this generation of babies and young children (28).

The disruption of antenatal care and routine vaccination schedules for mothers and infants during the pandemic resulted in lower vaccination rates (29). PIVOT-AL researchers found that these disruptions generated confusion and access issues, with a high proportion of changed appointments, and reported fears about attending healthcare settings for routine vaccinations (30). Women from ethnic-minorities and lower-income households were less likely to be vaccinated, and minority-ethnic women were more likely to report access problems and feeling less safe attending vaccinations for both themselves and their babies (30). When it came to roll-out of COVID-19 vaccination, willingness to be vaccinated during pregnancy was significantly lower, and this reluctance was significantly higher in minority-ethnic women and those of low-income (31). Concerns around the safety of the vaccine for pregnant or breastfeeding women, and for their babies was common, sometimes alongside wider feelings of mistrust around vaccines. A lack of data, the speed of vaccine development and worry about side effects were the three main themes concerning perceived safety of COVID-10 vaccination in pregnancy (31). Pregnant and postnatal women were reported to have seen the COVID-19 vaccination efforts as rushed, and to have expressed strong concerns around the safety of the vaccine for pregnant or breastfeeding women, and for their babies (32). Vaccine misinformation was found to have spread quickly, and was thought to be problematic for the encouragement of both routine and COVID-19 vaccination uptake (33).

4 Discussion of recommendations

Our recommendations below draw on our synthesis of the research carried out by teams working across the PIVOT-AL Collaborative and identify pandemic-related changes to service provision which represented risks to child and family health. Our recommendations are broadly divided into three key areas of focus. Thinking of changes made to service delivery during the pandemic, we make recommendations as to (i) those adaptations which should be retained as innovative ways for delivering care;

(ii) those elements which were stopped and should be reinstated to ensure safety, accessibility, and/or satisfaction with care; and (iii) those aspects of reconfigured care which should be removed from post-pandemic service provision as they have been not been found to add value, or to result in negative experiences of care. We also make longer-term recommendations for focused efforts amongst health service policy makers and practitioners could focus their efforts to better protect the well-being of parents, children, and families. These are not set out in terms of rank or relative importance.

4.1 What to retain

The adoption of technological solutions to facilitate remote access to healthcare services was a notable feature of pandemic healthcare provision. However, remote care must be offered in-line with clinical decision-making around safety and appropriateness for children and families. Maintenance of (at least some) virtual or remote care provision, or at least the option to attend some appointments virtually, was generally seen by both service users and healthcare professionals to be acceptable and, in some cases, preferable. A must, however, is the inclusion of birth partners and family members (to whose presence service users—including children, where appropriate—consent) in all child and family healthcare services. The pandemic—on occasion—allowed for creativity, adaptability, and flexibility to innovate from the bottom-up, sometimes rapidly. This agility, coupled, where possible, with patient and public involvement and engagement, should, where necessary, continue to be facilitated in post-pandemic service provision.

4.2 What to reinstate

While we have recommended continuing to facilitate some of the agility which characterised pandemic innovation, we note that, in many cases, consultation and engagement was lacking. At a system level, reinstating time for processing and ethical reflection on new directives for service delivery is important. Healthcare professionals and service users (including children, where appropriate) should be involved in discussion and decision-making across all aspects of child and family healthcare (3, 24, 25).

Pandemic infection prevention and control measures often displaced (or, at best, reduced) healthcare professionals’ clinical autonomy (19). Where the resulting care fell short of what healthcare professionals considered their professional ethical duties obliged them to provide, some experienced moral distress (19). We, thus, recommend that, even in the context of a pandemic, healthcare professionals’ autonomy and professional judgment as to what constitutes safe care is respected. This would include permitting infection prevention and control measures to be flexed where other considerations are at stake such as, for example, offering in-person care in preference to virtual care where there is a concern about domestic or child

abuse (34). Our research suggests that this will allay staff anxieties, both about falling short of offering the care they feel (professionally or personally) morally obliged to deliver and about “breaking” infection prevention rules by offering what would usually be healthcare and family support.

