

Aug 18, 2025

## 🌐 Maternal and Perinatal Wellbeing Scoping Review

DOI

<https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.5jyl88jq9l2w/v1>

julie.jomeen<sup>1</sup>, Julia Marsden<sup>1</sup>, Fransizka Wadehul<sup>2</sup>, Allisyn Moran<sup>3</sup>, Justine Le Lez<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Southern Cross University; <sup>2</sup>Maynooth University; <sup>3</sup>World Health Organization

Perinatal well-being



**Julia Marsden**

Southern Cross University

### Create & collaborate more with a free account

Edit and publish protocols, collaborate in communities, share insights through comments, and track progress with run records.

Create free account

OPEN  ACCESS



**DOI:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.5jyl88jq9l2w/v1>

**Protocol Citation:** julie.jomeen , Julia Marsden, Fransizka Wadehul, Allisyn Moran, Justine Le Lez 2025. Maternal and Perinatal Wellbeing Scoping Review. **protocols.io** <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.5jyl88jq9l2w/v1>

**License:** This is an open access protocol distributed under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution License**, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

**Protocol status:** Working

**We use this protocol and it's working**

**Created:** August 10, 2025

**Last Modified:** August 18, 2025

**Protocol Integer ID:** 224428

**Keywords:** maternal wellbeing, perinatal wellbeing, wellbeing frameworks, systematic review, SPIDER, PRISMA, comprehensive conceptualisation of maternal wellbeing, maternal wellbeing, defining wellbeing, concepts of objective wellbeing, wellbeing, perinatal wellbeing scoping review, objective wellbeing, adult wellbeing, subjective wellbeing, adolescent wellbeing, recent work on adolescent wellbeing, wellbeing literature, evaluative wellbeing, eudemonic wellbeing, perinatal health, hedonic wellbeing, health, quality of life indicator, health for women, transition to motherhood, maternal, world health organisation, motherhood, social well, enhancing health, top priority of the world health organisation, children in the perinatal period, life indicator, perinatal period

## Abstract

Ending preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths, and improving the overall maternal and perinatal health and wellbeing is a top priority of the World Health Organisation (WHO) in the years to come. The World Health Organisation (WHO) defines health as a 'state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity'. In the context of maternal and perinatal health, the concept of wellbeing still remains poorly defined. Defining wellbeing is complex and challenging, particularly in the inherent changes as part of the transition to motherhood. There are differing definitions, models, and theories of wellbeing. The wellbeing literature is generally classified into concepts of objective wellbeing (quality of life indicators [income, food housing], social attributes [education, health, political voice, social networks, and connections]) and subjective wellbeing (evaluative wellbeing, hedonic wellbeing, and eudemonic wellbeing). Recent work on adolescent wellbeing, adult wellbeing (AWB), and women's wellbeing (WWB) has highlighted that a comprehensive conceptualisation of maternal wellbeing (MWB)/perinatal wellbeing (PWB) is lacking at present. Further research is needed to clearly define the concept and domains of MWB/PWB in order to work towards enhancing health for women and children in the perinatal period.

## Guidelines

Table 1. SPIDER criteria for inclusion of papers and data extraction

SPIDER | Inclusion criteria | Exclusion criteria

--- | --- | ---

S | Maternal wellbeing OR maternal well being OR maternal well-being OR perinatal wellbeing OR perinatal well being OR perinatal well-being | Wellbeing in preconception, or 12 months postnatal

PI | Definitions OR concepts OR theories OR models OR domains OR subjective OR objective OR frameworks |

D | All | None

E | All technical and scientific documents | Non-English language

R | All | None

SPIDER: S = sample, PI = phenomenon of interest; D = design; E = evaluation; R = research type

### Study selection process

In order to be included, papers will need to:

- provide a definition, domain/s, or framework of maternal wellbeing (MWB)/perinatal wellbeing (PWB)
- focus on wellbeing in the perinatal period, either the whole perinatal period or pregnancy, labour or the postnatal period (up to 12 months)
- written in English

The following exclusion criteria will apply:

- wellbeing of mothers in the preconception period, or children older than 12 months of age
- wellbeing referring solely to infant or child wellbeing
- papers not available in English

The methodological quality of the papers will be investigated using the 14-point criteria for the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) Quality Appraisal Checklist, quality tools<sup>16-18</sup>. The three authors (JJ, JC, FW) will independently apply the criteria to the studies. Each tool has sub-questions to guide the analysis in a systematic way. Upon completion of the analysis, the authors will compare their findings until agreement is reached.

- Selection of papers and eligibility criteria
  - o Provide a definition of MWB/PWB
  - o Propose domains (objective and subjective) of MWB/PWB
  - o Focus on WB in the perinatal period either as a whole or on pregnancy, labour and birth or the postnatal period up to 12 months
- Exclusion criteria
- Quality Assessment
- Resolving disagreements between reviewers

## Data summary and synthesis

Data charting and synthesis will depend on the nature of the papers retrieved. One possibility is to use Thomas and Harden's thematic analysis framework <sup>19</sup> to guide the summary and synthesis.