Finally, an important recommendation is the permanent re-introduction family members to neonatal and children’s wards. In many specialist children’s services, family members are considered a valuable part of the team and preventing or limiting their access during the pandemic caused significant harm both to families and to the healthcare professionals providing care (19–21). It is clear from our evidence base that relational care is morally significant to healthcare professionals and important for patients and families (20, 21). This is true across child and family health services, and re-establishing high quality, joined-up provision of compassionate care to children and families is crucial to their ongoing health and well-being. All of this, however, requires the availability of face-to-face provision of care and support—in hospitals and healthcare settings, and in the community—the removal of which has been repeatedly criticised. Ultimately, face-to-face, compassionate care should be offered in all cases and sometimes, for example where domestic violence is suspected, be mandatory across family services. It is clear that a hospitalised child’s parents were considered an important part of healthcare team prior to the pandemic (20). Thus, our recommendation is not simply that family members should be welcomed back into child and family healthcare services but that the importance of their role should explicitly be recognised. Excluding them to reduce an infection risk opens the door to the possibility of equally significant emotional and psychological risks, which might have intergenerational consequences.

4.3 What to remove

Firstly, blanket or “one size fits all” policies should not be rolled-out across health and community services without consideration of variation in demographic need or accessibility to essential support services. This was clearly a rapid-response approach used in acute stages when the virus was not well understood, but, as time passed, the continued displacement of moral, compassionate and relational care was damaging to children, families and healthcare professionals (19, 20, 35). A narrow understanding of risk focused on the prevention of infection ignored risks linked to mental health and psychological safety, opening the door to different but equally significant consequences. These include severe mental health episodes, domestic abuse and violence, and suicide; all of which may impact parents’ ability to bond with their child, with serious consequences for infant outcomes (11).

We also note the crucial importance to families of effective, trustworthy communication across maternity and child development infrastructure. Confusing and conflicting messaging between Government organisations, the Royal Colleges, individual Trusts, and other Learned Academies, was (and, to some extent continues to be) an issue. When national public

health messaging is necessary, disinformation and/or conflicting information must be stopped as a matter of utmost importance (3, 36, 37). Messaging must be consistent from policy to practice and must include operationalisable ethical frameworks and guidance for healthcare professionals (3). Policy-makers and healthcare professionals must be agile enough to interpret and implement change in a uniform way.

5 Longer-term recommendations and future directions

5.1 Equity, ethics, and relational healthcare

Equitable, relational, compassionate care should be offered to all, with special consideration made for populations who struggle to access healthcare (19, 21, 38). This includes those living with high levels of social complexity or in areas with high levels of social deprivation (39), who may mistrust the NHS and wider social care systems (23) or are generally underserved by health and care systems (40). It would also be prudent to attend to the established relationship between parental, child health, and wider family health. This should acknowledge the reciprocal nature of the caregiver-infant mental health outcomes (41) and ensure healthcare professionals are working holistically (35) and with wider social and community services to enable a proactive model of support which facilitates intervention before families reach crisis point (28).

Protecting healthcare professionals’ emotional well-being and capacity (20, 21), protecting against redeployment in times of health system stress or shock, and arguing for greater representation of minoritized staff, is recommended across all maternity and children’s healthcare services (22). Better integration of physical and mental health care is also required (42). Access to common outdoor spaces and anticipated social spaces (e.g., infant care groups) are acutely important for supporting mental health during the parenting journey; their access should be given special consideration in light of protecting the physical health of the public.

5.2 A lifecourse approach to child and family health

Whilst this consensus statement focuses on research carried out during the pandemic in the United Kingdom, we would strongly recommend making comparisons with research from across the globe. An important next step would be for formal inter-cultural comparisons to be made. It is expected that recommendations could be derived from these comparisons and could therefore be synthesised. To ensure the future safety and security of children and their families over their lifecourse as they move on from the pandemic, we must also take into account the different resource available for child and family healthcare, especially in those countries where healthcare is not free-at-point-of-access (43); see also (44). These recommendations would then help the next

generation of healthcare if acted upon, and could offer some plasticity to the healthcare systems caring for children and families in future health system shock situations (45).

Furthermore, it is imperative that the longer-term detrimental effects of specific aspects of countries' governments' pandemic-related responses are explored. For example, it is widely recognised that prolonged quarantine measures are detrimental, psychologically (7), however, "lockdowns" to prevent the spread of infection had many other effects, the impact of which are still being calculated and understood. For example, the food insecurity which came about as a result of restricted movement, decreased access to healthcare, and heightened, chronic, stressful situations (such as those spent unable to leave home, or in high-intensity hospital care settings), have already been highlighted as having the potential to have a long term impact on the lifecourse of a "child of the pandemic" (46). Moreover, parent-infant relationships were challenged during the pandemic, with parents—often mothers—having to juggle the needs of their work, their family units, and their children as well as their education (47). It has already been found that these pandemic-related stressors have led to poorer parental mental health overall (48) and we know poor parental mental health can have a detrimental effect on their children's lifecourse (49). Future research must also attempt to understand the effect of stressors such as the pandemic on the very worst outcomes ruptures between families and the children of those families, such as ambivalence, abandonment, abuse, and infanticide (50), the lifecourse health effects of which are devastating, long-lasting, and often incalculable.

6 Conclusion

We have set out in this statement a brief review of the empirical evidence amassed during the pandemic by research teams who came together under the PIVOT-AL Collaborative banner. While COVID-19 is now known to pose less of a risk to children and young people, it is arguable, as we have shown above, that both the immediate and longer-term impacts of pandemic decision-making in health services had, and continue to have, significant consequences for children and families. The pandemic has made dramatic changes to the fabric of health and care services. In order to promote the health and well-being children and families both in times of relative stability, and during times of global crisis, the health and child development services of the future must be resilient, adaptable, tensile, and plastic enough to weather the inevitable systemic shocks. Health services must also attend to the (ethical) significance of relationships. We have suggested that new ways of thinking are required to optimise the provision of these services going forward, and to prepare them for future shocks. These include those that can be anticipated (for instance, related to climate change) and those that are

currently unforeseen. The evidence-base on the extent of the very worst outcomes possible for children and family health have yet to be totalled and may forever be incalculable, however, future research should address issues of intra-familial estrangement, harm, and rupture more directly to further improve child and family healthcare delivery in future health system shocks. To avoid current and future disaster, healthcare and child development decision- and policy-makers must push the boundaries of what is practically possible now and in the very near future in designing evidence based, equitable, relational and future-proofed child and family health services. We hope this statement will assist with such endeavours.

Author contributions

CABR: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing – original draft. SAS: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. EP: Project administration, Writing – review & editing. MG: Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Validation, Writing – review & editing. SMB: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. AC: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. BH: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. HS: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. OT: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. CP: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. SMW: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. LAM: Funding acquisition, Investigation, Writing – review & editing. SD: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. LF: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. CC: Investigation, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This consensus statement was funded by the Society for Reproductive & Infant Psychology Research Development Workshop Grant (ref:- SRIP/DWA/01; Title:- "Lockdown Babies & Lockdown Blues: Pregnancy, Childbirth, and Maternal Mental Health during the COVID-19 Pandemic").

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge The PIVOT-AL National Collaborative (<https://www.pivotal-collab.co.uk/>) for allowing a focus in part to be placed on perinatal mental health at the inaugural policy dissemination meeting of the 22 September 22

at The Royal Society of Medicine, London, UK. We would also like to thank the following colleagues for their input and advice at various points during some or all parts of this work including the grant application, the studies related to this work, and/or the synthesis of this work: Miss. Nina Khazaezadeh (NHS England), Dr. Daghni Rajasingam (Guy's and St. Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust), & Prof. Ingrid Wolfe (King's College London).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