## Methods

- 1 Utilise Arksey and O'Malley's framework and recommendations by Levac and colleagues for the scoping review methodology. This involves five key phases: (1) identifying the research question, (2) identifying relevant studies, (3) study selection, (4) charting the data, and (5) collating, summarizing, and reporting the results.
- 2 Identify the research question: What defines and constitutes the domains of MWB/PWB?
- 3 Establish data sources and search strategy for identifying relevant studies. Use the SPIDER (Sample, Phenomenon of Interest, Design, Evaluation, Research type) framework and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines to set search terms, selection criteria, and search strategy.
- 4 Search the following electronic databases: MEDLINE, PubMed, Scopus, CINAHL, EBSCO, Web of Science, and Cochrane. There will be no limitations on publication date. Include empirical studies of any design, as well as discussion papers, editorials, and grey literature.
- 5 Apply the following inclusion criteria for study selection: papers must provide a definition, domain/s, or framework of maternal wellbeing (MWB)/perinatal wellbeing (PWB); focus on wellbeing in the perinatal period (either the whole perinatal period or pregnancy, labour, or the postnatal period up to 12 months); and be written in English.
- 6 Apply the following exclusion criteria: wellbeing of mothers in the preconception period or children older than 12 months of age; wellbeing referring solely to infant or child wellbeing; papers not available in English.
- 7 Assess the methodological quality of included papers using the 14-point criteria for the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) Quality Appraisal Checklist. The three authors (JJ, JC, FW) will independently apply the criteria to the studies. Each tool has sub-questions to guide systematic analysis. Upon completion of the analysis, the authors will compare their findings until agreement is reached.
- 8 During study selection, ensure the following eligibility criteria are met: (a) provide a definition of MWB/PWB, (b) propose domains (objective and subjective) of MWB/PWB, and (c) focus on wellbeing in the perinatal period either as a whole or on pregnancy, labour and birth, or the postnatal period up to 12 months.
- 9 Conduct quality assessment and resolve disagreements between reviewers as part of the methodological process.

## Data summary and synthesis



- 10 Chart and synthesize data depending on the nature of the papers retrieved. Consider using Thomas and Harden's thematic analysis framework to guide the summary and synthesis.

## Anticipated outcomes

- 11 This scoping review will contribute to the international, evidence-informed, consensus-driven definition of maternal and perinatal wellbeing, including domains and indicators. It will also extend similar work developed for childhood and adolescence to the perinatal period, and build upon previous work developed on maternal morbidity and mortality.

## Protocol references

1. WHO. The Global Strategy for Women's, Children's and Adolescents' Health (2016-2030). 2015.
2. Newham JJ, Martin CR. Measuring fluctuations in maternal well-being and mood across pregnancy. *Journal of reproductive and infant psychology*. 2013;31(5):531-540.
3. Diener E. Subjective wellbeing. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1984;95:542-575.
4. Ryff C. Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1989.
5. Keyes C. Social well-being. *Social Psychology*. 1998.
6. Seligman M. *Flourish: A New Understanding of Happiness, Well-Being – and How to Achieve Them*. London: Free Press; 2011.
7. Moreno-Agostino D, de la Torre-Luque A, de la Fuente J, et al. Determinants of Subjective Wellbeing Trajectories in Older Adults: A Growth Mixture Modeling Approach. *Journal of happiness studies*. 2020;22(2):709-726.
8. Steptoe AP, Deaton AP, Stone AAP. Subjective wellbeing, health, and ageing. *The Lancet (British edition)*. 2015;385(9968):640-648.
9. Wadehul F, Glover L, Jomeen J. Conceptualising women's perinatal well-being: A systematic review of theoretical discussions. *Midwifery*. 2020;81:102598.
10. Pham MT, Rajić A, Greig JD, Sargeant JM, Papadopoulos A, McEwen SA. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Research synthesis methods*. 2014;5(4):371-385.
11. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International journal of social research methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.
12. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implementation science : IS*. 2010;5(1):69-69.
13. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*. 2009;6(7):e1000097.
14. Cooke A, Smith D, Booth A. Beyond PICO: The SPIDER Tool for Qualitative Evidence Synthesis. *Qualitative health research*. 2012;22(10):1435-1443.
15. Methley AM, Campbell S, Chew-Graham C, McNally R, Cheraghi-Sohi S. PICO, PICOS and SPIDER: a comparison study of specificity and sensitivity in three search tools for qualitative systematic reviews. *BMC health services research*. 2014;14(1):579-579.
16. NICE. Appendix G Quality appraisal checklist – quantitative studies reporting correlations and associations. 2012.
17. NICE. Appendix H Quality appraisal checklist – qualitative studies. 2012.
18. NICE. Appendix F Quality appraisal checklist – quantitative intervention studies. In:2012.
19. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2008;8(1):45.