1. WHO (2023) Statement on the fifteenth meeting of the IHR (2005) Emergency Committee on the COVID-19 pandemic. Available online at: [https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-\(2005\)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-19\)-pandemic](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic) (Accessed May 05, 2023).
2. WHO (2021). WHO coronavirus (COVID-19) dashboard. Available online at: <https://covid19.who.int/> (Accessed May 05, 2021).
3. Chiumento A, Baines P, Redhead C, Fovargue S, Draper H, Frith L. Which ethical values underpin England's National Health Service reset of paediatric and maternity services following COVID-19: a rapid review. *BMJ Open*. (2021) 11(6):e049214. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-049214
4. Adhanom Ghebreyesus T. Addressing mental health needs: an integral part of COVID-19 response. *World Psychiatry*. (2020) 19(2):129–30. doi: 10.1002/wps.20768
5. Frith L, Draper H, Fovargue S, Baines P, Redhead C, Chiumento A. Neither 'crisis light' nor 'business as usual': considering the distinctive ethical issues raised by the contingency and reset phases of a pandemic. *Am J Bioeth*. (2021) 21(8):34–47. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2021.1940363
6. Institute of Health Visiting (2021). Institute of Health Visiting. State of Health Visiting in England: "We need more health visitors!" UK Survey Report. Available online at: <https://bit.ly/43v8Yu7> (Accessed May 05, 2023).
7. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet*. (2020) 395(10227):912–20. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30460-8
8. Thomas EY, Anurudran A, Robb K, Burke TF. Spotlight on child abuse and neglect response in the time of COVID-19. *Lancet Public Health*. (2020) 5(7):e371. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30143-2
9. Ford T, Newlove-Delgado T, Sabu AK, Russell A. Neither seen nor heard: the evidence gap on the effect of COVID-19 on mental health in children. *Br Med J*. (2024) 387(e078339):1–4. doi: 10.1136/bmj-2023-078339
10. Institute of Health Visiting (2023). State of Health Visiting, UK survey report: Millions supported as others miss out. Available online at: <https://bit.ly/48W6TcE> (Accessed May 05, 2023).
11. Power C, Weise V, Mack JT, Karl M, Garthus-Niegel S. Does parental mental health mediate the association between parents' perceived stress and parent-infant bonding during the early COVID-19 pandemic? *Early Hum Dev*. (2024) 189(105931):1–10. doi: 10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2023.105931
12. Jackson L, Greenfield M, Payne E, Burgess K, Oza M, Storey C, et al. A consensus statement on perinatal mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic and recommendations for post-pandemic recovery and re-build. *Front Glob Womens Health*. (2024) 5(1347388):1–8. doi: 10.3389/fgwh.2024.1347388
13. Manera K, Hanson CS, Gutman T, Tong A. *Consensus methods: nominal group technique*. In: Liampittong P, editor. *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*. Singapore: Springer (2019):737–50. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_100
14. Draper H, Redhead C, Chiumento A, Fovargue S, Frith L. *Responding proportionately to the COVID-19 pandemic in UK long-stay, in-patient paediatric wards*. In: Biller-Andorno N, März JW, Mouton Dorey C, Dagron S, editors. *Proportionality: A Guiding Principle in Public Health Law, Ethics and Policy*. Oxford: OUP (2024).
15. Bateson K, Sercombe M, Hamilton W. *Securing Healthy Lives: An Extended Summary of Research About Parent-infant relationship Health and Support Across Cwm Taf Morgannwg*. London: Parent-Infant Foundation (2021).
16. Bateson K, Power C. Parents' perceptions and experiences of support to develop a secure parent-infant relationship. *Community Pract*. (2023):40–3.
17. Aydin E, Glasgow KA, Weiss SM, Khan Z, Austin T, Johnson MH, et al. Giving birth in a pandemic: women's birth experiences in England during COVID-19. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2022) 22(304):1–11. doi: 10.1186/s12884-022-04637-8
18. Aydin E, Weiss SM, Glasgow KA, Barlow J, Austin T, Johnson MH, et al. COVID-19 in the context of pregnancy, infancy and parenting (CoCoPIP) study: protocol for a longitudinal study of parental mental health, social interactions, physical growth and cognitive development of infants during the pandemic. *BMJ Open*. (2022) 12(6):1–10. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053800
19. Chiumento A, Fovargue S, Redhead C, Draper H, Frith L. Delivering compassionate NHS healthcare: a qualitative study exploring the ethical implications of resetting NHS maternity and paediatric services following the acute phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Soc Sci Med*. (2024) 344:116503. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.116503
20. Redhead CAB, Frith L, Chiumento A, Fovargue S, Draper H. Using symbiotic empirical ethics to explore the significance of relationships to clinical ethics: findings from the reset ethics research project. *BMC Med Ethics*. (2024) 25(66):1–15. doi: 10.1186/s12910-024-01053-9
21. Redhead C, Chiumento A, Fovargue S, Draper H, Frith L. Relationships were a casualty when pandemic ethics and everyday clinical ethics collided. In: Redhead C, Smallman M, editors. *Governance, Democracy and Ethics in Crisis-decision-making: The Pandemic and Beyond*. Manchester: MUP (2024):29–53. doi: 10.7765/9781526180056
22. Silverio SA, De Backer K, Dasgupta T, Torres O, Easter A, Khazaezadeh N, et al. On race and ethnicity during a global pandemic: an 'imperfect mosaic' of maternal and child health services in ethnically-diverse South London, United Kingdom. *eClinicalMedicine*. (2022) 48(101433):1–10. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101433
23. De Backer K, Brown JM, Easter A, Khazaezadeh N, Rajasingam D, Sandall J, et al. Precarity and preparedness during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: a qualitative service evaluation of maternity healthcare professionals. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica*. (2022) 101(11):1227–37. doi: 10.1111/aogs.14438
24. Silverio SA, De Backer K, Brown JM, Easter A, Khazaezadeh N, Rajasingam D, et al. Reflective, pragmatic, and reactive decision-making by maternity service providers during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic health system shock: a qualitative, grounded theory analysis. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2023) 23:1–15. doi: 10.1186/s12884-023-05641-2
25. Silverio SA, Varman N, Barry Z, Khazaezadeh N, Rajasingam D, Magee LA, et al. Inside the 'imperfect mosaic': minority ethnic women's qualitative experiences of race and ethnicity during pregnancy, childbirth, and maternity care in the United Kingdom. *BMC Public Health*. (2023) 23(2555):1–11. doi: 10.1186/s12889-023-17505-7
26. Whitaker L, Cameron C, Hauari H, Hollingworth K, O'Brien M. What family circumstances, during COVID-19, impact on parental mental health in an inner city community in London? *Front Psychiatry*. (2021) 12(725823):1–15. doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2021.725823
27. McIvor C, Vafai Y, Kelly B, O'Toole SE, Heys M, Badrick E, et al. The impact of the pandemic on mental health in ethnically diverse mothers: findings from the born in bradford, tower hamlets and newham COVID-19 research programmes. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (2022) 19(21):14316. doi: 10.3390/21Fijerph192114316

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declare that no Generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

28. Hogg S, Mayes G. *Castling Long Shadows: The Ongoing Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Babies, Their Families and the Services That Support Them*. London: First 1001 Days Movement (2022).
29. Buck E, Burt J, Karamatsas K, Hsia Y, Whyte G, Amirthalingam G, et al. 'Unable to have a proper conversation over the phone about my concerns': a multimethods evaluation of the impact of COVID-19 on routine childhood vaccination services in London, UK. *Public Health*. (2023) 225:229–36. doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2023.09.026
30. Skirrow H, Barnett S, Bell S, Mounier-Jack S, Kampmann B, Holder B. Women's views and experiences of accessing pertussis vaccination in pregnancy and infant vaccinations during the COVID-19 pandemic: a multi-methods study in the UK. *Vaccine*. (2022) 40(34):4942–54. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2022.06.076
31. Skirrow H, Barnett S, Bell S, Riaposova L, Mounier-Jack S, Kampmann B, et al. Women's views and experiences of accessing COVID-19 vaccination during and after pregnancy, and for their babies: a multi-methods study in the UK. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2022) 22(33):1–15. doi: 10.1186/s12884-021-04321-3
32. Dasgupta T, Boulding H, Easter A, Sutedja T, Khalil A, Mistry HD, et al. Post-pandemic maternity care planning for vaccination: a qualitative study of the experiences of women, partners, healthcare professionals, and policy makers in the United Kingdom. *Vaccines*. (2024) 12(1042):1–16. doi: 10.3390/vaccines12091042
33. Magee LA, Brown JR, Bowyer V, Horgan G, Boulding H, Khalil A, et al. Courage in decision-making: a mixed-methods study of COVID-19 vaccine uptake in women of reproductive age in the UK. *Vaccines*. (2024) 12(4):1–16. doi: 10.3390/vaccines12040440
34. Wilson CA, Dalton-Locke C, Johnson S, Simpson A, Oram S, Howard LM. Challenges and opportunities of the COVID-19 pandemic for perinatal mental healthcare: a mixed-methods study of mental healthcare staff. *Arch Women's Mental Health*. (2021) 24:749–57. doi: 10.1007/s00737-021-01108-5
35. Bridle L, Walton L, Van Der Vord T, Adebayo O, Hall S, Finlayson E, et al. Supporting perinatal mental health and wellbeing during COVID-19. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (2022) 19(3):1–12. doi: 10.3390/ijerph19031777
36. Jackson L, De Pascalis L, Harrold JA, Fallon V, Silverio SA. Postpartum women's psychological experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic: a modified recurrent cross-sectional thematic analysis. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2021) 21(625):1–16. doi: 10.1186/s12884-021-04071-2
37. Jackson L, Davies SM, Podkujko A, Gaspar M, De Pascalis LLD, Harrold JA, et al. The antenatal psychological experiences of women during two phases of the COVID-19 pandemic: a recurrent, cross-sectional, thematic analysis. *PLoS One*. (2023) 18(6):1–24. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0285270
38. Fernandez Turienzo C, Newburn M, Agyepong A, Buabeng R, Dignam A, Abe C, et al. Addressing inequities in maternal health among women living in communities of social disadvantage and ethnic diversity. *BMC Public Health*. (2021) 21(176):1–5. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-10182-4
39. Khan Z, Vowles Z, Fernandez Turienzo C, Barry Z, Brigante L, Downe S, et al. Targeted health and social care interventions for women and infants who are disproportionately impacted by health inequalities in high-income countries: a systematic review. *Int J Equity Health*. (2023) 22(131):1–19. doi: 10.1186/s12939-023-01948-w
40. Pilav S, De Backer K, Easter A, Silverio SA, Sundaresh S, Roberts S, et al. A qualitative study of minority ethnic women's experiences of access to and engagement with perinatal mental health care. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. (2022) 22(421):1–13. doi: 10.1186/s12884-022-04698-9
41. Landoni M, Silverio SA, Ionio C, Giordano F. Managing children's fears during the COVID-19 pandemic: strategies adopted by Italian caregivers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (2022) 19(18):1–12. doi: 10.3390/ijerph191811699
42. House of Commons (2023). *Mental health policy and services in England*. Available online at: <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7547/CBP-7547.pdf> (Accessed November 01, 2023).
43. Al-Motlaq M, Neill S, Foster MJ, Coyne I, Houghton D, Angelhoff C, et al. Position statement of the international network for child and family centered care: child and family centred care during the COVID19 pandemic. *J Pediatr Nurs*. (2021) 61:140–3. doi: 10.1016/j.pedn.2021.05.002
44. Fong VC, Iarocci G. Child and family outcomes following pandemics: a systematic review and recommendations on COVID-19 policies. *J Pediatr Psychol*. (2020) 45(10):1124–43. doi: 10.1093/jpepsy/jsaa092
45. Prime H, Walsh F, Masten AS. Building family resilience in the wake of a global pandemic: looking back to prepare for the future. *Can Psychol Psychol Canadienne*. (2023) 64(3):200–11. doi: 10.1037/cap0000366
46. Yoshikawa H, Wuermli AJ, Britto PR, Dreyer B, Leckman JF, Lye SJ, et al. Effects of the global coronavirus disease-2019 pandemic on early childhood development: short-and long-term risks and mitigating program and policy actions. *J Pediatr*. (2020) 223:188–93. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2020.05.020
47. Silverio SA. A hidden crisis: women's mental health after the pandemic. *Psychologist*. (2025) 38(1/2):54–7.
48. Roos LE, Salisbury M, Penner-Goeke L, Cameron EE, Protudjer JLP, Giuliano R, et al. Supporting families to protect child health: parenting quality and household needs during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLoS One*. (2021) 16(5):1–19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0251720
49. Glasheen C, Richardson GA, Fabio A. A systematic review of the effects of postnatal maternal anxiety on children. *Arch Women's Mental Health*. (2010) 13:61–74. doi: 10.1007/s00737-009-0109-y
50. Silverio SA, Wilkinson C, Fallon V, Bramante A, Staneva AA. When a mother's love is not enough: a cross-cultural critical review of anxiety, attachment, maternal ambivalence, abandonment, and infanticide. In: Mayer C-H, Vanderheiden E, editors. *International Handbook of Love: Transcultural and Transdisciplinary Perspectives*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer (2021). p. 291–315.